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I. Overview – The Department of Human Services seeks to attract and retain colleagues who are interesting, productive, and scholarly. Our first priority is to be very good teachers, and to be scholarly in our teaching. The department needs to balance teaching, scholarship, and service, but individual faculty members don’t all need to achieve exactly the same balance. Certainly we will differ with regard to specialty areas within our discipline, but we will also vary in terms of the types of scholarship we emphasize, investment in service and engagement, and balance between research and practice. This complex and rather abstract blend of expectations, which may well differ by individual, is hard to specify and harder to quantify. Nevertheless, we feel that it is important to provide faculty members with guidelines to help them develop productive and gratifying careers, guidelines specific enough to be practical, yet flexible enough to promote the individual differences that make our department a great place to live and work.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Human Services. The document is guided at the highest level by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some cases by the college. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures, the faculty member should have familiarity with The Code and with the WCU Faculty Handbook (section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the faculty member should also have available the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier, a separate document disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

Guidelines presented in this document represent minimal criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. It also provides the guidelines for completing the Annual Faculty Review. When departmental, college, and university committee members consider a faculty member’s submitted tenure portfolio and tenure request they will be asking, “Is this faculty member a person who will continue to make positive contributions to the university and the region in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service potentially for the next 20-30 years?” It is important for tenure track faculty members to understand that only meeting minimal expectations annually may put a faculty member in a tenuous position when it comes to receiving a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion.
The DCRD Committee reviews the Departmental Collegial Review Document at the request of the faculty, Department Head, Dean or Provost. The DCRD committee is not a standing committee. It will be formed when a review request is made. The department head will select from faculty who volunteer to be involved in the review process. Attention will be paid to include representatives from most academic programs in the department while ensuring that both tenured and non-tenured faculty members are represented.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching *(Faculty Handbook 4.04 & 4.05)*

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 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.
   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. Both 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 students feel respected and share a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

2. Methods of evaluation
   a. **Self-evaluation.** Narrative statement addressing Pedagogical Content Knowledge, particularly with regard to currency. What are you doing to help students understand the most important material in your field? How have you changed your teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and advancements for the courses you teach? *(4.05B2C).*
b. Colleagues' review of teaching materials and direct observation of classroom teaching

Review of teaching materials & direct observation of teaching.

1. All tenure-track, fixed-term, and part-time faculty members will have their teaching materials reviewed and their teaching directly observed during each academic year. Materials to be reviewed may include course syllabi, exams, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, media, etc. Direct observation will include either attending a classroom or a live on-line delivered session where content is delivered.

2. Tenured and non-tenured-tenure-track faculty will be reviewed by a two person committee of their peers who may be within or outside their discipline. The department head must approve the two person committee from a minimum of three faculty member names submitted by the faculty member under review. At least one of the submitted names must have had a minimum of three years of undergraduate or graduate teaching experience. **All review committees will be established in September.** The review can take place in either fall or spring semester but must be completed by March 30 of that academic year. Once the review committee is established, the members will negotiate with the faculty member to be reviewed as to when the review will take place. While both members of the review committee will review course materials only one needs to conduct the direct observation. This direct observer must have a minimum of three years teaching experience.

3. All fixed-term faculty and adjunct faculty will be reviewed by either the department head or the program director of the program for which the faculty member is teaching. The department head will meet with the program director at the beginning of each semester to determine fixed-term and adjunct review needs and who will conduct the review. These faculty members will be informed as to who will be reviewing them and a time will be negotiated as to when the review will take place.

4. Reviewers will use the electronic form of Attachment A to guide the review process and to prepare a report of the review. The faculty will submit this review to the department head as part of his/her AFE materials.

c. Student assessment of instruction (SAI)

- All courses will be evaluated with the university-approved SAI instruments. Faculty members will report all SAI summaries quantitative data with a 33+4% student response rate.

- Summary of SAI data for the period of evaluation by class, number of responses and domain.

- A faculty member may omit reporting any course SAI summaries with less than 33% student response rate; however, faculty members must
submit a minimum of 4 course SAIs per academic (fall, spring) year (even if a less-than-33% response rate)

d. **Professional Development Activities:**
   - Professional development activities should be listed and may include: Coulter Faculty Center activities, professional writing groups, teaching focused discipline specific conferences and workshops and teaching conferences and workshops.

e. **General comments**
   - The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution.

**B. Scholarship (4.05C)**

WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuation of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples are described in this section. The Department of Human Services recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another. It is important to note all Boyer categories are valued equally.

i. **Scholarship of discovery** — Original research that advances knowledge.

ii. **Scholarship of integration** — Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.

iii. **Scholarship of application** — Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.

iv. **Scholarship of teaching and learning** — Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

An activity that qualifies as scholarship, regardless of type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) the activity is subjected to external peer review; (2) there is clear evidence of methodological rigor; (3) the activity results in substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and (4) the outcomes are disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community. These four criteria help to differentiate the scholarship of teaching and learning from teaching, and the scholarship of application from service/engagement. Peer review can include traditional forms (e.g., journal reviewers, editors, committees awarding grants), but it can also include a broader community of scholars. For example, it can include both blind and open reviews of items presented for publication or presentation, and it can include "substantial" invited addresses to conferences such as being the keynote speaker for a regional or national conference, where the external peers constitute members of a program committee.

**Methods of evaluation** — Scholarship in the Department of Human Services, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of "units" of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the Collegial Review Committee.
Some scholarly activities are of such high value that they will be recognized as achieving three units, most activities will equate to two units, and some activities will equate to one unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be achieved.

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to make the case for the significance of their scholarly work (i.e., acceptance rates of journals, Boyer-external peer review of creative work), and what is listed below is not intended to be an exhaustive list of all activities that can be classified as scholarly work.

Faculty are expected to have a research agenda, evidenced in their narrative and scholarship artifacts.

**Three Scholarship Units (Category A)**
- Manuscript published in a refereed or peer-reviewed national or international journal
- Sole or co-authorship of a book
- Sole or co-author of an edited book including authorship of at least one chapter or section
- Awarded external grant of at least $10,000
- Editor of a journal
- Patent
- Boyer scholarship external peer reviewed according to department guidelines

**Two Scholarship Units (Category B)**
- Published book chapter
- Presentation at a national or international conference
- Accreditation report*
- Program review, externally reviewed*
- Awarded external grant of under $10,000
- Boyer scholarship peer reviewed according to department guidelines
- Manuscript published in a refereed or peer-reviewed state or regional journal

*The department recognizes the amount of work needed to produce either of these documents and believe more than service credit should be awarded. A non-tenured faculty member would generally not be expected to write such a document. However, should such a need arise for a non-tenured faculty member to produce either of these reports, a documented discussion between the faculty member and the department head should occur to determine support needed. The goal of this discussion would be to determine appropriate ways for the faculty member to maintain a scholarly agenda.

**One Scholarship Unit (Category C)**
- Awarded an internal grant
- Professional newsletter article
- Newspaper or magazine article
- Media appearance
- Sponsor of student research presentation
- Boyer scholarship peer reviewed according to department guidelines
- Manuscript published in a non peer reviewed or non-refereed journal
- Published book review
- Manuscript pending revision and resubmit status in a refereed or peer reviewed journal
- Presentation at a local, state, or regional conference
- Continuation report for grant
- Application for an external grant of at least $10,000

General comments:
These examples are not exhaustive, nor do they focus on “borderline” cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this department. Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present “interesting things” that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimate scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary nature, utilizing an alternative peer review process. The candidate may request a prior review of the proposed project in order to get feedback from the Collegial Review Committee.

Such examples of Boyer scholarship may include, but are not limited to:
- University or accreditation required external program review.
- Products of research as a member of an inter-institutional research team
- Research conducted for external organizations.

Procedures for External Review of Non-Traditional Forms of Scholarly work fitting within the Boyer Model.
When considering whether or not to submit a piece for external review the following criteria should be followed:
- there is clear evidence of methodological rigor;
- the activity results in substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and
- the outcomes are disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community.

If the faculty member chooses to submit a project for scholarship credit which does not fit traditional forms of scholarly work yet fits within the Boyer model the guidelines provided below should be followed.

1. The candidate will inform the Department head that s/he plans to include external reviews in the dossier as soon as possible to meet TPR and AFE deadlines.
2. The candidate will submit to the Department Head up to five names and contact information for potential experts in the field.
3. The Department Head will identify two external reviewers who agree to review the candidate’s materials.
4. The Department head will send to the reviewers the candidate’s project, a copy of the departmental CRD to provide context, and an evaluation protocol to guide review.
5. Each external reviewer will review the project and complete the protocol. The candidate will be provided copies of both review protocols to include in the dossier.

C. Service *(4.04.C.3 and 4.05.D)*

1. Types of service:

1) **Institutional service** – program director, committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring, at all levels, including department, college/school, and university. This also includes student retention activities.

2) **Community engagement** – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level.

3) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** - includes service in professional organizations, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as department head, a major role in faculty governance, etc.

4) **Advising** – actively and accurately advising an appropriate load of undergraduate and/or graduate students; being informed about curriculum and related processes, being available to advisees, assisting with academic, QEP and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation committee service as well as advising student professional organizations.)

3. Methods of evaluation

The faculty member’s listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations by students, etc.), and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix. Service in the Human Services Department will be based on the concept of “units” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year.

**Definitions**

*Internal service* refers to service to the university, college, department, program

*External service* refers to service to the community and the profession

*General Overload Service* refers to an increased workload for a faculty member that is above the accepted load. The faculty member is not receiving pay for these duties.
Units

Internal Service (to the university, college, department, program)

Three Service Units
- Program directorship or coordination

Two Service Units
- Leadership on a committee (e.g., chair of a committee, etc.)
- Undergraduate student advising (entry, ongoing, final)
- Chair of a university accreditation committee

One Service Unit
- Service on department, college, university, or system committees and task forces, (Search Committee, etc.)
- Liaison to other departments or colleges
- Graduate student advising (entry, ongoing, final)
- Faculty or staff mentoring
- Delivering staff / faculty in-service / workshop for WCU
- Student organization advisement
- Student recruitment activities
- Intra- and inter- WCU faculty or staff projects collaboration

External Service (to the community and the profession)

Two Service Units
- Professional conference track or program chair
- Professional conference chair or organizer
- Community engagement (local / regional / state / national / international and professional, civic, economic, service on external accreditation team, or educational entity)
- Consulting in the community (local, national, international)
- Outreach: newspaper editorials, interviews (printed, radio or TV)

One Service Unit
- Speeches, workshops, invited presentations for schools, communities or businesses
- Professional organization: Serving on the editorial board of a journal or ad hoc reviewer
- Professional organization: Reviewer for professional conferences
- Professional organization: Session chair or discussant for professional conferences
- Member of an external university accreditation committee
- Liaison to universities, school systems, businesses
- Taking students to conferences
- Taking students to community service projects (for online courses, involve students in community projects)
General Overload Service Units (to be justified by Faculty member)

- Teaching an unremunerated overload (3 points)
- Undergraduate advising _____ (1 point)
- Other: ______________________ (indicate the number of points: _____)

4. General comments

Faculty members are expected to participate in service activities at each institutional level (department, college/school, university) and to be active advisors to students. In addition, each faculty member is expected to engage in external service appropriate to professional training. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

A non-tenured tenure-track faculty member is encouraged to carefully consider the amount of service he or she commits to in any given year. The general expectation is for the faculty member at the beginning of the tenure process to focus on service to the program and then with yearly progression in the tenure process expand service to the department, college, university and community. Directly discussing with the department head as to the amount of and appropriate types of service is advised.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

a. Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE)

1. Overview – All faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. The Deans and the Provost determine the deadlines for the review process. The range for AFE inclusion will be from April 1 of the previous year to March 31 of the current year.

2. Procedures and preparation of documentation

a) Prior to March 31, the department head will request faculty members to submit all materials to be considered for the annual faculty review. Each faculty member will submit:

i) a completed AFE Check Sheet (Attachment C). Attachment C when properly completed will include a teaching statement that addresses pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching and student responses to instruction (See II.A1.a-c above for detailed description), and statements describing the faculty member’s scholarship and service;
ii. a formal review of the faculty member’s teaching that was conducted by the two person faculty committee (Attachment A);

iii. a separate comparative course evaluation report for each course taught; and

iv. the Human Services Faculty Growth Plan (Attachment D).

Documentation will primarily exist in the digital repository of faculty activities (Digital Measures) [Faculty members are strongly encouraged to extract this report themselves prior to the official extraction to be sure data are complete and accurate.], Banner, and CoursEval.

b) The Department Head shall prepare a written AFE Statement, addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The Department Head will use the faculty teaching statement, SAI data, committee review of teaching (Attachment A), AFE check sheet (Attachment C), data collected from Digital Measures and Banner, the previous year’s Faculty Growth Plan and other faculty submitted supporting documentation to prepare the AFE statement.

c) Once the AFE statement is prepared the department head will arrange to meet with the faculty member to review and sign the AFE Statement. Signing the AFE statement does not mean the faculty member agrees with the statement by the department head. The faculty member may prepare a rebuttal statement if s/he deems it necessary within 10 days of receiving the AFE statement.

The Human Services Faculty Growth Plan (Attachment D) will also be discussed and agreed upon between the faculty member and the Department Head. A copy will be placed in the faculty member’s file and one will be given to the faculty member.

3. Evaluation of Fixed Term Faculty – These procedures and guidelines are based upon the assumption that the full time non-tenured/non tenure track faculty member is responsible only for teaching and service. Those with contractual agreements specifying other expectations will be evaluated using appropriate aspects and weightings described in section IV. A (page 15).

4. Evaluation of Part-time Teachers - These procedures and guidelines are based upon the assumption that the part-time faculty member is responsible only for teaching. Those with contractual agreements specifying other expectations will be evaluated using appropriate aspects and weightings described in section IV. A (page 15).

a) All part-time instructors will be evaluated with regard to teaching effectiveness, using data from the following sources:

i. Annual review of teaching materials.

ii. Student Assessment of Instruction, using the university instrument, for each section taught and a personal statement addressing pedagogical content knowledge.
b) Part-time faculty should have peer review of materials during the first semester of the academic year in which they teach.

c) The Department Head in conjunction with the Program Director shall write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during the preparation of AFEs in the spring.

d) The Department Head shall place in the part-time faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer review of teaching materials, and all available SAI reports.

b. Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment

1. Overview - The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment.

2. Composition of review committees

a) The departmental TPR Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and shall be composed of six tenured faculty members elected annually by the department’s full-time faculty. In the event that there are fewer than six tenured faculty, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, providing that the resultant committee shall consist of at least three members, exclusive of the department head. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Provost, in consultation with the department and Dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

b) The College TPR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of faculty members of the college as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

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

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation

The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office finalizes the list. 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.

Supporting documentation (i.e., curriculum vita, selected copies of publications, presentations, grants, and awards) should be organized in a notebook binder. Please do not place documents in plastic cover sheets and insure that each section of your binder is clearly labeled.

The office of the Provost provides the timeline for the TPR review annually.

a. Preparation of the files of the candidates - files on each candidate shall be prepared according to university guidelines provided through the Provost.
b. Procedures of the Departmental Advisory Committee on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. (See Section II, 4.02 of the Faculty Handbook.)

c. Other Procedures during and at the end of the annual consideration process.
   1) Human Services faculty are requested to indicate to the department head if they are eligible for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure and if they desire consideration (Attachment E). Upon confirmation of their eligibility those faculty members who wish to be considered for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure are reminded of the criteria by which recommendations will be made. If a non-tenured faculty member is on the timeline for reappointment and or tenure consideration, but chooses not to be considered, the contract with that faculty member will be terminated at the conclusion of the current academic year.

   2) For the purpose of self-advocacy and to provide additional information for decision-making, the faculty will include material that provides evidence of productivity, such as the following:
      a) Evidence of presentations (oral/written)
      b) Selected syllabi
      c) Artifacts of teaching, service and research that represent one's best work
      d) Educational material such as case studies, simulation/games, modules, training guides, etc.
      e) Advertisement or agendas of workshops attended
      f) Committee reports
      g) When appropriate, evidence of involvement in faculty development activities related to teaching effectiveness
      h) Course evaluations-electronic versions
      i) Other

In its consideration of each candidate, the department shall assess and be guided by the individual's promise for sustained future professional achievement based upon the cumulative record in all the categories listed above. Recommendations for appointment/reappointment and promotion to a rank shall be consistent with the provisions of Section II, 4.02 of the Faculty Handbook. A recommendation for the conferral of permanent tenure must be based on a thorough assessment of the candidate's cumulative record and promise for sustained achievement. In addition, all recommendations on appointment/reappointment, promotion, and tenure shall be consistent with the needs and resources of the College related to the College strategic plan.

D. Post-Tenure Review

1. Overview - These guidelines are based upon section 4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event (other than AFE).
2. **Composition of review committee** - The departmental post tenure review committee shall be comprised of three elected tenured members of the department, excluding the department head and any members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty members in the department, the Provost, in consultation with the department and dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three. This committee is responsible for conducting the review and making appropriate recommendations to the department head.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   Included in the review process are the last five AFE statements and a current curriculum vita. In the case of unsatisfactory post tenure review, the department head, and PTR committee will meet with the faculty member to create a plan to best meet the department’s standards for tenured professors.

   See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.

---

**IV. Expectations and Criteria**

The criteria specific to each form of review and each type of promotion are described in detail below. The criteria for “meets expectations” in teaching are standardized. For “exceeds expectations” an additional list must be provided from below. For Scholarship and Service expectations, the faculty member should refer to the relevant “units” listed.

**Exceeds Expectations for Teaching:**

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to make the case for the significance of the their teaching (i.e. new instructional strategies, professional activities related to teaching, teaching strategies) and what is listed below is not intended to be an exhaustive list of all activities that can be classified as teaching activities.

**Examples of teaching that would count toward exceeds expectations:**

- New instructional strategies
- Professional activities related to teaching and subsequent curricular changes due to the professional activity
- New innovative teaching strategies
- Teaching awards
- Substantial changes to a course
- Integration of new technology into a course
- Innovative technology into a course
- SAIs are 3.5 or above
- Community integration into the course and benefit to community
- Service learning
- Community engagement
- Chair of dissertation
• Member of dissertation
• Chair of a thesis committee
• Member of a thesis committee
• New course
• Teaching overload (non-paid)
• Independent study
• Sponsor student presentation

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation: (4.05)

Teaching:
In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on:

a. teaching statement that addresses pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching and student responses to instruction (See II.A1.a-c above for detailed description)

b. two person committee review of teaching by direct observation and review of teaching materials identified earlier in this document,

c. SAIs (Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught.),

d. Demonstration of engagement in professional development activities.

Scholarship
Two Scholarship Units (Non-tenured faculty should refer to Reappointment [see B below] for AFE)

Service
Six Service units from internal and external service. The department recognizes that new faculty members would be expected to limit their engagement in service during their first two years.

B. Reappointment: (4.06)
To be reappointed the entire cumulative record of the faculty member is considered for the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Minimal meeting or failure to meet expectations over two or more years does not well serve the non-tenured tenure track faculty member. Such a pattern may result in a non-recommendation for reappointment at the department, college, or university level.

Teaching
In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on:

a. teaching statement that addresses pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching and student responses to instruction (See II.A1.a-c above for detailed description)

b. two person committee review of teaching by direct observation and review of teaching materials identified earlier in this document,
c. SAIs (Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 "factor scores" of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught.),
d. Demonstration of engagement in professional development activities.

Scholarship
Two Scholarship Units for the first year and three units thereafter. These units should come predominately from category A outlined in section II.B. Evaluators are looking for evidences of the establishment of a scholarship agenda that follows one or two patterns of focused research.

Service
Six Service Units with representation from both internal and external service. The department recognizes that new faculty members would be expected to limit their engagement in service during their first two years.

A non-tenured tenure-track faculty member is encouraged to carefully consider the amount of service he or she commits to in any given year. The general expectation is for the faculty member at the beginning of the tenure process to focus on service to the program and then with yearly progression in the tenure process expand service to the department, college, university and community. Directly discuss with the department head as to the amount of and appropriate type of service is advised.

C. Tenure (4.07)
Guidelines presented in this document represent minimal criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. When departmental, college, and university committee members consider a faculty member’s submitted tenure portfolio and tenure request they will be asking, “Is this faculty member a person who will continue to make positive contributions to the university and the region in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service potentially for the next 20-30 years?” It is important for tenure track faculty members to understand that by only meeting expectations annually may put a faculty member in a tenuous position when it comes to receiving a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion.

Teaching
In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on:

a. teaching statement that addresses pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching and student responses to instruction (See II.A1.a-c above for detailed description)
b. two person committee review of teaching by direct observation and review of teaching materials identified earlier in this document,
c. SAIs (Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 "factor scores" of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught.),
d. Demonstration of engagement in professional development activities.
Scholarship
An accumulation of 15 Scholarship Units, at least 12 units from Category A. This record should demonstrate on-going activity and future promise in scholarly activities.

Service
An accumulation of 30 Service Units with representation from both internal and external service.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
Teaching
Guidelines presented in this document represent minimal criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. When departmental, college, and university committee members consider a faculty member’s submitted tenure portfolio and tenure request they will be asking, “Is this faculty member a person who will continue to make positive contributions to the university and the region in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service potentially for the next 20-30 years?” It is important for tenure track faculty members to understand that only meeting expectations annually may put a faculty member in a tenuous position when it comes to receiving a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion.

In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on:
   a. teaching statement that addresses pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching and student responses to instruction (See II.A1.a-c above for detailed description)
   b. two person committee review of teaching by direct observation and review of teaching materials identified earlier in this document,
   c. SAI(s) (Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught.),
   d. Demonstration of engagement in professional development activities.

Scholarship
An accumulation of 15 Scholarship Units, at least 12 units from Category A. This record should demonstrate on-going activity and future promise in scholarly activities.

Service
An accumulation of 30 Service Units with representation from both internal and external service.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)
The promotion to full professor at Western Carolina University is held in high esteem. A faculty member who requests consideration for promotion to full professor status should show evidence of a sustained record of superior (exceeds expectations) performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service since the last promotion.
Teaching
In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive superior (exceeds expectations) overall ratings on:
   a.) teaching statement that addresses pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching and student responses to instruction (See II.A.I.a-c above for detailed description)
   b.) two person committee review of teaching by direct observation and review of teaching materials identified earlier in this document.
   c.) SAI's (Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught.)
   d.) Professional Development.

Scholarship
Fifteen Scholarship Units, subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor, with at least 12 Units from Category A.

Service
An accumulation of 30 Service Units subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor, with representation from both internal and external service including university level committees and service to the region should be documented.

F. Post - Tenure Review
Teaching
In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on:
   a.) self-evaluation
   b.) colleague’s review
   c.) SAI's (Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught.)
   d.) Professional Development.

Scholarship
An average of 2 Scholarship Units for each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review.

Service
An average of 6 Service Units with representation from both internal and external service each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review.

For Post-Tenure Review, the needs of the program and department could enable more or less concentration on the three above areas. Consultation with the Department Head will determine an appropriate workload, which could be a heavier teaching load, extra service, or extra research with a corresponding reduction in the other areas.
Approved by:

Dale B. Raths
Department Head, Human Services  
9/26/12  
Date

Dean, College of Education and Allied Professions  
9/26/12  
Date

Angela Brenton
Provost  
10/1/12  
Date
Attachment A
Peer Review of Teaching Materials and Classroom Observation
Department of Human Services

This form may be used for peer observations of untenured faculty (observation & materials), review of materials for tenured faculty, and evaluation of adjunct and part-time teaching faculty (materials, and observation as needed).

Faculty member being reviewed __________________________ Course name and number __________________________

Name of reviewer __________________________ Date of Direct Observation __________________________

Materials reviewed:

☐ Syllabus ☐ Student Work Samples ☐ Assignment Details/Handouts
☐ Website ☐ Assessments ☐ Other

Brief description of what was observed (including lesson content, delivery method, etc.)

Review the faculty member with reference to the following three categories. The descriptions are provided as a guide and need not be responded to in their entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Content Knowledge: evidence of currency in the field, knowledge of how students learn, and recognition of students’ prior knowledge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Observed in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Aspects of Teaching: evidence of 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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Observed in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Response to Instruction: evidence of course organization and clarity, availability to students, respect for students and rapport with students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Observed in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Summary Statement:

Peer Observer’s Signature __________________________ Date: ________________
Attachment B
Human Services Procedures for External Peer Review

1. The candidate will inform the Department head that s/he plans to include external reviews in the dossier as soon as possible to meet TPR and AFE deadlines.
2. The candidate will submit to the Department Head up to five names and contact information for potential experts in the field.
3. The Department Head will identify two external reviewers who agree to review the candidate’s materials.
4. The Department head will send to the reviewers the candidate’s project, a copy of the departmental CRD to provide context, and an evaluation protocol to guide review.
5. Each external reviewer will review the project and complete the protocol. The candidate will be provided copies of both review protocols to include in the dossier.
Attachment C
Human Services AFE Check Sheet

**TEACHING**
Teaching Load:

**Spring Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrol*</th>
<th>Org*</th>
<th>Enth*</th>
<th>Rap*</th>
<th>Fb*</th>
<th>Learn*</th>
<th>Over*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average SAI

**Fall Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrol*</th>
<th>Org*</th>
<th>Enth*</th>
<th>Rap*</th>
<th>Fb*</th>
<th>Learn*</th>
<th>Over*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average SAI

*Enrol—Class enrollment
*Org—Organization and Clarity
*Enth—Enthusiasm and Intellectual Stimulation
*Rap—Rapport and Respect
*Fb—Feedback and Accessibility
*Learn—Student Perceptions of Learning
Summer Semester (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAI Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course #</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Self-evaluation using the three principles.
   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.

   *Content knowledge*
   (Put statement here.)

   *How students learn and what they bring to the learning process*
   (Put statement here.)

   b. **Professional Aspects of Teaching:** 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.

   (Put statement here.)

   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. Both 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 students feel respected and share a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

   (Put statement here.)

2. Your peer review conducted by: [Please attach the peer review (Attachment A)]
3. Student Assessments of Instruction (Please attach printed comments for each class.)

Average of SAI data for **spring, summer, fall _____**

Check all that apply

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>New instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Professional activities related to teaching and subsequent curricular changes due to the professional activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>New innovative teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Teaching awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Substantial changes to a course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Integration of new technology into a course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Innovative technology into a course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>SAI are 3.5 or above in at least 75% of sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Community integration into the course and benefit to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Chair of dissertation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Member of dissertation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Chair of thesis committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>Member of thesis committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>New course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>Teaching overload (non paid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>Independent study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>Sponsor student presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any item checked above, where appropriate, provide documentation by corresponding alpha letter. i.e., d.—Was nominated for Chancellor’s Teaching Award

---

**Exceeds Expectations _____**

**Meets Expectations _____**

**Needs Improvement _____**

(Meets expectations requires satisfactory self and peer reviews and an average SAI of 3.0 on at least 75% of sections assessed)

**SCHOLARSHIP**

Place a number indicating the number activities you wish to count for the item selected.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Three Scholarship Units (Category A)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.</td>
<td>Sole or co-authorship of a book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Two Scholarship Units (Category B)

- B1. Published book chapter
- B2. Presentation at a national or international conference
- B3. Accreditation report
- B4. Program review, externally reviewed
- B5. Awarded external grant of under $10,000
- B6. Awarded internal grant
- B7. Manuscript published in a refereed or peer-reviewed state or regional journal

For any item chosen in Category B provide documentation by corresponding number.

### One Scholarship Unit (Category C)

- C1. Awarded an internal grant
- C2. Professional newsletter article
- C3. Newspaper or magazine article
- C4. Media appearance
- C5. Sponsor of student research presentation
- C6. Boyer scholarship peer reviewed according to department guidelines
- C7. Manuscript published in a non-peer reviewed or non-refereed journal
- C8. Published book review
- C9. Manuscript pending revision and resubmit status in a refereed or peer reviewed journal
- C10. Presentation at a local, state, or regional conference
- C11. Continuation report for grant
- C12. Application for an external grant of at least $10,000
- C13. Other

For any item chosen in Category C provide documentation by corresponding number.
Total Units

Exceeds Expectations
Meets Expectations
Needs Improvement
(Meets expectations for AFE = 2 Scholarship Units BUT 3 Scholarship Units for Reappointment)

**SERVICE**
Place a number indicating the number activities you wish to count for the item selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Internal Service</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three Service Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program directorship or coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a brief description of your duties for this last AFE year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Two Service Units</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Leadership on a committee (e.g., chair of a committee, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Undergraduate student advising (entry, ongoing, final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Chair of a university accreditation committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>One Service Unit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Service on department, college, university, or system committees and task forces (Search Committee, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Liaison to other departments or colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Graduate student advising (entry, ongoing, final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Faculty or staff mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Delivering staff / faculty in-service / workshop for WCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Student organization advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Student recruitment activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Intra- and inter- WCU faculty or staff projects collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any item chosen under Internal service provide brief listing of activities by letter indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>External Service</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Service Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Professional conference track or program chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Professional conference chair or organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Community engagement (local / regional / state / national / international and professional, civic, economic, service on external accreditation team, or educational entity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Consulting in the community (local, national, international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Outreach: newspaper editorials, interviews (printed, radio or TV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>One Service Unit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Speeches, workshops, invited presentations for schools, communities or businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Professional organization: Serving on the editorial board of a journal or ad hoc reviewer
h. Professional organization: Reviewer for professional conferences
i. Professional organization: Session chair or discussant for professional conferences
j. Member of an external university accreditation committee
k. Liaison to universities, school systems, businesses
l. Taking students to conferences
m. Taking students to community service projects (for online courses, involve students in community projects)
n. Other

For any item chosen under external service provide brief listing of activities by letter indicated.

General Overload Service Units (to be justified by Faculty member)
- Teaching an unremunerated overload (3 units)
- Undergraduate advising ____ (1 unit)
- Other: ____________________ (indicate the number of units: ____)

Total Units ____________

Exceeds Expectations _____
Meets Expectations _____
Needs Improvement _____

(Meets expectations = 6 Service Units with representation from both external and internal service). The department recognizes that new faculty members would be expected to limit their engagement in service during their first two years.
Attachment D

Human Services Faculty Growth Plan

This form is to be used to develop and discuss suggested strategies for professional growth. Indicate the current level of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and list suggested means of fostering growth.

TEACHING
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement

Suggestions

SCHOLARSHIP
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement

Suggestions

SERVICE
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement

Suggestions
Attachment E
Department of Human Services
Reappointment/Tenure/Promotion Form

To: Department Head

I have reviewed the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the College of Education and Allied Professions and have determined that:

________ I am not eligible for consideration according to the guidelines stated.

________ I wish to be considered for reappointment.

________ I wish to be considered for tenure.

________ I wish to be considered for promotion.

________ I do not wish to be considered this year.

________ Not applicable.

________________________________________
Signed

________________________________________
Date

Within 5 days, please return to: Department Head
Killian 208