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

I. Overview.
Criteria, guidelines, and procedures are supplementary to the Faculty Handbook and the WCU Tenure Policies and Regulations as approved by the Board of Governors, the provisions of which shall prevail on any matter not covered in this document or on any point where this document is inconsistent with those provisions. All faculty members must have documented evidence of educational preparation, quality teaching, service and scholarship in their discipline.

For new faculty in the School of Health Sciences, the contribution to teaching, professional and scholarly development and service activities is apportioned as such:

- First year health sciences faculty will be expected to devote a majority of their time to course preparation, teaching process, student learning, and professional development.
- Second year faculty are expected to begin work on at least one scholarly project in addition to their teaching assignments. Second year faculty are also expected to participate in community service, professional service and development.
- From the second through the sixth year the faculty member is expected to negotiate a plan with the school director for each academic year based on annual goals.

II. Domains of Evaluation
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
   1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 7 dimensions:

   a). Content expertise – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters. 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.

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). Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the 7 dimensions 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 is required for all untenured faculty. (4.3.1.1)

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

3. General comments – Professional development service activities, teaching awards, and nominations in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 4 types described by Boyer. These types of scholarly activity (discovery, integration, application, and teaching and learning) will result in externally peer reviewed scholarly activity in the School of Health Sciences.

Note: Unpublished scholarly activities meet the definition of scholarship if they appear in a publicly observable form; in other words, it must be public, subject to critical review, and in a form allowing the use and exchange by other members of the discipline (Shuler & Hutchings, 1998). Unpublished scholarly activity can take the form of a paper, poster, an audio or videotape presentation, written report, or Web site (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002).

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

i). Active research programs.

ii). Inventions, new discoveries, and patents.

iii). Research/grant proposals submitted and/or funded.

iv). Scholarly practice which results in the creation of new knowledge and/or improvement in existing practice.

v). Construction of new ideas or theories.
vi). Conceptualization and investigation of significant problems. 
vii). Development of a model or theory of practice in the health sciences, 
    health education, or health administration.

b). Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, 
across topics, or across time. Examples are:
   i). Development of interdisciplinary course materials relating to 
       health.
   ii). Synthesis of theories from diverse disciplines to enhance the 
       perspective of a health issue.
   iii). Synthesis of theories from diverse disciplines to explain human 
       responses to health.
   iv). Participation in development and/or accreditation of a new or existing 
       program in academic and/or non-academic settings.

c). Scholarship of application – Application of disciplinary expertise with 
results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers. Examples are:
   i). Participation in and/or development of innovative programs that 
       identify empowering strategies in the delivery of health care.
   ii). Identification of a practice problem not responsive to theory based on 
       traditional solutions and designing alternate approaches to the 
       problem.
   iii). Non-academic work experience that demonstrates successful 
       management of projects, programs, and/or practices through the use of 
       applied theory.
   iv). Assessment of outcomes in practice and application of lessons learned 
       from these assessments in activities that contribute to the enhancement 
       of state-of-the-art health care practices.

d). Scholarship of teaching and learning – Systematic study of teaching and 
learning processes. Examples are:
   i). A systematic evaluation of a new approach or new strategies followed 
       by sharing the findings with the health and/or academic communities.
   ii). Teaching other scholars about the scholarship of teaching.
   iii). Teaching which results in dissemination of new knowledge, 
       clarification of existing knowledge, or creative application of 
       knowledge, which pertain to the health sciences.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence - Scholarship in the 
School of Health Sciences will be evaluated on the overall research agenda and goals 
agreed upon by the faculty member and School Director in the Annual Faculty 
Evaluation. Specific criteria are given for reappointment, tenure and promotion as 
outlined in this document. In all cases, externally peer reviewed outcomes are most 
highly valued in all four scholarship areas. Items such as degree of difficulty, potential 
impact, and relevance to the discipline, and value to the mission of the school, college, 
and university should be described as applicable by candidate.
The following are examples of scholarship. This list is not exhaustive.

- An article published in a peer-reviewed journal
- A first edition book that is not self-published and the candidate is sole, or senior author
- Chapter in an academic textbook
- Development of educational multimedia presentations (i.e. podcasts, e-guides) that are available for worldwide dissemination
- An invited address at a state, national or international conference
- A keynote address at a regional, state, national, international conference
- Successful in the receipt of external research grant
- Undergraduate research project presented at peer reviewed conference
- An edited book with contributions from other scholars and the candidate is the sole, senior, or co-editor
- An accepted or funded external grant proposal of a minimum of $2500.00
- Engages students in a service learning project that involves an opportunity to process and reflect on experiences resulting in an externally reviewed report
- Editor of peer reviewed journal
- Presentation (oral or poster) at regional, state, regional, national, or international conference where abstracts were peer reviewed.
- Conducts a peer reviewed study for a local organization or government agency related to the discipline and has documentation of findings and disseminated.
- Conducts a peer reviewed study to solve a community problem related to the discipline and has documentation that findings were peer reviewed and disseminated.
- Development of an educational web page which is disseminated and peer reviewed
- Obtains a successful internal grant proposal which excludes proposals requesting travel expenses only
- Book review published in peer reviewed professional journal

3. General comments –
   a). Grant proposals and scholarship will be documented in this section and all faculty are expected to provide information at the time of the AFE.
   b). Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are also positively valued they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix.
   c). These guidelines are not exhaustive, nor do they focus on “borderline” cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this school. It is recognized that infrequently a candidate may present other activities that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimately scholarship.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)
   1. Types of service
      a). Institutional service: Faculty members’ contributions to institutional affairs will be consistent with the needs and resources of the School. Activities that support the university’s mission are appropriate and valued. Institutional service shall be evident at the school, college, and institutional level.
      b). Community engagement: Provides talk on a current disciplinary topic to a
local radio or television station, service organization, business organization, or nonacademic professional organization, public school, or community college.

c). Special expertise: Unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership.
d). Advising: Faculty members must quantify their advising workload, providing examples of student advising and mentoring. Evidence of advisement on thesis, dissertations, or research projects should be limited to titles and brief descriptions of these activities.
e). Professional service: This may include service to professional organizations.
f). Administration: This may include serving as Program Director.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence – The faculty member’s listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation included in the dossier appendices.

3. General comments – Professional development activities in the area of service are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event and they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix.

D. Collegiality

1. The School of Health Sciences recognizes the importance of collegiality and places great value on the ability of each faculty member to contribute to a positive environment in which all persons are treated with respect, civility, and dignity. A collegial faculty works smoothly toward common departmental goals and toward resolution of issues and concerns that routinely arise in academia. Collegiality extends to interactions between faculty members, faculty and staff, faculty and students, and faculty and administrators.

Evidence of collegiality will include:

a) Collaborative and active participation in committees, workgroups, and other mechanisms used to further the objectives of the school
b) Demonstrates creative problem solving
c) Adapts well to change
d) Uses good judgment in dealing with others.
e) Follows through on tasks and deadlines to further departmental objectives
f) Works to maintain positive relationships within the department, with the college, university, and the community
g) Communicates in a clear, respectful, positive, and non-judgmental manner with all constituents of the department, including other faculty and staff.
h) Shows respect, courtesy, and concern for colleagues and students.
i) Accessible to colleagues, staff, and students through office hours and maintaining a visible presence on campus
2. Methods of evaluation
Based on the evidence above, collegiality will be self evaluated via the candidate’s AFE, TPR reviews, and separate documents (should they be needed) attesting to strengths and weaknesses regarding this area. The school director will meet at least twice per academic year with faculty for general reviews, which will include discussion/evaluation of collegiality.

3. General Comments
The above list is meant to provide examples of collegiality and is not exhaustive. This area will be addressed with faculty in the reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as the annual faculty evaluation processes.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events
A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
   1. Overview - All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness.
   2. Composition of review committee – AFE documents are reviewed by the School Director annually.
   3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
      a). All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes (tenure-track faculty can use their TPR document):
         i) Teaching
            a) a self-evaluation addressing the seven teaching dimensions of teaching (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) direct observation of classroom teaching (required for non-tenured faculty; optional for tenured faculty): Direct peer observation of classroom or online teaching shall be accomplished at least once each semester. Observation will be used to verify or qualify evidence from other sources of data. Observers will complete the school evaluation form for peer review of teaching.
            c) Student Assessment of Instruction of all courses and sections for full-time tenured and tenure track faculty.
      ii). Scholarship and Creative Activity – List of scholarship and creative activities completed during academic year
      iii).Service – List of service activities completed during academic year.
      iv).Collegiality - Will be self evaluated via the candidate’s AFE, TPR reviews, and separate documents (should they be needed) attesting to strengths and weaknesses regarding this area.
v). Faculty member should describe progress on goals listed on previous year’s AFE. Goals for the next academic year are negotiated between faculty member and School Director. These goals represent a pathway and progression to the next reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review goal of faculty member.

b). Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document - This AFE document shall be prepared in accordance with the most recent criteria published by the Office of the Provost. Tenure track faculty may use their TPR document instead of creating a separate AFE document with the addition of new activities conducted since its last submission.

c). Evaluation of part-time/fulltime fixed-term, non tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by the program director and that documentation will be reviewed by the school director.

i). Each full-time fixed-term faculty member in the school will be evaluated on the criteria pertaining to Teaching, and either Scholarship, or Service as listed in section IV.

ii). All part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants will be evaluated for their effectiveness as teachers.

iii). All fixed-term faculty must be evaluated by direct peer observation of classroom or online teaching at least once per semester as well as for all who teach or assist in the classroom, clinical/internship setting, or laboratory.

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

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

2. Composition of review committee

The School of Health Sciences Collegial Review Committee will be made up of the school director and at least three tenured faculty members, in accordance with university policy as stated in 4.02.02 Section VI Composition of Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, of the Faculty Handbook.

i. The school director is the chair of the committee and does not vote. The school director will submit his/her recommendation regarding the candidate to the committee.

ii. When the school director is the person being considered by the committee, the school director shall excuse him/herself, and the committee shall elect a pro-tem chair (voting) from its membership. The pro-tem chair submits the committee’s recommendations directly to the dean. The school director (or any other member of the committee being considered) absents him/herself during the deliberations.

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** - These guidelines are based upon section 4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.

2. **Composition of review committee** - When tenured faculty become eligible for consideration, the school CRD Committee will also serve as the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. If there are not three tenured faculty from the school available to serve on the PTR Committee, the matter must be referred to the Provost. The Provost will consult with tenured faculty of the school and the dean of the college will select tenured faculty from similar departments in the university to constitute a committee of three tenured faculty for the school review. The school director is not eligible for service as a member of the PTR Committee. Tenured faculty undergoing review will be excluded from service on the PTR committee for that year of their review.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** - The review will be based on the following elements: the four most recent AFE statements, current curriculum vitae, the four most recent Faculty Activity Reports, a one to two page statement of professional goals and interests, and all course evaluations (SAI Data Report) each year for the last three years.

   a). Faculty for whom PTR is a requirement will be reviewed in the fifth academic year following:
      i). Award of tenure or promotion, or
      ii). Prior post-tenure review, or
      iii). Return to faculty status following administrative leave and continuing the PTR clock interrupted by administrative assignment.
      iv). The PTR committee will submit a written report of its findings to the school director.
      v). The school director will provide the faculty member with a copy of the written report.
      vi). Within two weeks of receiving the report, the faculty member will schedule a meeting with the school director to discuss the results. The faculty member may submit a written response at this time.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the School of Health Sciences –

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to their peer reviews and they should earn a mean score of at least 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” (Organization, Enthusiasm, Rapport, Feedback, and Learning as seen on Summary of SAI Data Report) on at least 70% of the courses taught.

2. Scholarship - Performance by fulltime faculty should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion, based on goals set in AFE. **Special note:** Faculty with fixed term appointments are to be evaluated on the criteria pertaining to Teaching, and either Scholarship, or Service as determined by the AFE goals.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level cumulatively.

4. Collegiality – Self evaluation as described in section II D above.

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to their peer reviews and they should earn a mean score of at least 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” (Organization, Enthusiasm, Rapport, Feedback, and Learning as seen on Summary of SAI Data Report) of the SAI on at least 70% of the courses taught.

2. Scholarship –To be considered for reappointment, candidates must have met goals set in their AFE each year or provide an explanation as necessary. After the candidate has completed the third year candidate should have submitted at least two publications for peer review. **Special note:** For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that a program of scholarship/research is being developed.

3. Service - The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (student advising, department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level, cumulatively. Evaluation of student advising should include accessibility, knowledge of programs,
policies, and procedures, and ability to guide students to meet their academic goals. A sample student advising evaluation is included in Appendix A.

4. **Collegiality** – Self evaluation as described in section II D above.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the candidate should, for up to three years prior to the review: receive satisfactory overall rating on teaching materials according to the consensus of the peer reviews; candidate’s self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions should be satisfactory; candidate should earn a mean score of at least 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” (Organization, Enthusiasm, Rapport, Feedback, and Learning as seen on Summary of SAI Data Report) on at least 75% of the courses taught. The Annual Faculty Evaluations for the three years prior to tenure should reflect meets or exceeds expectation evaluation of teaching overall.

2. **Scholarship** - To be considered for tenure candidates must have met goals set in their AFE each year or provide an explanation as necessary. In addition, the candidate must have a minimum of six activities of scholarship, including at least three successful publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) which the candidate must serve as sole, first or second author. In addition, the publications must be externally peer reviewed. The number of publication(s) in part, depends upon the strength of the other scholarship activities.

The school recognizes the four types of scholarship consistent with Boyer’s model including scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching/learning. When submitting evidence that is not in a traditional format (e.g. article, books, professional presentations) candidates are encouraged to include a rationale identifying relationship to Boyer’s model, and relevance of the scholarship to the discipline, school and/or university. External peer review of scholarship is required. Inclusion of other indicators is not only allowable but encouraged.

3. **Service** – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. By the time one is up for tenure, there should be at least some service activity at each internal level over the preceding two years, cumulatively. In order to demonstrate competent student advising, faculty may submit correspondence from students, alumni, or others, advisement records, and/or evaluations by current students and graduates on the quality of advisement.

4. **Collegiality** – Self evaluation as described in section II D above.

D. **Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review: receive satisfactory overall rating on teaching materials according to the consensus of the peer reviews;
candidate’s self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions should be satisfactory; candidate should earn a mean score of at least 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” (Organization, Enthusiasm, Rapport, Feedback, and Learning as seen on Summary of SAI Data Report) on at least 75% of the courses taught; and the Annual Faculty Evaluations for the three years prior to tenure should reflect meets expectation or exceeds expectation evaluation of teaching overall representing a high level of achievement.

2. Scholarship - To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must have met goals set in their AFE each year or provide an acceptable explanation. In addition, the successful candidate must have a minimum of six activities of scholarship, including at least three successful publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) which the candidate must serve as sole, first or second author. The publications must be externally peer reviewed. The number of publications, in part, depends upon the strength of the other scholarship activities.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. By the time one is up for promotion to Associate Professor, there should be at least some service activity at each internal level over the preceding two years, cumulatively which would be representative of a high level of achievement. In order to demonstrate competent student advising, faculty may submit correspondence from students, alumni, or others, advisement records, and/or evaluations by current students and graduates on the quality of advisement, (see appendix A).

4. Collegiality – Self evaluation as described in section II D above.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. The candidate for promotion to Full Professor must achieve superior performance (exceed expectations) in all four areas consistently for the three years prior to review.

2. Teaching - In order to exceed expectations in teaching, the faculty member, for up to three years prior to the review must be rated as having met or exceeded expectations for the following: rating on teaching materials according to the consensus of the peer reviews; candidate’s self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions should be satisfactory; candidate should earn a mean score of at least 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” (Organization, Enthusiasm, Rapport, Feedback, and Learning as seen on Summary of SAI Data Report) on at least 80% of the courses taught; The Annual Faculty Evaluations for the three years prior to tenure should reflect positive evaluation of teaching overall and the candidate should be able to illustrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and instruction. In addition, the successful candidate will demonstrate leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching and/or research.

3. Scholarship - To be considered for promotion to full professor, the successful candidate will have a record of exceeds expectations at the associate level and
has a sustained effort for personal contributions to the scholarship in which one has engaged. In addition, the candidate must have a minimum of ten activities of scholarship, including at least six successful publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) which the candidate must serve as sole, first or second author. In addition, the publications must be externally peer reviewed.

Scholarship should be consistent with Boyer’s model including scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching/learning. Evidence submitted that is not in a traditional format (e.g. article, books, professional presentations) by candidates are encouraged to include a rationale identifying relationship to Boyer’s model, and relevance of the scholarship to the discipline, school and/or university. External peer review of scholarship is required.

4. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service at different levels within the university, (department, college/school, university), and externally via community engagement, special expertise, and professional service. These activities 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. Also, faculty members may quantify their advising workload, providing examples of student advising and mentoring. Evidence of advisement on thesis, dissertations, or research projects should be limited to titles and brief descriptions of these activities. The successful candidate will have a sustained record of exceeds expectations to the service in which one has engaged. In order to demonstrate competent student advising, faculty may submit correspondence from students, alumni, or others, advisement records, and/or evaluations by current students and graduates on the quality of advisement.

5. Collegiality - Self evaluation as described in section IID above.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.06)

The elected departmental CRD Committee shall also serve as the PTR Committee. They will conduct a peer review of faculty professional activities. Documents that may be submitted include the following: annual faculty evaluations for the previous four years, annual faculty activity reports for the previous four years, a current CV, and a portfolio of the faculty member’s best works. Faculty for whom PTR is a requirement must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of any of the following: award of tenure or promotion, prior post-tenure review or return to faculty status following administration leave. A time schedule will be set up for all faculty members who have not undergone a review within the last five years.

In accordance with the university policy stated in Section 4.06 Post Tenure Review Policy Procedures in the Faculty Handbook. Peer reviewers shall present
their written evaluations to the school director. The director shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The school director shall then append his/her evaluation relative to the mission of the school.

1. **Teaching** – The above criteria for effectiveness (IIA.) as a teacher shall be reviewed by the School Director and shall be rated as either exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations.

2. **Scholarship** – The above criteria for effectiveness (IIB.) in the area of scholarship shall be reviewed by the School Director and rated as either exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations.

3. **Service** – Expectations: The above criteria for effectiveness (IIC.) in the area of service shall be reviewed by the School Director and rated as either exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations.

4. **General comments** – The faculty member's performance for post tenure review will be judged satisfactory if he or she has demonstrated satisfactory performance in all categories in the school's AFE in each of the previous four years and has met goals set in their AFE.

   a). 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 PTR Committee for review:

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

   ii). 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.

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

   b). If the PTR 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.

   c). Within one month following the review, the faculty member and school director 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.

   d). 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 Western Carolina University Handbook.

Approved by:
School Director: [Signature]
Date: 7/19/09

Dean: [Signature]
Date: 7/13/09

Provost: [Signature]
Date: 7/20/09
Appendix A

Health Sciences Sample Advising Evaluation Survey

Directions: Please take a minute to evaluate your experience concerning your most recent advising session. Answer each of the following survey questions and when you are finished, press the submit button. The results of this evaluation will be completely anonymous.

Who is your academic advisor?

I am currently enrolled as a
Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior
Graduate Student

Please list the date when you last met with your advisor.

On average, how many times per semester do you consult an advisor?
- 0
- 1-2 times
- 3-5 times
- More than 5 times

When do you typically see your advisor?
- Only during registration
- Only at non-registration times
- During registration as well as at other times during the semester
- Never, I self-advice

What was the reason for your most recent advising session?
- [ ] my first meeting with this advisor
- [ ] to registration for the next semester
- [ ] a follow-up session regarding registration
- [ ] general advising about degree requirements or internship
- [ ] a session to discuss post-graduate opportunities
- [ ] to add, drop or withdraw a class
- [ ] other (discuss scholarships, grades, other problems)

Scheduling an appointment with my advisor is
Approximately how much time was generally spent in your most recent advising session?

- [ ] less than 10 minutes  
- [ ] 10 to 20 minutes  
- [ ] 20 to 30 minutes  
- [ ] more than 30 minutes

Did you have an appointment or come in on a walk-in basis?

- [ ] appointment  
- [ ] walk-in during office hours  
- [ ] walk-in outside office hours

Please rate the following statements regarding the advising you have received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received clear guidance about liberal studies requirements for graduation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor is knowledgeable about liberal studies requirements for graduation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor allows me the freedom to select liberal studies courses that meet my personal needs while staying within the confines of requirements for graduation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received clear guidance about recreational therapy degree requirements for graduation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor is knowledgeable about recreational therapy degree requirements for graduation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor reassess my progress toward graduation by regularly checking my degree evaluation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor provides guidance and advice regarding my clinical internship plans</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor provides guidance and advice regarding my post-graduate plans (graduate school/employment)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor posts scheduled appointment times for advising sessions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor returns messages (email and phone) in a timely fashion</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor demonstrates an interest in my personal and academic success</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor refers me to appropriate campus resources when needed</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advising experience has assisted me in progressing toward my graduation goals</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a student, I have taken an active role in the advising process by scheduling my appointment early, maintaining communication with my advisor between formal sessions, preparing for advising sessions in advance and effectively communicating with my advisor</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I drop by during my advisor’s office hours, my advisor seems friendly and approachable.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What has been the most positive aspect of your advising experience at WCU?

What recommendations do you have for improving advising at WCU?

Are there any additional comments you would like to make about your advising experience at WCU?
Bill, I had an opportunity to talk with my College Executive Council regarding possible names for the new building...here are some of our recommendations

   Center for Intergenerational Health Studies
   Intergenerational Health Studies Building
   Center for Intergenerational Health
   Intergenerational Health Building

   Learning Center for Intergenerational Health Care

I look forward to meeting with the university committee to discuss our suggestions.

Linda Seestedt-Stanford, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences Belk 207 Western Carolina University Cullowhee, N.C. 28723

828-227-2143 (voice)
828-227-7705 (fax)