Department /Division: Biology, Chemistry and Physics, and Geosciences and Natural Resources

Collegial Review Document Unique to the Position of the Science Education Program Coordinator

Effective Fall Semester, 2012

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

I. Overview of Responsibilities of the Coordinator of the Science Education Program
The Coordinator of the Science Education Program has a unique role among the science departments and, therefore, is summarized below. In this document, the term ‘Department’ refers to the science department in which the science education faculty member holds an appointment.

The primary responsibilities for this position are to provide leadership and coordination for the science education program, teach undergraduate and graduate courses (especially in support of science education), and supervise science education field experiences. Specific duties include (a) teach courses in methods of science education for undergraduate and graduate students, (b) teach courses in science specialty area, (c) advise and/or coordinate advising of science education students, (d) supervise science education field experiences, (e) supervise and/or coordinate supervision of graduate students in the MAT and MA Ed. programs, (f) lead science education program management and development with support of Science Education Advisory Committee (see pages 6-7), (g) maintain a record of scholarly productivity, (h) pursue external funding, (i) conduct outreach to schools to support secondary science education, and (j) assume some of the role and responsibilities common to most Coordinators of Professional Education Programs in Specialty Areas not defined above.

Beyond the traditional domains of teaching, scholarship, and service, overarching behavioral expectations include professionalism and ethicality. Professionalism entails shared responsibility among colleagues and appreciation of and respect for differences in expertise, ideas, and background, in addition to mutual trust. Non-professional behavior interferes with the ability of colleagues to achieve the mission and goals of the department, college, or university. Non-professional behaviors not only impede the work of the university but also threaten the freedom of expression of others, an essential feature of the university environment. Persistent or severe non-professional behavior may be grounds for negative decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review (Faculty Handbook Section 7.10).

II. Domains of Evaluation
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:

   a) **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** -- Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. 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, teaching is also a profession that requires providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course.

   c) **Student Response to Instruction** -- Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are also rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

2. **Methods of evaluation**

   The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data to form an overall impression of effectiveness, each with its own unique contribution.

   a) **Self-evaluation.** Narrative statement addressing pedagogical content knowledge, particularly with regard to currency. Consider addressing the following questions in your statement. How do your teaching practices 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? Have you made changes in your teaching based on student feedback? Faculty members are not expected to incorporate major changes every year, but maintaining currency should be evident over time. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. *(4.05B2C)*

   b) **Peer review of teaching materials.** The departmental collegial review committee will evaluate, for all instructional faculty, teaching materials, including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. *(4.05B2B)*

   c) **Direct observation of instruction.** All non-tenured faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually, using the departmental protocol. Members of the department’s collegial review committee will observe each non-tenured faculty member in a class and also meet with them to discuss and evaluate their teaching materials (see section on AFE). *(4.05.B2B)*
d) **Student assessment of instruction.** All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAIs using a form of the Faculty Senate-approved 20-item university-wide SAI instrument. Student evaluations for all class sections should indicate a majority of students believe the instructor is an effective teacher. *(4.05B2A)*

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence**
   a) Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the elements of effective teaching *(4.05A)*
   b) Peer review of teaching materials—including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. *(4.05B2b)*
   c) Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. *(4.3.1.1)*
   d) Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument *(4.05A)*

3. **General comments**
   Faculty members should have the ability to create an atmosphere for learning, and stimulate learning by students. This ability can best be assessed through the University criteria outlined above. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting the University expectations, the cumulative record of faculty should reflect they have been willing and effective in teaching in a wide variety of instructional settings possible with the position.

   a) **Professional Development:** Documentation of professional development related to teaching can be enhanced by participation in pedagogy-related conferences, workshops, courses and the application of teaching and learning scholarship.

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

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.
   a) **Scholarship of discovery** — Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
   b) **Scholarship of integration** — Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
   c) **Scholarship of application** — Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
   d) **Scholarship of teaching and learning** — Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence**—including acceptable processes for peer review
Scholarly activity is expected of the person holding this position in the person’s area of specialty, consistent with understanding and improving science education, including the possibility of basic science research. Those endeavors can be satisfied by submission of presentations, manuscripts, funding proposals, etc. through science or education related outlets. To count within this category, the activity must lead to an artifact that is evaluated by discipline experts external to WCU who agree the work is a quality expression of one of Boyer’s forms of scholarship. Scholarship productivity of untenured faculty must be dominated by discovery related to science or learning science. Scholarship productivity of tenured faculty may reflect any mixture of the four types described above. Evidence of productivity is indicated by the following, some of which, necessarily, also reflect teaching effectiveness:

* participation in research;
* number, and quality of publications;
* recognition by professional organizations such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions, requests for critical reviews of research proposals, and requests to referee articles by other scientists;
* evidence of participation in student research such as the production of reports, student oral or poster presentations, theses, or published articles;
* evaluation by peers outside the department and the University;
* presentation of papers or posters at professional meetings;
* grants applied for and grants funded;
* innovative teaching methods and new curriculum development based on scholarship;
* research in progress.

3. General comments – Scholarship is expected of all permanent faculty, though the type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary between faculty members due to expertise, interests, needs of the Department and University, and stage of career.

a) Grant proposals and awards – The cumulative record of faculty should indicate regular submission of grants proposals, with enough success to raise the funds necessary to support their research programs.

b) Professional development in scholarship is enhanced by a faculty member’s participation in activities such as grant writing workshops, short courses that demonstrate use of new technology within their discipline, and working with colleagues at other institutions or agencies. Participation in a mentoring program as the person being mentored is also considered professional development.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service
a) Institutional service is general expertise service done as an act of good citizenship such as serving on committees, recruiting students, mentoring new faculty members and advising administrators. This service might include: participation in committee work at the departmental, college and university level; participation in open house activities, orientation and other forms of student recruitment; helping new faculty members succeed in their new positions by
providing advice regarding teaching, research and service; advising administrators regarding the needs of the department, college and university (this can include advice regarding changes in curriculum, programs, student enrollments, grant requests, challenges associated with resources for advising, teaching and research, personnel issues etc.); helping each other by presenting guest lectures in other faculty’s classes, if a faculty is unable to hold class. Faculty advisor to student organizations and off-campus instruction.

b) Community engagement includes activities such as participation in local school activities, presentations to local community groups, aid to local organizations that require science expertise, mentoring elementary, middle and high school students, participation in science fair judging, professional volunteer work and interactions with media. Role in community development (e.g. consulting) and leading teacher professional education workshops.

c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership includes: Service as Coordinator of the Science Education program and administrative and organizational duties performed as director of the Western Carolina Regional Science Fair held annually at the University.

This individual serves in a unique position: working with science departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and departments in the College of Education and Allied Professions. General coordinator duties are program leadership; curriculum oversight; faculty recruitment, load, and, when appropriate, evaluation; program planning and evaluation. More specifically, the individual holding the Science Education coordinator position will devote significant time to building and managing the program (e.g. through course and curricular development, recruiting, advising, and supervision of students, acting as a liaison with public schools and university departments, helping the institution to retain accreditation from external agencies, etc.); working with students, faculty, and the science advisory committee; and outreach into the secondary schools.

Service on committees that require an extraordinary amount of time, such as faculty senate, over-sight committees.

Service related to exceptional leadership that provides an improved instructional quality, administration, or research capabilities.

d) Advising students includes being informed about curriculum and related processes, being available to advisees, and assisting academic and career planning. These activities include familiarity of:
* the specific emphasis areas available to students pursuing the BSED in comprehensive science
* the four semester plan regarding upper level elective course offerings;
* how science and math courses completed by BSED students fit into the liberal studies requirements;
* the requirements for liberal studies, junior/senior courses and total hours toward graduation;
* the surcharge policy;
* the requirement of availability to meet with advisees during advising time and during the drop/add period of the semester;
* the responsibility for timely responsiveness to email and telephone inquiries regarding advising;
* where to direct students to find out about career opportunities for students completing a BSED.

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence** – Administrative professional judgment can appropriately be applied in this area of evaluation. The workload of Committee Chairpersons will be taken into account. Other evidence such as letters of appreciation can be taken into account.

3. **General comments** - Faculty members should have the ability to serve the University and the public in ways appropriate to their discipline and an educational institution of our type.

   a) **Professional development** in the area of service can be enhanced by participation in activities that improve leadership, advising, or engagement skills (e.g., workshops, conferences, training sessions, formal courses).

**III. Specific Procedures for Review Events**

A. **Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)**
   
   1. **Overview**
      The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to the AFE review process. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service expectations described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of the one-calendar-year reflected in each AFE portfolio. In addition:

      The AFE Committee will review materials submitted by the faculty member and will make written comments regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. A single written statement prepared by the committee and signed by the Chair of the Committee. This AFE statement represents the collective view of the committee. The Department Head may choose to either 1) endorse the Committee statement or 2) add a separate statement as Department Head with consult of the other two science department heads. In either case, this letter will be signed by all science Department Heads.

      * The faculty member will be given statements from the Head and the Committee.

      * The faculty member has one week to respond to the AFE reports. The Department Head will offer or require a consultation with the faculty member to review his/her evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance if necessary. The faculty member must sign the reports to indicate receipt, but has the right to add a written statement of acceptance, clarification, or rebuttal to be included with the AFE report. The Head shall, following the meeting with the individual and receipt of any
additional written statement from the faculty member either add an addendum to it or forward it as previously written.

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

2. Composition of review committee
   The composition of the AFE committee is identical for the TPR committee for the calendar year. The review committee for the Coordinator of Science Education will consist of 6 tenured members: the Head of the Department (chair), two faculty members from the home department (appointed by the Department Head), one member from each of the two other science departments (either the Department Head or a designee), and one member from the College of Education and Allied Professions, appointed by his/her Dean. It is desirable that the persons on this committee have a working understanding of the science education program, such as membership on the College of Arts and Sciences Science Education Advisory Committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
   A. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes: (1) a self-statement, not to exceed 3 pages, that summarizes and evaluates their performance in the areas of teaching (including assessment of the effectiveness of instruction), scholarship, program director, and service, (2) the completed AFE Template distributed by the Department Head each fall semester, and (3) the following materials:

   1) Teaching
      a) a self-evaluation addressing teaching effectiveness, especially pedagogical content knowledge (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review
      b) copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials
      c) direct observation of classroom teaching (if required)
      d) Student Assessment of Instruction

   2) Scholarship and Creative Activity
      The summary of scholarship will include the items listed in the AFE Template provided by the Department Head.

   3) Service
      The summary of service will include the items listed in the AFE Template provided by the Department Head.
b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document
The AFE Portfolio is due to the AFE committee by the last Friday in February each year. The portfolio will include information for items III.A.3.a.1-3, along with a filled in template, and course syllabi and exams from the previous two semesters assembled in a 1.5” 3-ring binder. Faculty may include other instructional-related materials in addition to syllabi and exams if they so choose. A blank template will be provided each year by the Department Head and will include a table to document teaching load and activities for the following:
* List of courses taught
* Total number of credit and contact hours
* Total number of students taught
* Number of different lecture and laboratory preparations
* List of courses or laboratories that were new or involved significant new preparations or new textbook
* List of independent studies supervised and brief statement of faculty role
* Teaching award considerations (nominated, finalist, awarded)
* Participation in pedagogy-related courses or workshops
* Brief documentation of use or development of new, creative, or innovative techniques, content or materials
* List of student professional presentations supervised.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)
1. Overview – The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to the reappointment, tenure and promotion review process. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative record.

2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) - The review committee for the Coordinator of Science Education will consist of 6 tenured members: the Head of the Department (non-voting chair), two faculty members from the home department (appointed by the Department Head), one member from each of the two other science departments (either the Department Head or a designee), and one member from the College of Education and Allied Professions, appointed by their Dean. It is desirable that the persons on this committee have a working understanding of the science education program, such as membership on the College of Arts and Sciences Science Education Advisory Committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)
1. Overview - The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to post-tenure review. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative record.

2. Composition of review committee – The review committee for the Coordinator of Science Education will consist of 6 tenured members: the Head of the Department (non-voting chair), two faculty members from the home department (appointed by the Department Head), one member from each of the two other science departments (either the Department Head or a designee), and one member from the College of Education and Allied Professions, appointed by their Dean. It is desirable that the persons on this committee have a working understanding of the science education program, such as membership on the College of Arts and Sciences Science Education Advisory Committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation -- The post-tenure review documents will consist of a faculty member’s CV, copies of all AFE Committee reports during the review period, and copies of the Department Head’s AFE reports during the review period.

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

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations as Coordinator of the Science Education Program

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching –
It is required that the faculty member be an effective teacher as demonstrated by, among other things, student evaluations, peer evaluations, and thorough peer reviews of course materials and works toward meeting Departmental and program learning goals. In any given year, the teaching by the Science Education Program Coordinator should promote critical thinking in addition to content knowledge; provide learning experiences for students that, when feasible, include opportunities outside of the classroom such as fieldwork, lab work, research, applied training, or service; and engage in activities to promote ongoing innovation and improvement in their instruction. In addition, the faculty member must also adapt and contribute to continuous curricular improvements.

2. Scholarship –
The faculty member must demonstrate that s/he is an active scholar to maintain currency in their field, to help advance their discipline, to improve as educators, and to provide opportunities for students. The type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary between faculty members due to expertise, stage of a scholarly project, interests, needs of the Department and University, and stage of career. Though scholarly products may vary year by year, each year the faculty member must show evidence of ongoing scholarly activity and continued progress towards completion of scholarly products (as one example, publications).
3. Service
The effectiveness of the faculty member’s role of Science Education Program Coordinator is the most important service area. In addition, the faculty member must show meaningful, on-going participation in program and departmental activities, consistent with his/her position, experience, and background. Other forms of service, such as, service to the College, University, discipline, and region are also expected, though the type and amount will likely vary from year to year.

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

B. Reappointment (4.06)
1. Teaching - To achieve the teaching mission and aspiration of WCU and the strategic goals of the University, the Science Education Coordinator has expectations of how and what he/she teaches. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting Department definitions of load and teaching effectiveness, the cumulative record of faculty should reflect that they regularly update their courses, maintain good student course evaluations, and contribute in multiple ways from the following areas, as appropriate:
   * Teaching large section courses for non-major students
   * Teaching service and core courses: 100-300 level
   * Teaching 300-600 elective level courses
   * Teaching science education methods courses for undergraduate and graduate students
   * Teaching courses involving individual instruction such as supervised student teaching
   * Teaching also includes the quality and effectiveness of supervision of student teachers in the science education program.

2. Scholarship – The Science Education Program Coordinator must show evidence of ongoing scholarly activity and continued promise toward achieving the level of scholarly productivity required for tenure. The scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are valued, but the scholarship of discovery, or science and/or learning science, must be represented in the granting of tenure.

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

3. Service -- The faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness as Program Coordinator, as well as other meaningful participation in program and departmental activities, especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising). Because of the unique role of Science Education, external engagement, especially with regional educators, is expected as part of building and maintaining a quality science education program.

4. General comments
Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, the faculty member must have demonstrated a consistent and solid record of teaching over several years. The faculty member must have demonstrated proficiency in a range of teaching preparations.

2. Scholarship - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, including a record of ongoing scholarly activity, the faculty member must have publications in peer-reviewed journals, involve students in research (where appropriate) or create other special out-of-class opportunities for students related to research in science and/or science education, demonstrated ability to obtain funds necessary to carry out research, and have a research plan that shows promise of continued productivity in the future. The scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are also valued but must not represent the sole form of scholarship.

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

3. Service -- In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member will have engaged in service beyond the department-level prior to tenure. This type of service should include serving on college level or university level committees. In addition, as Science Education Program Coordinator, service must include discipline-based service to the community.
4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

The criteria for meeting expectations for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as for tenure; they are listed below.

1. Teaching - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member must have demonstrated a consistent and solid record of teaching over several years. The faculty member must have demonstrated proficiency in a range of teaching preparations.

2. Scholarship - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, including a record of ongoing scholarly activity, the faculty member must have publications in peer-reviewed journals, involve students in research (where appropriate) or create other special out-of-class opportunities for students related to research in science and/or science education, demonstrated ability to obtain funds necessary to carry out research, and have a research plan that shows promise of continued productivity in the future. The scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are also valued but must not represent the sole form of scholarship.

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

3. Service – In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member will have engaged in service beyond the department-level prior to promotion to associate professor. This type of service should include serving on college level or university level committees. In addition, as Science Education Program Coordinator, service must include discipline-based service to the community.

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

B. Promotion to Full Professor (Faculty Handbook Section 4.07.A.6.c)

University criteria include evidence of superior teaching, service, and scholarship for promotion to full professor. This section describes examples of what is required for such promotion in the Science Education Program.
1. **Teaching** - Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory established in earning tenure, and should demonstrate leadership as an educator. Evidence of this leadership could include publications related to pedagogy, mentoring of young faculty, or participation (as a leader) in teaching workshops or seminars.

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

3. **Service** – Faculty should show broadening contributions to service, including ongoing contributions to the regional educational community. This service should reflect clear evidence of a superior of performance, which should include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities.

4. **General comments** – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

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

1. **Teaching** - Faculty must satisfy the criteria for tenure (referenced in section IV-C), and must be engaged in other activities that are consistent with his or her rank as described above.

2. **Scholarship**

   Faculty following a traditional university scholar model (see general comments below) must in addition to the criteria described for tenure, demonstrate productivity in any of the four areas of scholarship by having publications in peer-reviewed journals, involving students in research and other special opportunities, demonstrating ability to obtain funds necessary to carry out research, and having a research plan that promises continued productivity in the future.

3. **Service**
Faculty following a traditional university scholar model (see general comments below) should show broadening contributions to service. This service should reflect clear evidence of a high level of performance beyond that expected for tenure, which would include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities.

4. General comments

Determination of whether faculty are meeting expectations for post-tenure review is not solely gauged by the sum of selected accomplishments. Instead, faculty evaluation is assessed through consideration of the cumulative past record, and evidence for continued growth. It is recognized that a faculty member cannot perform equally well in all areas each year, but each individual must make an effort to make a contribution across the board over time. Furthermore, it is recognized that faculty members who have been at WCU for lengthy careers have much to offer given their experience and knowledge of institutional history. In consultation with the Department Heads, these faculty may choose to engage in significantly increased levels of service, such as, serving on major WCU or UNC committees or establishing and facilitating important professional contacts. These types of service are highly valued. Faculty failing to meet standards for any category must develop, in conjunction and with the approval of the Department Head, an action plan to address the specified deficiencies. Progress on the action plan will be assessed in the next Annual Faculty Evaluation.

Approved by:  

Sean O'Connell  

Department Head, Biology  
29 July 2012  
Date

Department Head, Chemistry and Physics  
7/12/12  
Date

Department Head, Geosciences and Natural Resources  
7-30-2012  
Date

Dean  
31 Jan/12  
Date

Angela Branton  
8/20/12  
Date