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

I. Overview –

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation in the Department of Geosciences and Natural Resources. The document is guided at the highest level by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. We recognize that faculty vary in their teaching, scholarly, and service activities, and that there is not a single model that defines success. We feel it is important to provide faculty with guidelines to help them and the University assess their productivity; however determination of whether faculty are meeting expectations in our department is not solely gauged by the sum of selected accomplishments. Instead, faculty evaluation at all levels is best assessed through consideration of the cumulative past record, and evidence for continued growth.

The central mission of the GNR faculty is to provide high quality education to students. We seek to actively engage students in learning using a teacher-scholar model that develops critical thinking, effective communication, and disciplinary-specific knowledge. A teacher-scholar model is one that integrates teaching with scholarship in a manner that best serves the mission of the Department. Fundamental to student engagement are enrichment experiences outside of the classroom involving hands-on learning, scholarship, or service. We recognize that scholarship, teaching, and service are often intertwined, and that all are important in preparing students to excel in their chosen careers and to contribute to societal issues.

This document describes the evaluation of all faculty with an appointment in the GNR Department, with some exceptions. These exceptions are only for faculty with a special or joint appointment, whose evaluation process is described in other documents that are also approved by the Department, Dean, and Provost.

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. Shulman (1987) 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 useable 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 – 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, 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, especially pedagogical content knowledge. (4.05A)
   b) Peer review of teaching materials --including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2b)
   c) Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. (4.3.1.1)
   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 –
In order to “meet expectations” in the area of teaching, the faculty member must recognize that knowledge of the natural and technological worlds and of how students learn, is changing and
expanding rapidly. To achieve the teaching mission and aspirations of WCU, and the strategic goals of the GNR department, the GNR faculty have expectations of how and what we teach. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting University definitions of load and the three dimensions of teaching, faculty must prepare students to contribute to society, be able to understand science, and be able to communicate in this changing world. To achieve these goals, we expect the cumulative record of individuals will reflect that:

- Their courses promote critical thinking in addition to content knowledge
- They provide learning experiences for our students that include opportunities outside of the classroom such as fieldwork, research, applied training, and service
- They teach a variety of courses as needed by the program that may include lower and upper level majors courses, liberal studies courses and graduate level courses
- They will engage in activities to promote ongoing innovation and improvement in their ability to meet the above goals

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 workaday 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 by the AFE Peer Review Committee
• SAI responses on relevant items, such as:
  o My instructor is well prepared for class meetings or
  o 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, workshops, opportunities, and courses, as well as observing of other faculty teaching, especially within the GNR Department.

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

  1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 4 types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.
     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 —

  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 GNR Department. However, productivity in these other areas must not be the sole source of scholarship for the granting of tenure.

  All scholarship must be peer reviewed. We define peer review as the evaluation of scholarly work by people external to Western Carolina University with knowledge and expertise in the discipline in order to determine the quality of the work; and where the results of that assessment are made known to the faculty member and others, as appropriate for the work being evaluated. Scholarly work also must be disseminated to a broad audience so that knowledge is advanced.

  Traditional examples of scholarly products include peer-reviewed publications and funded, competitive, peer-reviewed grants. Non-traditional scholarly products, on topics ranging from
pedagogical research to unique applications of the discipline to leading professional field trips, will also be considered scholarship provided they meet our definition of peer review. When there is no traditional peer review process, the faculty member must document how the work will advance the discipline, how the work has been reviewed, and how it will be disseminated.

Scholarly Activity---The GNR Department also values and expects productive scholarly activity from faculty members in addition to the scholarly products described above that have gone through a more rigorous peer review process. Typical examples of such activities include conference presentations, research involving students, and organizing or leading professional field trips.

3. General comments –

We expect our faculty to be active scholars to maintain currency in their field, to help advance their discipline, to improve as educators, and to provide opportunities for students. Scholarship is expected of all permanent faculty in the GNR Department, though the type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary between faculty members due to expertise, interests, needs of the Department and University, and stage of career. We value scholarship that advances understanding of a discipline, as well as, scholarship that advances teaching.

a) Grant proposals and awards –
(see Section B2 above)

b) Professional development –

Professional development is important for faculty to grow as productive scholars, effective educators, and good ambassadors to Western and their disciplines. There are a myriad of activities that can contribute to professional development; some typical examples are listed below.

- Participation in activities such as grant writing workshops and short courses that demonstrate that develop research, teaching, or service skills.
- Collaborative arrangements or partnerships with colleagues at other institutions or agencies.
- Development and conducting research, writing and submitting grant proposals.
- Organizing or leading field trips for professionals, which is a standard practice for dissemination of knowledge in field-based disciplines common in the GNR Department. Typically, these field trips are conducted in collaboration with professional organizations, such as, the Geological Society of America, Carolina Geological Society, Society of American Foresters, or Ecological Society of America.
- Leading, and/or participating in discipline-related professional organizations or outreach activities to the general or educational community.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. 1. Types of service
a) **Institutional service** –

The following items will be considered:

a. Membership and offices held in Department, College, or University Committees  
b. Administrative duties  
c. Special assignments in Department, College, or University  
d. Other information a faculty member wishes to submit

b) **Community engagement** –

The following items will be considered:

a. Community outreach related to the discipline  
b. Workshops related to the discipline  
c. Presentations to non-professional organizations  
d. Off-campus instruction and regional service  
e. Other information a faculty member wishes to submit  
   1) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** -  
      a. Offices held in professional organizations  
      b. Peer review of grants, manuscripts, and programs  
      c. Other information a faculty member wishes to submit

c) **Advising** –

The following items will be considered:

a. Number of advisees  
b. Availability to students  
c. Quality of academic advising and counseling  
d. Faculty advisement to student organizations  
e. Other information a faculty member wishes to submit

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence** –

The faculty member's listing of service and engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, and other indicators of effort, quantity, or quality that the faculty member wishes to include in their file.

3. **General comments** –

Faculty members must show meaningful participation in program and departmental activities. This participation is required of all faculty; especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising, etc.). It is expected that prior to the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor that faculty will have engaged in service beyond the department. The promotion from Associate to Full Professor should reflect a further broadening of the faculty member's service contribution, and should reflect clear evidence of a superior performance in service. Such evidence would include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities.

a) **Professional development** –
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 AFE Peer Review Committee will assess individuals in light of the central mission of the
         GNR faculty, which is to provide high quality education to students. We seek to actively engage
         students in learning using a teacher-scholar model that develops critical thinking, effective
         communication, and disciplinary-specific knowledge. A teacher-scholar model is one that
         integrates teaching with scholarship in a manner that best serves the mission of the Department.
         Fundamental to student engagement are enrichment experiences outside of the classroom
         involving hands-on learning, scholarship, or service. We recognize that scholarship, teaching,
         and service are often intertwined, and that all are important in preparing students to excel in their
         chosen careers and to contribute to societal issues. Faculty will be evaluated on their
         - Effectiveness to educate students using the teacher-scholar (or similar) model
         - Contributions to scholarship in their disciplines
         - Engagement in university and external service

         The AFE Peer Review Committee will evaluate and write a report for all faculty members
         covered by this document, and that report will initially be given to the Department Head. The
         Department Head will then write a separate report for all faculty members covered by this
         document. The evaluation reports written by both the AFE Peer Review Committee and the
         Department Head will be given to each faculty member before the end of spring semester.

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

         - In the case of the AFE Peer Review Committee report on the Department Head, the Chair of
           the Committee will submit the evaluation to the Head for review. The Chair will subsequently
           meet with the Head to discuss the Committee evaluation.

         A summary of the year's departmental AFE results from the Department Head, the AFE Peer
         Review Committee, and any written statements by the faculty member shall be prepared and
         submitted to the Dean by the deadline established by the Dean.

      2. Composition of review committee –
         a. The AFE peer review committee will be composed of four (4) tenured persons who are
            also members of the GNR TPR committee plus one (1) untenured person. When
            possible, the committee will include at least one tenured person from each of the degree
            granting programs.
b. If four (4) tenured persons from the GNR department are not available, the committee membership will be reduced to three (3) tenured persons from the GNR TPR committee.
c. The untenured person must be in a tenure-track position and must have completed at least two years of full-time employment in the GNR Department. The untenured member shall not be either the committee chair or secretary. If no untenured person is eligible, then the committee will consist of only the tenured persons.
d. The Department Head shall not be a member or an observer of this committee.
e. The committee shall be appointed by the Department Head in consultation with the faculty.
f. The length of service for tenured faculty is three years with staggered appointments. A tenured faculty member may be appointed for successive terms. The length of service for untenured faculty is one year.
g. Members of the committee will be excused while their files are being reviewed.
h. The expectation is that all faculty in permanent positions within the Department shall serve on this committee on a rotating basis.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation

a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes (1) a self-statement, not to exceed 3 pages, that summarizes and evaluates their performance in the areas of teaching (including assessment of the 3 dimensions), scholarship, and service, (2) the completed GNR Annual Report of Faculty Activities table distributed by the Department Head each fall semester, and (3) the following materials:

1) Teaching
   a) as part of the self-statement described in 3a (above), a self-evaluation addressing the 3 dimensions of teaching, especially pedagogical content knowledge (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review. Selected teaching materials should include, but are not limited to syllabi, the final exam, and 1 or 2 selected examples of materials that exemplify the course learning environment.
   b) direct observation of classroom teaching (if required)
      Arrange to have a tenured member of the Department observe and write an evaluative report at least one class per year (one class per semester for full time lecturers in their first year of employment).

c) Student Assessment of Instruction

2) Scholarship and Creative Activity –
Criteria for evaluating scholarship are described under Section II B of this document (Domains of Evaluation). These products and activities will be summarized in the GNR Annual Report of Faculty Activities table distributed by the Department Head each fall semester.

3) Service –
Criteria for evaluating service are described under Section II C of this document (Domains of Evaluation). These products and activities will be summarized in the GNR Annual Report of Faculty Activities.

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document -
  a. Faculty will compile their AFE materials in a single, 3-ring binder, and submit those materials to the Department Head for review by the AFE Peer Review Committee. The deadline for submission will be in the middle of February, on a date that will be specified by the department head.
  b. The materials to be submitted will include the information described above plus the previous year’s AFE statements from both the Department Head and the AFE Peer Review Committee.
  c. The Committee will examine the current year’s AFE document plus the previous year’s AFE statements to provide a time frame to better assess faculty contributions to the University, especially in the area of scholarship and service where productivity and activity are likely to be variable.
  d. The Committee will review the AFE materials and make comments regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. A single written statement will be prepared by the committee and forwarded to the Department Head. The letter will be signed by the tenured Chairperson of the Committee.
  e. The Department Head will use both the information provided in the faculty member’s AFE document plus the AFE Peer Review Committee’s statement in preparing his/her letter.
  f. After a faculty member has completed 3 years towards tenure, the Department Head’s statement will include a cumulative assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure in teaching, scholarship, and service. This will be continued in subsequent years until the faculty member has achieved tenure.

c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track faculty (4.05 F) -

1) Procedures for Lecturers.
   a) Materials for Annual Review:

   Lecturers are to submit a file folder that includes the materials in the following list to the Department Head no later than March 1st of each year. The quality and effectiveness of teaching will be evaluated based on the following materials and the written philosophy and self-evaluation statements should not exceed three pages in length.
   a. A self-statement, not to exceed three pages, that summarizes and evaluates their teaching philosophy, performance, and three
dimensions of teaching, especially pedagogical content knowledge, over the review period.
b. Student evaluations of teaching for all course sections over review period.
c. Reports from peer observers of teaching (a minimum of one per calendar year)
d. Course materials to include examples of syllabi, classroom activities, creative use of technology in teaching, etc.
e. A current CV
f. Other: e.g., workshops on teaching and learning, presentations/papers related to teaching, etc.

b) Classroom Visits:

Lecturers in their first year of employment should have a classroom observation at least once per semester while those in their 2\textsuperscript{nd} year or later should be observed at least once per academic year. Classroom observations must be conducted by a tenured faculty member in the department who will write an evaluative report that includes a review of course materials. When possible, these observations must be completed by a faculty member within the Department who is not the Department Head. The written report must be submitted to the Department Head. Any concerns will be addressed to the Lecturer in a timely manner, and the Lecturer will be given time to correct problems appropriately.

c) Annual Evaluation:

Lecturers will be evaluated by the AFE committee established annually by the department as outlined in Section III, A., 2. A meeting with the department head will be offered and shall follow the procedure outlined in Section III, A., 1. Criteria for this review are the following: (1) Clarity of syllabus, assignments, philosophy, and self-assessment; and (2) evidence of coherence with the curriculum. Based on review of these selected materials, this committee advises the Department Head of the names of Lecturers whose teaching merits reappointment. The Department Head will consider this advice in his/her review of the Lecturer’s AFE file.

2) Procedures for part-time instructors

a) The materials for review include four items. The sum of these materials must address the three dimensions of teaching.

(1) Submit copies of syllabi, final exams, and selected examples of materials that exemplify the course learning environment to the department’s office assistant each term for each different course taught. These are kept on file.

(2) Arrange to have a tenured member of the Department observe and write an evaluative report of at least one class per academic year. When possible,
this observation should be completed by a faculty member within the Department who is not the Department Head. The written report must be submitted to the Department Head.

(3) Submit to the Department Head a brief (one page) teaching self-report to include statements on teaching philosophy, a description of how the philosophy is reflected in their courses, and an assessment of teaching effectiveness, especially pedagogical content knowledge.

(4) Participate in the departmental student evaluation survey in each course section.

b) Process of Evaluation
For individuals hired for a semester, the above materials must be submitted by the last day of classes for the teaching assignment. For those hired to teach both terms for the academic year, this AFE procedure must be completed April 1st. It is the instructor’s responsibility to be sure the steps outlined above are completed by the deadlines.

Each part time faculty member will receive a written AFE from the Department Head. The student evaluations, the teaching observation letter, and the Department Head’s evaluation will be presented to each Faculty member (in writing). If desired or necessary, the Department Head will meet with each Faculty member individually to review the documents, and both will sign to verify the meeting.

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

1. Overview –

The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) –
The Department, College, and University review committees shall be composed in the manner specified by 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 –
The Geosciences and Natural Resources Department will conduct a post-tenure review (PTR) on all tenured faculty covered by this document. Each faculty member shall be evaluated by the same criteria and by the same processes. The purpose of the evaluation “is to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence among tenured faculty.” The review will be consistent with the Western Carolina University Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures; these criteria, guidelines and procedures are supplementary to that document. The criteria by which a faculty member will be evaluated are outlined in section II of this document. These criteria include quality and effectiveness of teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service.

Criteria for acceptable faculty performance include professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties, taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the department head; and efforts to improve performance. Exemplary faculty performance, as determined by the department, involves sustained excellence in teaching, scholarly achievement, and service.

2. Composition of review committee –
The Department Head assigns three tenured faculty, excluding her/himself, to the PTR review team, who then conduct the review and write the report. If three tenured colleagues are unavailable for the review the Department Head, in consultation with the Dean and faculty member being reviewed, will select tenured faculty from similar departments to make up the remaining positions of the committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation –

a. Faculty members affected by this policy include all tenured faculty covered by this document in the Geology and Natural Resources department. Formal PTR reviews must occur no later than the fifth year following the awarding of tenure and/or promotion and a PTR review must occur at least once every five years.

b. Faculty on leave will not have that leave period count as part of the five years between review events; faculty temporarily assigned away from Cullowhee or Asheville at the time a review is scheduled will be reviewed the next academic year they resume responsibilities in the area.

c. PTR reviews are based on the work completed over the previous four years and include: (a) the four most recent APE evaluations and supporting materials, (b) a current vitae, and (c) a brief self-statement.

d. Peer reviewers will present a copy of their evaluation to the Department Head. Peer reviews are to be completed in accord with a calendar established by the University and Department Head.
Responsibility of Each Tenured Faculty Member
a. Each tenured faculty member is responsible for maintaining documents that support their activities for the previous four years. The items to be included are those presented for the Annual Faculty Evaluation process.

b. Each tenured faculty member is responsible for including the previous four Annual Faculty Evaluation summary statements. They must also include a self-statement, not to exceed three pages, that summarizes and evaluates their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service over the review period.

Responsibility of the Department Head
a. The Department Head establishes and circulates the timetable for the PTR and defines when written reports are due in accordance with university guidelines. Faculty under consideration for PTR will be given at least one month to prepare their documents.

b. The Department Head meets with the subject(s) of PTR reviews to discuss the written report.

c. The Department Head appends an evaluation to that written report relative to the mission of the university, college and department, to which the PTR review subject has the option of attaching a written response.

d. In the case of an unsatisfactory review, the department head will, in consultation with the faculty member, the PTR review committee, and the College Dean, develop a three (3) year plan for improvement. That plan will be done within one (1) month of the PTR review. That plan will include (a) specific areas of improvement; (b) resources available for that improvement; and (c) administrative support provided. The plan will also include consequences for failure to make adequate progress by the third year.

e. The Department Head will, in conjunction with the PTR review team, monitor the progress of that plan and provide oral and written assessments of that progress to the faculty member every six (6) months.

Responsibility of the Review Team
a. The Review Team will, in accord with the schedule established, review the materials provided by the PTR candidates.

b. The Review Team will, in accord with the schedule established, provide the Department Head with a written statement of their findings.

c. The Review Team will collaborate with the Department Head, in the event of an unsatisfactory review, on the development of an improvement plan and the semi-annual monitoring of that plan.

Due Process
a. Disciplinary actions for noncompliance with the improvement plan are limited to those established in Chapter VI of The Code.
b. Due process and right of appeal are specified in *The Code* and in the "Tenure Policies and Regulations of Western Carolina University" in the *Faculty Handbook* and are guaranteed.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in Department of Geosciences and Natural Resources

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
   1. Teaching –
      The Department requires that every faculty member be an effective teacher as demonstrated by, among other things, student evaluations, peer evaluations, and thorough peer reviews of course materials and works toward meeting Departmental learning goals defined in Section II.A.3. On any given year, the teaching by faculty should promote critical thinking in addition to content knowledge; provide learning experiences for students that, when possible, include opportunities outside of the classroom such as fieldwork, research, applied training, or service; and engage in activities to promote ongoing innovation and improvement in their instruction. In addition, faculty must also adapt and contribute to the Department’s continuous curricular improvements.

   2. Scholarship –
      Each faculty member must demonstrate that they are active scholars to maintain currency in their field, to help advance their discipline, to improve as educators, and to provide opportunities for students. The type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary between faculty members due to expertise, stage of a scholarly project, interests, needs of the Department and University, and stage of career. Though scholarly products may vary year by year, each year faculty must show evidence of ongoing scholarly activity and continued progress towards completion of scholarly products (as one example, publications).

   3. Service –
      Each faculty member must show meaningful, on-going participation in program and departmental activities, consistent with their position, experience, and background. This participation is required of all faculty; especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising, etc.). Other forms of service, such as, service to the College, University, discipline, and region are also expected, though the type and amount will likely vary from year to year.

   4. General comments –
      Any given year is a snapshot into the longer career of a faculty member. While teaching should continuously meet expectations, defined elsewhere, it is understood that on an annual basis scholarly products and the level service may be variable. During each year, however, faculty should be active in scholarship and service consistent to achieving longer terms goals proper for the faculty member’s appointment and rank.

B. Reappointment (4.06)
   1. Teaching -
      Teaching: To achieve the teaching mission and aspirations of WCU, and the strategic goals of the GNR department, the GNR faculty have expectations of how and what we teach. We expect
that in addition to satisfactorily meeting University definitions of load and the three dimensions of teaching (as describe above), faculty must prepare students to contribute to society, be able to understand science, and be able to communicate in this changing world. To achieve these goals, we expect the cumulative record of individuals will reflect that:

- Their courses promote critical thinking in addition to content knowledge
- They provide learning experiences for our students that include opportunities outside of the classroom such as fieldwork, research, applied training, and service
- They teach courses that reflect departmental needs, and these courses may include lower and upper level majors courses, liberal studies courses, and graduate level courses
- They will engage in activities to promote ongoing innovation and improvement in their ability to meet the above goals

2. Scholarship –
Scholarly Activity: Faculty must show evidence of ongoing scholarly activity and continued promise toward achieving the level of scholarly productivity required for tenure. The scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are valued, but the scholarship of discovery must be represented in the granting of tenure.

Evidence of scholarly activity may include peer-reviewed publications; oral presentations; grants applied for and funded; dissemination of innovative teaching methods and new curriculum development; research in progress; involvement with students; unpublished research and manuscripts; organizing and leading professional field trips; lectures in the discipline presented at non-professional meetings; other indications of keeping current in the field; workshop or short course attendance; formal academic course completion; membership and participation in professional organizations. As described previously, the boundaries between teaching, scholarship, professional activity, and service are commonly blurred, as exemplified by the activities listed above. To be considered as productive scholarship, as defined in section II. B., these activities must include external peer review and dissemination of results.

3. Service –
Service/Engagement: faculty must continuously show meaningful participation in program and departmental activities, especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising). A faculty member’s record of service beyond the department at reappointment; such as regional or professional engagement, and college or university level service, should be consistent with the faculty member’s type of appointment, length of appointment, and rank.

4. General comments –
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 their cumulative past record, and evidence for continued growth. The GNR Department expects that recently-hired faculty will, in most cases, initially devote a disproportionate amount of time to their teaching activities, and that the amount of time that they spend on scholarly activities and service will increase in subsequent years.
GNR-DRCD 2nd and 4th Year Expectations

While the overall GNR 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 GNR 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, GNR offers a reduced course load to first year faculty. The 2nd year reappointment file should demonstrate progress towards meeting department teaching standards and student learning goals. Faculty should reflect upon their first year of teaching considering both university and departmental 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 students.

- **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 GNR 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 (DRCD 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, and/or service to the region.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. **Teaching**

**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 the range of teaching preparations he or she has been assigned. This range might include different levels (from introductory and liberal studies
courses to upper level courses in the major) and class types (traditional lecture courses, independent studies, or field investigation courses).

2. Scholarship –

Scholarly Activity: For tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of 1) an on-going, established research program, 2) that has been productive, and 3) shows promise of continued productivity. Such a record is typically evidenced by publications in peer-reviewed journals, involvement of 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 valued, but the scholarship of discovery must be represented in the granting of tenure.

Our department expects faculty to actively engage students in learning using a teacher-scholar model. This requires that faculty are active, productive scholars and that some of their scholarly activity provides students with opportunities to enrich their educational experience. It is not feasible to establish a standard publication expectation for tenure because 1) the Department encompasses a wide-range of disciplines, having collectively published in about sixty different peer reviewed journals, with research approaches ranging from computer-based to lab-based, to field-based; 2) the highly variable, and sometimes lengthy time it may take from project initiation to publication; and 3) the expectation of undergraduate student involvement in research, which requires significant time and may decrease scholarly productivity.

The typical successful case for tenure will include several peer-reviewed publications. However, the number of peer-reviewed publications is not the sole source of evidence that will be considered in granting tenure. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being considered for tenure to demonstrate that their scholarship is 1) on-going, 2) productive, and 3) has promise for continued productivity.

3. Service –

Service/Engagement: In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member must have engaged in service beyond the department prior to the granting of tenure. This type of service should include serving on college level or university level committees and include discipline-based service to the community or society or service to the profession.

4. General comments –

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 –

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 the range of teaching preparations he or she has been assigned. This range might include different levels (from introductory and liberal studies
courses to upper level courses in the major) and class types (traditional lecture courses, independent studies, or field investigation courses).

2. Scholarship –

Scholarly Activity: For promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of 1) an on-going, established research program, 2) that has been productive, and 3) shows promise of continued productivity. Such a record is typically evidenced by publications in peer-reviewed journals, involvement of 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 valued, but the scholarship of discovery must be represented in the granting of promotion to Associate Professor.

Our department expects faculty to actively engage students in learning using a teacher-scholar model. This requires that faculty are active, productive scholars and that some of their scholarly activity provides students with opportunities to enrich their educational experience. It is not feasible to establish a standard publication expectation for promotion to Associate Professor because 1) the Department encompasses a wide-range of disciplines, having collectively published in about sixty different peer reviewed journals, with research approaches ranging from computer-based to lab-based, to field-based; 2) the highly variable, and sometimes lengthy time it may take from project initiation to publication; and 3) the expectation of undergraduate student involvement in research, which requires significant time and may decrease scholarly productivity.

The typical successful case for promotion to Associate Professor will include several peer-reviewed publications. However, the number of peer-reviewed publications is not the sole source of evidence that will be considered in granting promotion to Associate Professor. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being considered for tenure to demonstrate that their scholarship is 1) on-going, 2) productive, and 3) has promise for continued productivity.

3. Service –

Service/Engagement: 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 include discipline-based service to the community or society or service to the profession.

i. General comments –

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.

c. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

For promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a record of superior teaching, scholarship, and service.
1. Teaching
Teaching: Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory established in earning tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and 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.

2. Scholarship
Scholarly Activity: Faculty are expected to demonstrate that their cumulative scholarly record will have a broad and long-lasting impact on their discipline, education, and community. The record should show the faculty member has been continuously engaged in scholarship, and produced publications and artifacts indicative of continuous and cumulative work. Evidence of broad and long-lasting impact includes, but is not limited to, being recognized by professional organizations, such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions; authoring oft-cited work that has advanced their discipline, creating an innovative pedagogical model that has been adopted by other institutions, performing critical reviews of scholarly programs and proposals; and refereeing articles for peer-reviewed journals. The scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and teaching and learning are all valued when considering promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

3. Service
Service/Engagement: Faculty should show broadening contributions to service internal and external to the University. This service should reflect clear evidence of superior performance, which would include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities. Evidence of this broader impact may include a wide range of activities, such as application of scholarship to serve regional needs, collaborative projects with government and nongovernment agencies, bringing forth new education models, etc.

4. General comments
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 --
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 (from introductory and liberal studies courses to upper level courses in the major) and class types (traditional lecture courses, independent studies, or field investigation courses).

2. Scholarship --
Scholarly Activity: 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 –

Service/Engagement: 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 superior performance and broad impact. Evidence of this broader impact may include a wide range of activities, such as 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 Department recognizes that a faculty member cannot 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 Department recognizes that faculty members who have been at WCU for lengthy careers have much to offer given their experience and knowledge of institutional history. In consultation with the Department Head, 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 Department fully values this level of service. Faculty failing to meet Departmental standards for any category must develop, in conjunction and with the approval of the Department Head, an action plan to address the specified deficiencies. Progress on the action plan will be assessed in the next Annual Faculty Evaluation.
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