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I. Overview

A. Introduction
The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Physical Therapy. The document is guided at the highest level by The Code of The University of North Carolina system and by the Western Carolina University (WCU) Faculty Handbook. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some cases by the College of Health and Human Sciences.

Faculty members at WCU are expected to be effective teachers, to be practicing scholars in their disciplines, and to provide meaningful service to the University and the community. (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.04.A.)

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 tenure, promotion or reappointment (TPR), the faculty member should also refer to specific guidelines disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

B. Types of Review (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.04)
1. Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE)
2. Reappointment
3. Tenure
4. Promotion
5. Post-tenure Review

C. The Department of Physical Therapy Collegial Review Committee functions in accord with university policy (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.04) and also performs the following duties:
1. For each faculty member, at the time of third year reappointment (or as appropriate), coordinates/conducts the department’s review of:
a) Teaching, including review of teaching materials addressing the seven dimensions of teaching
b) Scholarship, including designation of relative unit value
c) Service, including designation of impact of faculty member’s participation

2. Coordinates the alternative review process (i.e., scholarship that does not meet more traditional forms of peer review).

3. Note: the Department of Physical Therapy Collegial Review Committee’s evaluation will be formative for the candidate and advisory to the Department Head (or Dean in the case of the Department Head’s evaluation).

D. The **Department of Physical Therapy Collegial Review Advisory Committee** shall consist of at least three members, elected annually, with at least one tenured and one tenure-track faculty member and with the Department Head as non-voting chair. The role of this committee is to:

1. Review the department’s Collegial Review Document on an annual basis and recommend changes as warranted
2. Review the overall process for faculty evaluation, including any related evaluative instruments

E. **Definitions from Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education** (CAPTE) pertinent to this document - from *Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation of Education Programs for Preparation of Physical Therapists* (last revised October 2007)

1. **Core Faculty** - those individuals appointed to and employed primarily in the program, including the program administrator, the Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education and other faculty who report to the program administrator. The core faculty have the responsibility and authority to establish academic regulations and to design, implement, and evaluate the curriculum. Members of the core faculty typically have full-time appointments, although some part-time faculty members may be included among the core faculty. The core faculty include physical therapists and may include others with expertise to meet specific curricular needs.

2. **Clinical Education Faculty** - individuals engaged in providing the clinical education components of the curriculum, generally referred to as either Center Coordinators of Clinical Education or Clinical Instructors. While the educational institution/program does not usually employ these individuals, they do agree to certain standards of behavior through contractual arrangements for their services.

3. **Associated Faculty** - individuals who have classroom and/or laboratory teaching responsibilities in the curriculum and who are not core faculty or clinical education faculty. In WCU’s Department of Physical Therapy
associated faculty provide guest lectures on specific topics in accordance with their area of expertise. Associated faculty are not paid as part-time faculty.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching *(WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.04 & 4.05)*

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

   a) **Content expertise** – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matter. Content expertise includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.

   b) **Instructional delivery skills** – Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.

   c) **Instructional design skills** – Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.

   d) **Course management skills** – Effective teachers give timely feedback to students, make efficient use of class time, and handle classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately. Encourages students to assess instruction.

   e) **Evaluation of students** – Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.

   f) **Faculty/student relationships** – Effective teachers display a positive attitude toward students, show concern for students by being approachable and available, present an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, sufficient support for student learning, and respect diversity.

   g) **Facilitation of student learning** – Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.

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

   a) **Student assessment of instruction (SAI)**, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument is required of all sections of all courses taught by core faculty (either tenured, tenure-track or fixed-term). Associated faculty who teach or assist in the classroom, clinical education setting or laboratory must be
evaluated at least once each year using evaluation instruments approved by the faculty.

b) **Peer review of teaching materials, including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2b).** Consistent with university policy, at least two faculty colleagues review teaching materials and provide feedback, addressing the seven dimensions of teaching. Peer review of teaching materials is part of all evaluation processes other than Post-tenure Review. Departmental expectations for course materials are delineated in a separate document (Appendix A).

c) **Direct observation of instruction** - All tenure-track faculty members must be evaluated at least annually by direct observation of teaching as required by the University of North Carolina (UNC) General Administration (UNC Policy Manual 400.3.1.1.G). The colleague who observes will complete the peer review of teaching form developed by Coulter Faculty Center (Appendix B) or comparable form and provide feedback to the faculty member as appropriate.

d) **Self report and evaluation of teaching (4.05A).** The self-report and evaluation should include a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of teaching methods and strategies used and selected teaching materials from the review period. Guidelines established by WCU’s Coulter Faculty Center provide a template (Appendix C). Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the seven dimensions of effective teaching, is a component of all evaluation processes other than Post-tenure Review.

3. In order to **meet expectations** in the area of teaching the faculty member must achieve satisfactory ratings on the peer review of teaching, peer review of teaching materials and scoring/comments on SAI’s.

   a) Satisfactory range on SAI refers to ratings of 3 and above on at least 60% of Likert-scale items and generally satisfactory comments on open-ended items.

   b) Issues not directly related to instructional quality are not included. For example, students will often “strongly disagree” with the statement that sufficient time is allocated for course content. Curriculum content is dictated by rigorous accreditation standards that cannot be altered by an individual faculty member.

   c) If ratings from SAI are not consistent with other assessments, explanation should be provided (in Department Head’s summary, as indicated). In certain areas that can be objectively reviewed
4. If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be "unsatisfactory" and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address each area.

5. General comments

Professional development activities in the area of teaching are highly valued and should be included in the self-evaluation of teaching.

A. Scholarship and Creative Works (WCU Faculty Handbook Section 4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes four categories of scholarship and scholarly activities according to Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarship and scholarly activities follow. Descriptions include examples from Boyer and a position paper, Physical Therapy Faculty and Scholarship, that was adopted by CAPTE in October 2004:

   a) Scholarship of discovery
      (1) WCU: Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
      (2) CAPTE: ...contributes to the development or creation of new knowledge. This represents the traditional view of research, and is disseminated through publications such as peer-reviewed articles, books, and presentations at scientific meetings.

   b) Scholarship of integration
      (1) WCU: Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
      (2) CAPTE: ...involves contributions to the critical analysis and review of knowledge within disciplines or the creative synthesis of insights contained in different disciplines or fields of study. This includes activities such as literature reviews, meta-analysis, and the synthesis of the literature from other disciplines and discussion of its significance for physical therapy.

   c) Scholarship of application [or practice... per CAPTE]
      (1) WCU: Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
(2) CAPTE: ...applies findings generated through the scholarship of integration or discovery to solve real problems in the professions, industry, government, and the community. This involves taking findings generated via the scholarships of discovery and integration and applying them to clinical practice or teaching and learning.

d) Scholarship of teaching and learning
(1) WCU: Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.
(2) CAPTE: ...contributes to the development of critically reflective knowledge about teaching and learning. ...The scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. The attributes associated with scholarship of teaching include classroom assessment and evidence gathering, current ideas about teaching in the field, peer collaboration and review, and inquiry and investigation centered on student learning. It requires faculty members to frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning, teaching methods and educational theory.

e) General comments (additional guidelines from CAPTE)
(1) CAPTE: The quality of scholarship will be judged by whether the faculty member established clear goals, demonstrated adequate preparation, used appropriate methods, presented the results effectively, and critically evaluated the work.

(2) CAPTE: Expected (according to CAPTE criteria) is the development of a scholarly agenda, a long-term plan for building lines of inquiry that will result in original contributions to the profession, [that]...should include specific goals that identify types of scholarship, scholarly activities, and anticipated accomplishments with a timeline.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence – including acceptable processes for peer review
a) Definition: Scholarship is the product of scholarly activities that have been documented, externally peer reviewed and appear in a publicly observable form; in a form allowing use and exchange by other members of the discipline. (Hutchings & Schulman, 1999)

b) An alternative review process, coordinated by the Department of Physical Therapy Collegial Review Committee and further described in Appendix D, will be used to evaluate the rigor and value of scholarship (e.g., the Scholarship of Application) that is
less amenable to more traditional types of peer-review (e.g., publication of a manuscript in a peer-reviewed journal). The process includes a mechanism for external peer-review. The review is guided by a form adapted from Seestedt-Stanford (Appendix E) and criteria presented in Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997).

c) Scholarship and scholarly activities in the Department of Physical Therapy will be based on the concept of a “unit” of work. The unit will be determined with reference to such criteria as the degree of difficulty, potential impact within the field, and value to the mission of the department and the university. For example, published outcomes are more highly valued than unpublished outcomes, and peer reviewed journals are more highly valued than non peer reviewed publications.

d) The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship and scholarly activities in the department. A faculty member may present other professional works that are not listed yet are still legitimately scholarship or scholarly activities. A faculty member may provide rationale and petition to have work evaluated for a higher number of units within either category (e.g., highly competitive and extensive external grant submission or major book revision).

e) For the purposes of tenure and promotion, only scholarship (i.e., units from Category A) will be considered. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion, as they move through the probationary period, commonly show progressively more units from Category A to demonstrate the progression from scholarly activity to scholarship.

f) It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document scholarly work so that it can be evaluated.

g) Although what constitutes a unit cannot be comprehensively defined, the following guidelines should be useful to the candidate and the review committees:

(1) Category A (Scholarship)
   (a) Two units – examples include:
      (i) Author of an article published in a peer-reviewed journal that is important to scholarship of the discipline. Note: physical therapy faculty have diverse audiences for their scholarly work, including major
journals in the physical therapy profession, but also major journals in each of their speciality areas. The Departmental Collegial Review Committee will review for appropriate determination of merit.

(ii) Author or editor of book
(iii) Author of a book chapter
(iv) Invited address at a state, national or international conference (e.g. keynote address or scholar lecture).
(v) Funded external research grant or contract totaling at least $10,000 per year, and candidate is the principal investigator or co-principal investigator (first year; thereafter this counts as one unit per year)*

(b) One unit – examples include:
(i) Author of an article published in a peer-reviewed journal
(ii) Interim report of a major external grant*
(iii) Authorship of conference proceedings
(iv) External grant submission that was scored and/or favorably reviewed for resubmission*
(v) Peer-reviewed presentation (including poster or platform presentations) at a state, regional, national, or international conference
(vi) Invited address at a local or regional conference
(vii) Patent application
(viii) Documented, externally reviewed, publicly disseminated engagement or teaching activity
(a) Service-learning project that is documented and publicly disseminated, subject to alternative peer-review.
(b) Consultation or study for a local/regional organization or government agency related to the discipline (e.g., to solve a community problem) with documentation of findings, subject to alternative peer-review.
(c) Major educational multimedia presentations (e.g., podcasts, e-
guides) that are available for public (e.g., world wide web) dissemination, subject to alternative peer-review

*Significance of grant-related activity (and consequently unit designation) will depend on the amount of the grant award, the competitiveness of the process, the relevance to departmental needs, and the complexity of the proposal/activity/final report. The one unit awarded for grant submission will be replaced by two units if the grant is funded.

(2) **Category B (scholarly activity*) — examples (worth half unit) include:

(a) Develop educational materials for public dissemination
(b) Direct student research or service-learning project
(c) Conduct a study or needs assessment for a local organization or government agency (e.g. to address a community problem) related to the discipline with documentation of findings
(d) Develop a new program for public dissemination (e.g., interdisciplinary balance and falls program based on current research)
(e) Review submissions for journal, granting agency, or conference proceedings
(f) Scholarly review of book (or product) that is published
(g) Funded internal grant (e.g., Hunter Scholar) not travel-related
(h) Participation on a scholarly panel
(i) Consultation as expert witness
(j) Moderator of conference symposium (e.g., involving commentary or synthesis)
(k) Presentation on a current disciplinary topic on radio/television, service organization, business organization, or non-academic professional organization, public school, or community college
(l) Consultation related to discipline (regional, state or national)

* Scholarly activity may be considered scholarship (and receive more than one half unit) if the candidate can show that the activity was documented, externally peer-reviewed and publicly disseminated.
h) In order to meet expectations in the area of scholarship and scholarly activities the faculty member must:
   (1) AFE and reappointment - average 1 unit per year from Categories A or B with gradual progression to having more units from Category A
   (2) Tenure or Promotion to Associate - average 1 unit per year over the previous 5 years from Category A
   (3) Promotion to Full - average of 1.5 units per year over the previous four years from Category A
   (4) Post-tenure review - average 1 unit per year over the previous four years from Categories A or B.

i) If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be "unsatisfactory" and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address each area.

3. General comments

a) Total units from Categories A or B, regardless of classification (scholarship or scholarly activity) will be utilized in the AFE and for re-appointment. Only items that meet the requirements of scholarship (i.e., documented, externally peer-reviewed and disseminated) will be considered for tenure and promotion. The candidate should demonstrate progressively more scholarship from Category A.

b) The Department of Physical Therapy Collegial Review Advisory Committee will oversee issues and materials to ensure correct allocation of credit, as appropriate.

B. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service

a) Institutional service at all levels, including department, college/school and university is expected. Examples include serving on committees, recruiting students, participating in faculty governance, and mentoring new faculty members.

b) Community engagement includes providing disciplinary expertise to professional, civic, economic, or educational entities at the local, regional, or national level and is expected of all faculty.

c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership includes service in professional organizations, work on accreditation documents, or a major role in faculty governance.
d) **Advising (Service to Students)**

(1) All faculty are expected to participate in:
   
   (a) Activities for prospective applicants and community groups about careers in physical therapy and requirements for admission. This includes university and departmental open houses; presentations for campus, school and community groups; individual meetings with prospective students; and development of recruitment materials.
   
   (b) General advising for current students, as assigned
   
   (c) Advising students in each course for which the faculty member is an instructor and/or coordinator
   
   (d) Advising selected students' work on major projects
   
   (e) Advising student professional organizations, as needed
   
   (f) Serving on thesis/dissertation committees, as needed

(2) Advisors should be informed about departmental policies and procedures (e.g., admissions, academic, and clinical education), curriculum, and university/community resources; be available to advisees; post office hours; mentor professional development; and guide career planning. Advising will be evaluated by the Department Head.

e) **Professional service**

(1) All core faculty members who are licensed physical therapists are expected to be active members in the American Physical Therapy Association and to participate in professional activities at regional, state and/or national levels.

(2) Active participation in departmental accreditation activities is required of all faculty. These activities include:
   
   (a) Preparation of accreditation documents.
   
   (b) Establishment and maintenance of educational affiliation documents and experiences with multiple clinical sites for student learning experiences.
   
   (c) Review and revision of curriculum and other departmental functions to maintain accreditation.
   
   (d) Participation in outcomes research of graduates and alumni.
   
   (e) Participation in annual program assessment.
   
   (f) Participation in university accreditation activities.
(3) Other professional service may include:
(a) Consultation with or assistance to colleagues outside the department.
(b) Presentation as a guest speaker or lecturer within or outside the university.
(c) Presentations at professional meetings or at other colleges and universities.
(d) Service within professional organizations, such as committee membership or participation in governance.
(e) Planning/presentation of workshops or conferences.
(f) Service on editorial boards.
(g) Service as elected leaders.
(h) Contributions to community committees, councils, boards, and workshops related to one’s professional expertise.
(i) Service to professional or community organizations.
(j) Participation in national and international service projects or organizations.
(k) Participation in extracurricular groups.

f) Administration

(1) All faculty members are expected to be actively involved in program development, student recruitment, faculty recruitment, program accreditation, and continuous program implementation.

(2) Faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, especially the Department Head and Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education (ACCE), have major responsibility for continuous, year-round management and coordination.

(3) The ACCE has the following responsibilities:
(a) Developing the clinical education component of the curriculum.
(b) Serving as liaison between the department and clinical education sites.
(c) Implementing, selecting, and evaluating clinical sites.
(d) Fostering the ongoing development of clinical education programs and clinical education faculty.
(e) Assuming other specific administrative duties as delineated in the department’s ACCE position description.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence
a) The faculty member's listing of service/engagement activities and related documentation will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data and other indicators of quality of service.

b) Advising will be evaluated by the Department Head based on general guidelines stated above.

3. **General Comments**

   a) Faculty members are expected to participate in service activities at each institutional level (department, college/school, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. Service on departmental committees is expected of all faculty. First year faculty are expected to participate minimally in service activities, instead focusing on new course development and increasing their general knowledge of university policies, procedures and governance. Involvement in college and university committees, study groups, task forces, etc., is expected of faculty after their first year. Over time, faculty members are expected to increase the level of service, to assume greater leadership roles, to expand the scope of their service (e.g., regional, state or national levels) which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. Interdisciplinary collaboration is encouraged.

   b) Performance of assigned and voluntary responsibilities in a professional manner with consistently appropriate personal and professional relationships with students, faculty, staff, and extra-departmental colleagues is expected.

   c) In order to **meet expectations** in the area of service/engagement the faculty member must:

      (1) Demonstrate (after the first year) a sustained record of service at department, college and university levels.

      (2) Demonstrate progressively greater quality and/or quantity of involvement (e.g., more demanding, greater leadership, broader scope, more significant impact).

   d) In order to **exceed expectations** in the area of service/engagement the faculty member must exceed the above stated expectations in quantity, quality, impact or other significant measures.

   e) If a faculty member **does not meet expectations** the rating will be "unsatisfactory" and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).
4. **Professional development** activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department and should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted.

5. Collegiality is critical to the optimal function of any department and is valued in all aspects of a faculty member’s responsibilities. Characteristics of collegiality include, but are not limited to, the following:
   a) Collaborative and cooperative with the organization
   b) Committed to service
   c) Creative
   d) Responsible
   e) Effective communicator
   f) Forward thinking
   g) Knowledgeable
   h) Respectful and concerned

II. **Specific Procedures for Review Events**

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

1. **Overview**
   a) Each faculty member develops annual goals that are behaviorally stated, measurable, reasonably challenging, compatible with the needs of the department, and address teaching, scholarship and service.
   b) Each faculty member meets with the Department Head at the beginning of the academic year in order to review/discuss annual goals for the academic year and any resources necessary to accomplishment goals.
   c) During spring semester each faculty member completes the university’s Annual Report of Faculty Activities, Delaware Study or similar report of activities (decision by UNC system), as specified by Office of the Provost.

2. **Departmental Collegial Review Advisory Committee** (For composition and responsibilities, see Section I. C., Page 2.)

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   a) All full-time (core) faculty members will submit to the Department Head an AFE portfolio that includes:

   (1) **Teaching**
   (a) a self-evaluation addressing the seven dimensions of teaching (per “Guidelines for Teacher’s Self-Report and Assessment of Teaching” (Appendix A)
(b) Selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review
(e) Peer review of teaching materials reported on specified assessment tool (Appendix B)
(d) Peer review of direct observation of classroom teaching reported on specified assessment tool (Appendix C)
(e) Student Assessment of Instruction of all course sections (both tenure-track and fixed term faculty)

(2) Scholarship and Creative Activity – list of activities with brief annotation and unit designation (approved by Departmental Collegial Review Advisory Committee, as indicated).

(3) Service - appropriate documentation or evidence demonstrating that expectations outlined in Section II.C and Section IV.A.3 have been achieved at the “meets expectations” level.

(4) Statement of success in meeting annual goals

(5) Goals for the next academic year

(6) Copy of the “Candidate’s Statement” from Collegial Review dossier, as applicable

b) Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE portfolio

(1) Department Head reviews the information provided in the portfolio and from the CR Advisory Committee as indicated (for example, third-year reappointment) and provides summary information as follows:
   (a) Teaching Evaluation Summary Report (Appendix E)
   (b) Scholarship and scholarly activity
   (c) Service
   (d) Success at meeting annual goals
   (e) Annual goals for next academic year

(2) All evaluative information is summarized in a written AFE report.

(3) If performance does not meet expectations in any area, a written plan of action with specific goals/objectives is developed. This is reviewed with the faculty and can be negotiated.
(4) During spring semester each faculty member meets with
the Department Head to discuss the Department Head’s
annual evaluation.
(a) A written summary of this meeting is shared with
the faculty member.
(b) Each faculty member is required to sign the
summary for the purpose of documenting that
he/she has received and read the Department Head’s
AFE.
(c) The faculty member has the opportunity to register
a reply for the purpose of accepting the AFE or for
offering a rebuttal to the Department Head’s
summary.
(d) The AFE for each faculty member is then submitted
to the Dean of the College of Health and Human
Sciences at or near the end of spring semester.

c) Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05 F)
or “Associated Faculty” as defined by CAPTE (See I.E.3.)

(1) Full-time core faculty that are not on tenure-track but are
fixed term (e.g., Academic Coordinator of Clinical
Education) are evaluated according to the same process,
procedures and criteria in teaching and service, not
scholarship.

(2) Associated Faculty (per CAPTE definition, I.6.E.3.) are
evaluated as follows:
(a) Procedures for Communicating with Associated
Faculty:
(i) For each associated faculty member who
will be teaching in a course, send:
(a) a letter confirming date and topic to
be covered
(b) a copy of the course syllabus with
objectives.
(ii) Have associated faculty member complete
(or update) a brief resume (using standard
CAPTE form) and file in departmental files
(iii) Make sure that the course and the area of
teaching responsibility are identified and
his/her qualifications for these
responsibilities are included.

(b) Procedures for Assessing Teaching of Associated
Faculty:
(i) Students should complete the Guest Faculty
Evaluation form at the completion of the
lecture or unit (following department policy to assure anonymity (Appendix F).

(ii) If at all possible, the Course Coordinator should attend the class session (especially if it is the first time a person has taught a particular unit) and review handouts, lecture notes and class assignments.

(iii) Afterward, the Course Coordinator should follow-up with a letter thanking the individual for his/her contribution and summarizing the results of the student evaluations.

(iv) Course coordinator should critique the adjunct faculty member’s teaching with the Department Head, completing the form, *Review of Teaching Effectiveness by Associated Faculty* (Appendix G).

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

1. Overview
   a) Candidate will prepare his/her dossier according to the schedule and guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost with guidance from the Department Head.
   b) Candidate will have completed dossier to departmental secretary for review by the Department Collegial Review Committee at least five working days prior to the scheduled meeting of the committee.

2. Composition of review committees
   a) **Departmental Collegial Review Committee (VI.A.)**
      (1) “In departments with six or fewer tenured faculty members, the committee shall be composed of the Department Head and tenured faculty provided the resultant committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members, exclusive of the head.” *(WCU Faculty Handbook, p. 68)*
      (2) If there are not 3 tenured faculty from the department available to serve on the Collegial Review Committee, the Department Head and the Dean will consult with the Provost and select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of 3 tenured faculty.
      (3) “Committee memberships shall be determined by elections that shall be conducted during the spring term of each year. The Department Head shall be chair of the committee and shall not vote.” *(WCU Faculty Handbook, p. 68)*
   b) **College Committee – per CHHS By-laws**
(1) The College Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee shall be composed of the Dean as the non-voting Chair, and eight full-time faculty members, six elected by the College faculty and representing each department/school in the college and two appointed by the Dean. The appointed members should be faculty from the larger department/schools in the college.

(2) Elected members must be tenured and shall be elected by the full time faculty of the College to staggered three-year terms; appointed members must be tenured and are appointed by the Dean for one-year terms. All members shall be eligible for re-election or reappointment. Each department shall have one elected representative on the Committee. The Associate Dean(s) and the Department Heads are not eligible to serve on this committee either as appointed or as elected members.

(3) The Committee shall review all candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion within the College following the procedures in the WCU Faculty Handbook. The Committee shall make recommendations to the Dean on all candidates for tenure and promotion, 3rd year reappointment, and any reappointment candidate receiving a negative recommendation at the department level. The Committee will provide written feedback to the Department Head/school director and 3rd year candidates on their progress towards meeting goals for successful tenure and the quality of their dossier.

(4) The Committee shall meet at the call of the Dean and two thirds of the membership will be required for a quorum. Absentee ballots will not be allowed for TPR committee members.

c) University Committee – (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.04)

(1) The University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee shall consist of the provost as nonvoting chair; the dean of the Graduate School; one tenured faculty member elected from each undergraduate college by the full-time faculty of the college; one tenured faculty member elected by the full-time faculty of the university library; and faculty members appointed by the provost equal to the number of elected faculty members on the committee.

(2) The elected members of the committee shall serve three-year terms, staggered so that one-third of the elected members are elected each year. Elected members may not serve consecutive terms. Appointed members shall serve
one-year term without limitation on the number of consecutive terms.

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** *(WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.06)*

1. **Overview** – *Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) are teaching and/or service and/or research*” (p. 79). The review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.

2. **Composition of review committee**

   a) When tenured faculty become eligible for consideration, the Department Collegial Review Committee will also serve as the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee.

   b) If there are not three tenured faculty from the department available to serve on the Department Collegial Review Committee, the matter must be referred to the Provost. The Provost will consult with tenured faculty of the department and the dean of the college and select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of three tenured faculty.

   c) The Department Head may participate in the deliberations of the committee, but is not eligible to vote.

   d) Tenured faculty undergoing review will be excluded from service on the Department Collegial Review Committee when his/her record is being reviewed.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**

   a) Faculty for whom PTR is a requirement will be reviewed in the fifth academic year following award of tenure or promotion; or prior post-tenure review; or return to faculty status following administrative leave.

   b) The faculty member being reviewed will provide the four most recent Annual Faculty Evaluations (including supporting materials) and a current Curriculum Vitae (CV).

   c) The Department Collegial Review Committee will submit a written report of its findings to the Department Head.
d) The Department Head will provide the faculty member with a copy of the written report.

e) Within two weeks of receiving the report, the faculty member will schedule a meeting with the Department Head to discuss the results. The faculty member may submit a written response at this time.

4. Criteria

a) The faculty member's performance for post tenure review will be judged satisfactory if he or she has demonstrated satisfactory performance in all seven categories in the department's AFE in each of the previous four years.

b) The faculty member's performance for post tenure review will be judged unsatisfactory if either of the following two results are recorded in any of the four AFE's submitted to the Department Collegial Review Committee for review:

(1) The candidate received a rating of unsatisfactory in any category on one or more of the four AFE's submitted for review, AND

(2) The candidate did not demonstrate, in the year following any unsatisfactory rating, sufficient improvement to receive a satisfactory rating in the same category or categories previously rated unsatisfactory.

(3) OR, the candidate received a rating of unsatisfactory in any category on the AFE immediately preceding the year of post tenure review.

5. Outcomes

a) If the Department Collegial Review Committee judges a faculty member's performance to be unsatisfactory, the committee will provide suggestions for improvement in the area(s) judged to be unsatisfactory.

b) Within one month following the review, the faculty member and Department Head will develop a three-year plan for improvement, subject to approval by the dean. The plan will clearly outline the criteria for acceptable performance and the consequences for not achieving satisfactory performance by the end of the three-year period. These consequences may affect pay increases, professional rank, and/or employment status.

6. Due Process and the right of appeal shall be guaranteed as defined in the "Tenure Policies and Regulations of Western Carolina University," located in the WCU Faculty Handbook.
References:


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

IV. Criteria for meeting expectations in the Department of Physical Therapy

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.05)

1. Teaching – satisfactory ratings on the peer review of teaching, review of documents and student assessments of instruction that are 3.0 in at least 60% of categories.
   a) Satisfactory range refers to ratings of 3 and above on Likert-scale items and generally satisfactory comments on open-ended items.
   b) Issues not directly related to instructional quality are not included. For example, students will often “strongly disagree” with the statement that sufficient time is allocated for course content. Curriculum content is dictated by rigorous accreditation standards that cannot be altered by an individual instructor.
   c) If ratings from the Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) are not consistent with other assessments, explanation should be provided (in Department Head’s summary, as indicated). In certain areas that can be objectively reviewed (e.g., “objectives are clearly stated” or “various instructional strategies are utilized”) peer assessment or Department Head’s summary assessment will take precedence over student assessment.

2. Scholarship – an average of 1 unit from Categories A or B each year showing a general progression from scholarly activity (Category B) to scholarship (Category A)

3. Service or Engagement
   a) Demonstrate (after the first year) a sustained record of service at department, college, and/or university levels.
   b) Demonstrate progressively greater quality and/or quantity of involvement (e.g., more demanding, greater leadership, broader scope, more significant impact).
   c) By the time of tenure, exhibit significant contributions in at least one area of service/engagement.

4. General comments – If a faculty member does not meet expectations in any category, the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address each area.

B. Reappointment (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.06)

In order to be recommended for reappointment the faculty member must:
1. **Teaching** – receive ratings on various assessment measures (e.g., the peer review of teaching, review of documents and SAI’s) that are satisfactory or above.
   a. Satisfactory refers to ratings of 3 and above on Likert-scale items in at least 60% of categories and generally satisfactory comments on open-ended items.
   b. Not included would be issues not directly related to instructional quality. For example, students will often “strongly disagree” with the statement that sufficient time is allocated for course content. Curriculum content is dictated by rigorous accreditation standards that cannot be altered by an individual instructor.
   c. If ratings from the SAI are not consistent with other assessments, explanation should be provided (in Department Head’s summary, as indicated). In certain areas that can be objectively reviewed (e.g., “objectives are clearly stated” or “various instructional strategies are utilized”) peer assessment or Department Head’s summary assessment will take precedent over student assessment.

2. **Scholarship** – demonstrate an average of one unit from Categories A or B each year. In order to meet the requirements for tenure, tenure-track faculty should demonstrate a progression from scholarly activity (Category B) to scholarship (Category A).

3. **Service/Engagement** – in order to meet expectations in the area of service/engagement the faculty member must:
   a. Demonstrate (after the first year) a progressive record of service at department, college and university levels
   b. Demonstrate progressively greater quality and/or quantity of involvement (e.g., more demanding, greater leadership, broader scope, more significant impact).
   c. By the time of tenure, exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one area of service/engagement.
   d. Be an effective and proficient advisor of prospective and enrolled students.

C. **Tenure (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.07)**

*The tenure decision shall include, but is not limited to, an assessment of: (a) the faculty member’s demonstrated professional competence as evaluated by meeting or exceeding departmental criteria; (b) the faculty member’s potential for future contributions; and (c) institutional needs and resources.* In order to be recommended for tenure the faculty member must demonstrate high levels of achievement in teaching, scholarship and service:

1. **Teaching** – ratings on various assessment measures (i.e., the peer review of teaching, review of documents and SAI’s) that are satisfactory or above over the last three years prior to applying for tenure.
a. Satisfactory refers to ratings of 3 and above in at least 60% of categories on Likert-scale items and generally satisfactory comments on open-ended items.

b. Issues not directly related to instructional quality are not included. For example, students will often "strongly disagree" with the statement that sufficient time is allocated for course content. Curriculum content is dictated by rigorous accreditation standards that cannot be altered by an individual instructor.

c. If ratings from the SAI are not consistent with other assessments, explanation should be provided (in Department Head’s summary, as indicated). In certain areas that can be objectively reviewed (e.g., "objectives are clearly stated" or "various instructional strategies are utilized") peer assessment or Department Head’s summary assessment will take precedent over student assessment.

2. Scholarship – a total of five units from Category A (scholarship) over the previous 5 years.

3. Service – demonstrate a sustained record of service at department, college, university levels and/or professional service with superior contributions in at least one area of service/engagement.

4. General comments – Faculty who desire to apply for tenure earlier that expected should demonstrate exemplary performance in two of the three major categories (teaching, scholarship, or service). Record of scholarship, teaching, and service from previous institution(s) will be given full consideration.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.07)
Applicants for promotion to associate professor or tenure must demonstrate high levels of achievement in teaching, scholarship and service that meet the same criteria as those for tenure.

E. Promotion to Full Professor
Applicants for full professor must demonstrate superior levels of performance in teaching, scholarship and service.

1. Teaching - generally superior ratings on the peer review of teaching, review of documents and SAI’s over the last three years prior to applying for promotion to full professor.

   a. Superior range refers to ratings of 3 and above on Likert-scale items in greater than 75% of categories and generally satisfactory comments on open-ended items.

   b. Issues not directly related to instructional quality are not included. For example, students will often "strongly disagree" with the
statement that sufficient time is allocated for course content. Curriculum content is dictated by rigorous accreditation standards that cannot be altered by an individual instructor.

c. If ratings from the SAI are not consistent with other assessments, explanation should be provided (in Department Head’s summary, as indicated). In certain areas that can be objectively reviewed (e.g., “objectives are clearly stated” or “various instructional strategies are utilized”) peer assessment or Department Head’s summary assessment will take precedence over student assessment.

2. Scholarship – minimum criteria is an average of at least 1.25 units from Category A per year over previous three years.

3. Service – sustained record of service at the department, college, university or professional level that reflects a significant level of commitment and leadership in at least one area

4. General comments – teaching and service will carry relatively less weight and scholarship relatively more weight in the decision to promote to full professor

F. Post-tenure Review (WCU Faculty Handbook, Section 4.06)
Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review must demonstrate satisfactory performance on the AFE over the previous four years. See general comments for actions in the event of unsatisfactory review.

1. Teaching -- satisfactory ratings on the peer review of teaching, review of documents and student assessments of instruction over the previous four years.
   a. Satisfactory range refers to ratings of 3 and above on Likert-scale in at least 60% of categories and generally satisfactory comments on open-ended items.
   b. Issues not directly related to instructional quality are not included. For example, students will often “strongly disagree” with the statement that sufficient time is allocated for course content. Curriculum content is dictated by rigorous accreditation standards that cannot be altered by an individual instructor.
   c. If ratings from the SAI are not consistent with other assessments, explanation should be provided (in Department Head’s summary, as indicated). In certain areas that can be objectively reviewed (e.g., “objectives are clearly stated” or “various instructional strategies are utilized”) peer assessment or Department Head’s summary assessment will take precedence over student assessment.

2. Scholarship -- average of at least 1 unit annually for previous four years from Category A or B
3. **Service** – sustained record of service at the department, college, university or professional level.

4. **General Comments** – it is critical that the faculty member demonstrate a sustained commitment to the fundamental responsibilities of a faculty member, including meeting expectations for teaching, advising, and service to the department and institution, and participating meaningfully and positively in the functions of the department and larger institution.

   a. Acceptable performance equals "professional compliance" and "conscientious execution of duties including efforts to improve."

   b. Exemplary performance equals "sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship and service". (from WCU DCRD Review Sheet)

   c. The faculty member’s performance for post-tenure review will be judged unsatisfactory if either of the following two results are recorded in any of the four AFE’s submitted to the Department Collegial Review Committee:
      1) The candidate received a rating of unsatisfactory in any category on one or more of the four AFE’s submitted for review, AND
      2) The candidate did not demonstrate, in the year following any unsatisfactory rating, sufficient improvement to receive a satisfactory rating in the same category or categories previously rated unsatisfactory. OR
      3) The candidate receives a rating of unsatisfactory in any category on the AFE immediately proceeding the year of post-tenure review.

   d. If the Department Collegial Review Committee judges a faculty member’s performance to be unsatisfactory, the committee will provide suggestions for improvement in the area(s) judged to be unsatisfactory.

   e. Within one month following the review, the faculty member and Department Head will develop a three-year plan for improvement, subject to approval by the Dean. The plan will clearly outline the criteria for acceptable performance and the consequences for not achieving satisfactory performance by the end of the three-year period. These consequences may affect pay increases, professional rank, and/or employment status.

   f. Due process and the right of appeal shall be guaranteed as defined in the "Tenure Policies and Regulations of Western Carolina University," located in the WCU Faculty Handbook.
Approved by:

Karen Y. Green
Department Head

[Signature]

6/26/09
Date

Dean

[Signature]

6/29/09
Date

Provost

[Signature]

7-20-09
Date
APPENDIX A

Western Carolina University
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy

Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching Materials

Faculty Member:

Person(s) Reviewing Materials:

Course Materials Being Reviewed:

Date of Review:

Consistent with university policy, at least two faculty colleagues review teaching materials (including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc.) and provide feedback, addressing the seven dimensions of teaching. Peer review of teaching materials is part of all evaluation processes other than Post-Tenure Review. Departmental expectations for course materials are delineated in a separate document. (from departmental Collegial Review Document).

a) Content expertise – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matter. Content expertise includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education. Criteria:

| Teaching materials reflect up-to-date information that includes current substantive research (i.e., evidence-based practice). | SD D N A SA |
| Lead instructor demonstrates evidence of expertise required to teach content (e.g., licensure, advanced degrees, clinical experience, scholarship): Evidence: | SD D N A SA |

b) Instructional delivery skills – Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.

| Instructional strategies address diverse learning styles (e.g., PowerPoints, audiovisuals, small group work, laboratory). | SD D N A SA |
Expectations for course are clearly delineated in syllabus and for each assignment.

Evaluation of students incorporates various strategies (e.g., multiple choice written or short answer examinations, independent assignments, laboratory practical examinations, small group projects/presentations, etc.)

| Expectations for course are clearly delineated in syllabus and for each assignment. | SD D N A SA |
| Evaluation of students incorporates various strategies (e.g., multiple choice written or short answer examinations, independent assignments, laboratory practical examinations, small group projects/presentations, etc.) | SD D N A SA |

c) **Instructional design skills** – Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.

| Course objectives are present, consistent with curriculum objectives and stated in behavioral terms. | SD D N A SA |
| Expectations are clearly stated. | SD D N A SA |
| Course materials are organized and clearly written. | SD D N A SA |

d) **Course management skills** – Effective teachers give timely feedback to students, make efficient use of class time, and handle classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately.

| Expectations for professional behavior are stated in course syllabi. | SD D N A SA |
| Consequences for inappropriate behavior are stated in course syllabi. | SD D N A SA |

e) **Evaluation of students** – Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.

| Evaluative strategies are consistent with course objectives. | SD D N A SA |

f) **Faculty/student relationships** – Effective teachers display a positive attitude toward students, show concern for students by being approachable and available, present an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, sufficient support for student learning, and respect diversity.

<p>| Course syllabi include office hours. | Yes / No |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course syllabi include disability statement.</th>
<th>Yes / No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading criteria are established.</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content is at an appropriate level for students.</td>
<td>SD D N A SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) **Facilitation of student learning** – Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.

| Instructional strategies require students to demonstrate high academic standards (e.g., evidence-based practice, quality written communication, appropriate documentation). | SD D N A SA |

Comments:
APPENDIX B  
Western Carolina University  
College of Health and Human Sciences  
Department of Physical Therapy  

Guidelines for Colleagues' Review of Teaching  
(adapted from Coulter Faculty Center form)  

Name of instructor being evaluated:  
Instructor's department: Physical Therapy  
Date of evaluation:  
Name of reviewer:  

Please check the boxes below that indicate the data reviewed for this evaluation:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course syllabi</th>
<th>Class observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test, exams, and quizzes</td>
<td>Assignment sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading lists</td>
<td>Media materials (e.g. PowerPoints, AV's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please list):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: Based on analysis of the data provided from the sources indicated above, rate each of the following items on the following scale:  

5 Excellent  
4 Good  
3 Acceptable  
2 Weak in certain areas of this dimension  
1 Weak in many areas of this dimension 
NA Not able to evaluate (Please attach an explanation)  

The comments and questions under each heading below are provided to assist in defining each dimension, but the details do not have to be rated separately. The rating pertains only to the overall dimension.  

Rating  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Expertise:</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the instructor display up-to-date knowledge of the subject?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design Skills:</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are course objectives clearly stated on all syllabi? Is the content appropriately sequenced and paced? Are learning activities clearly related to course objectives? Do course assignments, readings, and other materials appear to be conducive to student learning? Are student performance expectations well defined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Instructional Materials:</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are texts and other sources appropriate for the course? Does the reading list reflect careful selection of sources? Are reading requirements appropriate? What is the quality of any study guides, student manuals, and media materials?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility in Approaches to Teaching:</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do course materials suggest creativity and flexibility by including an appropriate variety of instructional strategies and methods? Is there evidence that assignments, projects, etc. can be tailored to individual student's interests and needs? Are innovative methods employed to encourage instructor-student interaction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Students: Are assessment procedures consistent with course objectives? Are grading standards clearly articulated and applied fairly and consistently? Are the types of tests (essay, multiple choice, etc.) appropriate for the content and consistent with what was taught?

Optional Comments: (Please comment on any areas that need strengthening and explain any special considerations or extenuating circumstances that may affect this evaluation.)
APPENDIX C

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy

Guidelines for Teacher's Self-Report and Assessment of Teaching
(adapted from Guidelines developed by Coulter Faculty Center)

1. Make a page with the heading, Teacher's Self-report and Assessment of Teaching

2. List your name, department, and the date you prepared your self-report.

3. Write a brief statement (1-3 pages.) highlighting the strengths of your teaching. Your students and your colleagues will be evaluating you on the points listed below, and therefore you may want to refer to this list in preparing your statement. Your comments, however, should supplement the information provided by your students and your colleagues and bring out any strong points that may not be apparent to them. Feel free to address some or all of the points listed below or to add any additional points that may be appropriate. The comments and questions under each heading are provided to assist you in preparing your statement, but a direct response to these details is not required.

Teaching Philosophy and Methods: You might discuss your assumptions and beliefs about effective teaching in your discipline. Statements about the academic abilities of students who typically enroll in your courses might be appropriate. Comments on how you apply your teaching philosophy and methods to meet the learning needs of these students would be helpful.

Content Expertise: You might describe what you have done over the past year to stay abreast of recent developments in your field.

Instructional Delivery Skills: If you make a conscious effort to create a classroom environment that is conducive to learning, describe the strategies you typically use to accomplish this goal. Comments on the types of teaching methods you use would also be appropriate.

Instructional Design Skills: Have you developed any new courses from scratch? Can you describe what you have done to revise and improve your courses? Have you refined some of your course objectives? Updated your syllabi? Developed new study guides, assignments, tests, or other materials? Have you incorporated instructional technology into your teaching or developed other new activities or experiences that are conducive to student learning?

Course Management Skills: You might explain how you normally manage daily course logistics such as giving timely feedback to students, using class time efficiently, managing or facilitating student interactions, and dealing with problematic situations (e.g. academic dishonesty, plagiarism, tardiness, etc.).
Evaluation of Students: Perhaps you can describe your assessment procedures. For example, what kinds of tests do you give and how often do you give them? Do you use other means of providing constructive feedback on student work and evaluating their progress?

Faculty/Student Relationships: What kind of instructor-student relationship do you think is most productive for your courses? Describe any planned activities that you use to establish the kind of relationship you desire. How much time do you typically spend communicating with students (in person or electronically) outside of class? Do you make any special efforts to make yourself approachable and available?

Facilitation of Student Learning: What do you do to stimulate students' motivation to learn? Do you use any special in-class activities to encourage and recognize students' academic achievements? Describe any extracurricular or out-of-class activities that you arrange or support in order to prepare students for professional work and to promote well-rounded student development.

Optional Comments: Feel free to comment on any special considerations or extenuating circumstances that may affect this evaluation.
APPENDIX D

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy

Alternative Review Process

The Department of Physical Therapy encourages faculty to incorporate the Scholarship of Application into their professional activities, emphasizing our role as Stewards of Place and our responsibility to engage in activities that improve the health and/or quality of life for the residents of our region.

All faculty are also expected to provide meaningful community engagement or service. The Scholarship of Application, or scholarly engagement, goes beyond the provision of service to those within or outside the university. To be considered scholarship, there must be an intellectually compelling and significant (consequential) application of disciplinary expertise with results that are documented, publicly disseminated, and critically evaluated by peers (both internal and external to the institution).

To facilitate the development and evaluation of these activities, the Department Head convenes the Department of Physical Therapy Collegial Review Committee (Committee) as required. The Committee is organized and managed at the direction of the Department Head.

The Committee has both pre-screening and post-review evaluation responsibilities over Scholarship of Application programs. Specifically, the Committee is responsible for:

- Pre-screening of engagement activities to ensure that they match the mission of the department and the resources available;
- Assistance in developing roadmaps for success in the planning, implementation and documentation of Scholarship of Application programs;
- Post-activity evaluation to ensure completion and impact; and,
- Validation as Scholarship of Application

Forms of engagement may include significant funded support, projects resulting in noteworthy impact, and/or quality of life improvements. Forms of dissemination (other than traditional journal publications) may include formal reports as appropriate for intended audiences, policy statements, guidebooks and/or pamphlets.

Additionally, the results of scholarly engagement may be documented through report(s) from stakeholders and/or clients documenting the magnitude of delivery and/or impact resulting from the engagement activities and application of disciplinary expertise. Peers are those who have the academic, clinical or discipline-specific expertise and knowledge to form an unbiased evaluation of the magnitude and impact of scholarly engagement activities.
APPENDIX E

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy

External Peer Review of Scholarship

Portfolio Written By: ____________________________

Portfolio Reviewed By: __________________________

Instructions:
In order to provide feedback to the author of the portfolio, you are asked to assess the: (1) quality of the candidate’s documentation and (2) quality of his/her scholarship. Please review criteria for tenure, promotion, reappointment and post-tenure review in the Department of Physical Therapy’s Collegial Review Document to complete your ratings.

When asked to provide judgment ratings, please use the following scale:

Not at all   Adequately   To a Great Extent

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA

For each question, circle the number that best represents your judgment. If there is inadequate information to make a judgment, circle NA. You may provide explanatory comments for low ratings or superior performance.

1. Quality of the Documentation

a. To what extent is the material presented in the portfolio effectively organized?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA

b. To what extent does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating his/her work?
   
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA

c. To what extent does the scholar present his/her message with clarity and integrity?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA

d. Overall, to what extent did the scholar effectively document his/her work such that could be evaluated and rewarded?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA
Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement... For ratings of 4 or below, please provide your rationale for the rating and/or make suggestions for improvement. In addition, feel free to provide positive feedback detailing superior performance.

Comments:

2. **Quality of Research**
   a. Does the scholar’s aggregate work represent a meaningful line of research in the discipline?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA
   b. Is there evidence that the scholar’s work is recognized by others doing similar work?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA
   c. Is the scholar’s work likely to impact the physical therapy profession?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA
   d. Overall, to what extent does the scholar’s work demonstrate **significance**?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  NA

Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement... For ratings of 4 or below, please provide your rationale for the rating and/or make suggestions for improvement. In addition, feel free to provide positive feedback detailing superior performance.

Comments:

Recommendation:

Based upon the materials reviewed and the evaluative guidelines provided:

___ Recommend him/her for the specified action (e.g., tenure, promotion or reappointment) with confidence

___ Recommend him/her for the specified action

___ Not recommend for the specified action
APPENDIX F

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy

Teaching Evaluation Summary Report

Name of instructor being evaluated:

Date:

Name(s) of evaluator(s):

Sources of data used for this evaluation:

| Dept. made student rating form or questionnaire (attach a copy) |
| Colleagues' review of teaching materials |
| Instructor's self-report and assessment |
| Other sources of data (e.g. alumni, dean, dept. head, etc.). Please specify: |

Instructions: Based on analysis of the data provided from the sources indicated above, place an X on the continuum to indicate your evaluation of this instructor's teaching expertise on each of the dimensions listed below.

Content Expertise:
Instructor displays adequate knowledge of the subject. |

| WEAK | | | | STRONG |

Instructional Delivery Skills:
Instructor communicates information clearly; creates environments conducive to learning; uses an appropriate variety of teaching methods.

| WEAK | | | | STRONG |

Instructional Design Skills:
Instructor designs course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and learning experiences that are conducive to student learning.

| WEAK | | | | STRONG |

Course Management Skills:
Instructor gives timely feedback to students; makes effective use of class time; handles classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations effectively (e.g. academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.)

| WEAK | | | | STRONG |

Evaluation of Students:
Instructor designs assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives; ensures fairness in student evaluation and grading; provides adequate constructive feedback on student work.

| WEAK | | | | STRONG |
Faculty/Student Relationships:
Instructor displays a positive attitude toward students; shows concern for students by being approachable and available; presents an appropriate level of intellectual challenge along with sufficient support for student learning; has respect for diversity

### Facilitation of Student Learning:
Instructor maintains high academic standards; prepares students for professional work and development; facilitates student achievement; provides audiences for student work.

### OVERALL SUMMARY

**Instructor's overall competence in teaching:**

| Superior in all dimensions of teaching listed on this form |
| Superior or acceptable in all dimensions of teaching listed on this form |
| Needs to strengthen teaching skills in certain areas |
| Does not meet minimal expectations |

**Optional Comments:**

---

1 According to Arreola (1995), content expertise includes the "body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education" (p.19).
APPENDIX G

Date:
Course:
Guest Lecturer:

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy
Student Assessment for Guest Lecturer

SA - Strongly Agree   A – Agree   D – Disagree   SD - Strongly Disagree   N/A – Not Applicable

1. The instructor shows concern for student learning.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

2. The instructor is able to explain difficult material in a way that I can understand.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

3. The instructor uses multiple instructional strategies and technologies.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

4. The instructor is prepared for each class session.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

5. The instructor is responsive to student’s questions.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

6. Students are treated respectfully and collegially.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

7. The objectives of this course are clear.
   SA  A  D  SD  NA

Please provide thoughtful, constructive comments to the following questions.

1. What was most helpful to you as a learner in this guest lecturer’s presentation(s)?

2. Please note any suggestions for improvement in this section of the course.
APPENDIX II
WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Physical Therapy

Review of Teaching Effectiveness by Associated Faculty

Adjunct Faculty Member: ________________________________

Course Coordinator: ________________________________

Unit/Course: ________________________________

Teaching evaluation based on:

___ Observation of teaching
___ Review of written materials (e.g., lecture notes, handouts)
___ Student teaching evaluations
___ Other: ________________________________

Summary of teaching effectiveness:

General recommendation:

___ Excellent/Invite back

___ Good / Invite back

___ Good/ Suggest specific modifications

___ Needs significant improvement/ do not invite back

Suggestions for improvement:

___ ________________________________ Date ________________________________

Course Coordinator/Faculty

___ ________________________________

Department Head

___ ________________________________

Date