I. Overview:

The School of Stage & Screen represents a unique entity within the College of Fine and Performing Arts (not to mention the University as a whole). A few of our members are originating artists and are thus analogous to our colleagues in the School of Art & Design who create works in the privacy of their studios. These members (in the same manner as composer) can send their work out into the world where it will or will not receive recognition. Such works of art clearly fall under the “Scholarship of Discovery” rubric and are the equivalent of traditional scholarly endeavors.

The vast majority of our faculty, however, are interpretative and collaborative artists. They can only practice their art with the active participation of others. Unlike, for example, a violinist, a set designer cannot rent a hall and perform a concert. Her work is meaningful—both as art and scholarship—only when done in the context of a cinematic or theatrical production, which is to say that her art can only be practiced when someone agrees to hire her to do it. What’s more, she must bend her art to fit the production; in the end, it is the production and not the set design that is the work of art.

The United States Institute of Theatre Technology (USITT) specifically addresses this peculiarity in its Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (pg. 4): “In other disciplines, when an individual scholar or artist decides to address a particular subject, he/she has great discretion in establishing not only the exact subject but also the terms and conditions that will structure the development of the subject. Theatre, however, is a collaborative medium in which the director, designers, and technicians share responsibility for developing an interpretation, concept, and visual style for a given production... This important difference distinguishes theatre as a discipline from other academic subjects within an institution and must be considered when evaluating individual accomplishment.” This applies to Motion Picture and Television Production as well as Dance.

This collaborative requirement also dictates where most of the artist-scholars within our School can practice their art. Unlike traditional scholars and many other artists, the collaborative nature of the work of our members means that it is not easily portable. To draw the most common analogy, our artistry is much like architecture: it combines the most visionary and prosaic of skills, it cannot be done alone, and it must be done in a particular place at a particular time. Just as someone building a home in Los Angeles is unlikely to look for an architect in Asheville, so a director living in Cullowhee is unlikely to be called upon to do a project (for stage or screen) in New York. This is not a reflection upon the quality of the work of the director any more than it is of the quality of the architect. To provide another analogy, a surgeon in a teaching hospital is not only likely to be known mainly by other medical practitioners in her area but also available
only in her area if she is to continue her teaching and practice. In the same way, many of
the members of the School of Stage & Screen can only work locally while remaining on
our faculty.

While it is possible (indeed, while the standards of the School must demand) that the
work of such artists be on the same level as that of a more traditional scholar, the easily
assessed medium of validation for such work is not so simple. Within traditional
academic disciplines, certain journals and publishers are evidence of “national
recognition.” Absent such generally recognized sources of validation, we must evaluate
each piece of art on its individual merits, keeping in mind the collaborative nature of the
endeavor.

In evaluating the work of the members of the School of Stage & Screen, the question
cannot be “where did it appear?” but rather “what is the level of achievement?”

This criteria – the application of high standards to work which is produced regionally –
not only maintains the integrity of the department, college, and university; it precisely
achieves the aims of both Boyer and the QEP.

The criteria, guidelines and procedures contained herein are supplementary to Section 4
of the current 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 herein by further allowable specification or on any point wherein this
document is inconsistent with those provisions.

This document shall be provided to and discussed with each new faculty member before
initial appointment and at the beginning of the first term of employment. It shall also be
provided in writing and discussed at the beginning of each academic year with each
candidate being reviewed for reappointment, promotion or tenure, and each non-tenured
or continuing part-time faculty member. A record of these discussions shall be kept in
the individual's personnel file.

Further, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the faculty
member should also have available the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier, a
separate document disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

A. Earned Academic Degrees

The National Association for Schools of Theatre (NAST) is the nationally recognized
accrediting agency for schools of theatre.

NAST also serves as an accrediting agency for professional curricula (B.F.A. & M.F.A)
“when the program is based in theatre techniques and their extensions, and when the
program is primarily concerned with the conception, planning and execution of
film/video productions.” (NAST Handbook 2007-08, Appendix II.E. pg 160)
“NAST recognizes the Master of Fine Arts as the appropriate terminal degree for performance, design/technology, and playwriting faculty. At the same time, the Association recognizes that some highly qualified artist-teachers may hold other academic degrees; others may not hold any academic degrees. In such cases, the institution should base appointments on experience, training, and expertise at least equivalent to those required for the master’s degree in the appropriate field.” (Standard II.E.1.b.(3), NAST Handbook 2007-08, pg. 50).

The candidate not holding the appropriate terminal degree in the teaching field must supply sufficient documentation of alternate qualifications/credentials at a level reflective of the terminal degree at the time of hire. These credentials must be appropriate to the assignment and at a “significant/high” or “exceptional/superior” level.

The School of Stage & Screen follows NAST guidelines (cited above) for establishing the appropriate credentials for its faculty at the time of hire and which clearly indicate the status of the credentials in relation to tenure and promotion.

B. Alternate Qualifications

As indicated in Section I.A. of this document and consistent with NAST accreditation guidelines, significant professional/industry “experience, training, and expertise...equivalent to those required for the master’s degree in the appropriate field” may be considered as appropriate qualifications for faculty in part-time or lecturer positions.

Exceptional professional/industry “experience, training, and expertise ...equivalent to those required for the master’s degree in the appropriate field” may be considered appropriate qualifications for faculty in tenure-track or term positions. Alternative Qualification Summary should be included in reappointment, tenure and promotion documentation.

Examples of Alternative Qualifications would include (but not be limited to) creative credits governed by national agreements (such as Writers Guild of America, Directors Guild of America, Screen Actors Guild, Actors Equity, Society of Stage Directors and Choreographers, American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and their international equivalents); technical credits performed under International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians, United Scenic Artists, and their international equivalents; publication by licensing organizations such as Samuel French and Dramatists Play Service or multiple mountings of a dramatic, dance, or performance piece; and consistent work in non-union houses and on non-union productions subject to peer review. (Examples of peer review in this latter instance would include, but not be limited to, contemporaneous reviews; evaluation by a production’s director, producer, or manager; evidence of re-hiring by the producing entity; or evidence of the producing entity’s high standing within its artistic community. In all cases it is the responsibility of the applicant or faculty member to
demonstrate scope and relevance of this scholarly peer review such as reputation and/or artistic standing of the person or entity.)

C. Outside Peer Review Committee

There may be cases that a candidate’s materials may not be able to be reviewed in traditional peer review manners. In cases like this the candidate may request that an Outside Peer Review Committee be formed to evaluate their scholarship, teaching and/or service. This committee would be charged with evaluating the candidate’s material to determine if it meets the criteria of the department’s standards. It is recommended that this review take place during the Candidates 3rd year and then again prior to the Final review. This committee would comprise of persons that are considered “Peers” in the candidate’s field and it may include academics as well as industry professionals. This committee may not have any members who are directly associated with the University or the candidate. The Director in consultation with the Dean of the College will choose the committee. The candidate may submit names of possible committee members but the ultimate selection rests with the Director and the Dean.

Please note that during the Annual Faculty Evaluations, that committee may also recommend to the candidate that he/she might want to consider requesting the appointment of an Outside Peer Review Committee. However the ultimate responsibility rests with the candidate.

D. Promotion and Tenure

It is the candidates responsibility to make the case of how he/she has successful achieved the requirements for promotion and tenure as set forth in this document, including the use of the Matrix of Teaching, Scholarship and Service. The expectation for Promotion and Tenure are the following: (please also see Appendices A, B,C)

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and/or Tenure requires that the candidate meet the “High” expectations in each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, service). The School of Stage & Screen accepts the College of Fine and Performing Arts definitions of “high” performance (Appendix B) required for promotion to Associate Professor as general guidelines that may be modified in individual circumstances. It is up to the candidate to make the case that he/she has achieved the high level of performance required for promotion to Associate Professor and or tenure. It is also expected that the candidate have a continuous record in each category.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires that the candidate meet the “Superior” expectations in each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, service). The School of Stage & Screen accepts the College of Fine and Performing Arts definitions of “Superior” performance (Appendix B) required for promotion to Professor
as general guidelines that may be modified in individual circumstances. It is up to the
candidate to make the case that he/she achieved the superior level of performance
required for promotion to Professor. It is also expected that the candidate have a
continuous record in each category.

II. Evaluation

Please see the Matrices A, B, C for College and Department’s expectations for each
of the three areas of evaluation for examples of “High” and “Superior”
qualifications.

A. Teaching

The School of Stage & Screen regards teaching, specifically the passing on of our
professional knowledge and experience to students, to be the primary objective of the
department. (Faculty Handbook 4.04 & 4.05)

A. 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.
      Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of
      knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning.
      Shulman (1987) has called this combination “pedagogical content
      knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or
      pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars
      restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable
      by their students.
   b) Professional Aspects of Teaching -- Effective teaching relies upon
      the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional
      functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon
disciplinary expertise – and different disciplines often approach
teaching differently – teaching is also a profession that requires
common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for
example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students,
providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding
progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students,
making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated
for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class
management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s
ability to perform the duties associated with the job.
   c) Student Response to Instruction -- Students have a unique and
      important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness.
      They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for
course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate
to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence
   a) Self-evaluation. (4.05.B.2.C) reviewed by Department Head and S&S Collegial Review Committee annually.

   The self-report and assessment is to be completed once per academic year after the faculty has been provided course evaluations from one or more semesters. This task is considered a portion of Boyer’s critically reflective process and should discuss weaknesses, strengths, successes, failures and methods to improve each course. “As to self evaluation...Faculty might be asked to step back and discuss...their impressions about the gains and losses experienced in the classroom – what worked well, what barriers were encountered, what steps might be taken to improve the course the next time around.” (Boyer, 1990, p. 37)

   In the self evaluation, the faculty member must address Pedagogical Content Knowledge, particularly with regard to currency.
   - What are you doing to help students understand the most important material in your field?
   - How have you changed your teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and advancements for the courses you teach?
   - What methods have you retained and how do you know they are still working?

   Faculty members are not expected to incorporate major changes every year, but maintaining currency should be evident over time. Change for change sake is not the intention. The methods that are working should be retained and only those areas that need improvement should be changed. Keeping the material fresh, relevant and appropriate to the goals of the professor, class and the School should be what drives this narrative statement.

   b) Peer review of teaching materials. (4.05.B.2.B) reviewed by S&S CRC annually

   The School’s Collegial Review Committee will evaluate, for all tenure-track faculty, using the School’s protocol form, teaching materials, including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc.
This activity is considered to be part of critical and reflective teaching discussed by Boyer. Performing this task assists other faculty in improving their teaching and reviewing others’ materials is beneficial to both the reviewer and reviewed.

e) **Direct observation of instruction.** (4.05.B.2.B)

Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually in conjunction with post-tenure reviews or promotion using the departmental protocol. The department head or program director will be one observer, and a second observer will be a full-time faculty member with at least three years of teaching experience, selected by the CRC in consultation with the faculty member. The individual faculty member will have the right to appeal the selection of the second observer to the CRC for cause.

This activity is considered to be part of critical and reflective teaching discussed by Boyer. Performing this task assists other faculty in improving their teaching and reviewing others’ classroom management is beneficial to both the reviewer and reviewed.


d) **Student assessment of instruction.** (4.05.B.2.B)

All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAIs using a form of the Senate-approved university-wide SAI instrument.

e) **Peer Review**

For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to teaching and learning is REQUIRED. Meritorious is defined as above meeting expectations. Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one’s teaching and learning through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.

Professional development activities in the area of teaching are positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate. These activities could include attending seminars, developing new teaching methods, or materials. Activities should relate to the faculty member’s current assignment, support an initiative in an area that will enhance Stage and Screen’s services to students and its image in the community.

Student work which is taken to a national conference (as in Dogwood’s Search) or which is used within the profession as if it were created for a client (as in the William Ivey Long project) would be considered examples of peer reviewed teaching projects.
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3. **General comments** — The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution, but we attach the greatest weight to the peer review of substantive teaching materials and quantitative SAIs along with such measures as student evaluations conducted by the Director during individual and group discussions with departmental students and formal exit interviews by the program director/department head with graduating students. The Stage & Screen faculty view student evaluations as a tool for individuals to use to improve their teaching (formative uses). Due to the large number of factors empirically shown to affect teacher student evaluations (i.e. gender of instructor, number of times the course meets in a week, time of day the course meets, the student's perception of the importance of the course to the major, instructor's personality, etc.) comparison across faculty using student evaluations is not considered appropriate (summative uses).

The Stage & Screen faculty values both rigor and acceptable teaching practice. However, the faculty does not believe that standards and difficulty should be lowered to increase student evaluations. Due to the multiple issues which arise with student evaluations, rating teaching as poor if a faculty member's rating is below departmental, college or university averages is not an acceptable use of the student evaluations. The emphasis should be on identifying trends in courses over a number of terms.

Low response rates make course evaluation scores less reliable and reduce validity. Courses with low enrollments and/or those with low response rates should be very carefully considered. Each faculty member should maintain a comprehensive table of course evaluation scores.

a) Professional development activities in the area of teaching are positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate. These activities could include attending seminars, developing new teaching methods, or materials. Activities should relate to the faculty member's current assignment, support an initiative in an area that will enhance Stage and Screen's services to students and its image in the community.

**B. Scholarship**
The College of Fine and Performing Arts recognizes a difference between scholarly activity and scholarship. Scholarly activity is required and may encompass the many facets of activities covered under the umbrella of the Boyer model. For scholarly activity to be accepted as scholarship in the deliberations for reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit it must meet the standards of peer review as set forth in this document. Scholarly activity may sometimes fall under service and it is up to the individual to document and reference this activity.
An activity sometimes falls between service and scholarly activity and it is up to the individual to decide the scope and intent. Faculty members are advised to check with the unit CRC and/or Director/Department Head if there is a question about the scope of the activity.

NOTE: Although we recognize that the pathway to scholarship may take many disparate routes, the general guidelines for all scholarship is that it must be disseminated and be peer reviewed. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain HOW this scholarship has been disseminated and peer reviewed and how it meets the criteria set forth in this document. It may be valuable for the candidate to include in their documentation information that may help the non-artist to understand the level and quality of scholarship. This might include a description of industry specific terms, quality/value/importance of producing organizations or why your unique type of scholarship meets the requirements of this document.

The School of Stage & Screen makes no formal distinction between the different types of scholarship as described by Boyer in terms of inherent value, recognizing that each type contributes in its own way to the advancement of learning.

1. Scholarship of Discovery

In all cases a peer review is mandatory for artistic efforts to be considered as scholarship. They may be listed as scholarly activity but they will only count as scholarship if they are peer reviewed. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the level of peer review.

While some members of the School may choose to produce traditional scholarly works, it is assumed that most of our members will be creating works of art (narrative films, plays, abstract films, documentaries) or engaged in more didactic activity derived from the dramatic arts (commercials, industrial and promotional films, instructional drama).

- As a collection of artists, the School of Stage and Screen values the creation of art (which allows for ambiguity) above the commercial (which does not). In the same manner that traditional scholarship values a book above an article because the book allows for more complex thought, so we value the creation of a work of art over the less complex uses of our skills. For this reason, a work of art will be given the weight of a scholarly book, while a commercial will count as the equivalent to an article.

- One can no more count minutes in a film, however, than one can count lines in a mathematical proof. The question posed by an original work of art is whether it is sufficiently complex, developed, and moving, not how long it is. To use an example in music, no one would suggest that the expansive symphonies of Bruckner (fine as they may be) are more complex than a three-minute work of Anton Webern. This is particularly important when judging the work of
performers: Masha has many fewer lines than other characters in The Seagull, but because she opens and closes the play, hers is among the most significant roles in Chekhov.

- An original literary work (screenplay, novel, stage play) would certainly fulfill the role that a major scholarly work would serve in a more traditional department.

- The direction of a motion picture, television episode, or stage play would similarly be considered a superior achievement (subject to the same standards of evaluation) as would playing a key, decision-making role in a theatrical or cinematic endeavor. (Please note here that "cinematic" refers to the means of creation and not that of distribution. A film is a film whether it appears on a theatrical screen, a television screen, or a computer screen.)

- Participating in a production in a non-decision making role (e.g., camera operator or assistant stage manager) could be considered evidence of high achievement.

- For performers, appearance in a significant role, whether leading or supporting, would be considered evidence of superior scholarship of discovery. Appearance in a minor role could be considered evidence of "high" achievement.

- Assessing such scholarship of discovery is no more challenging and complex than judging a work of historical research, literary criticism, or political science. As in any intellectual endeavor, reasonable minds may disagree but procedures can and must be put in place to critically review the work.

- In traditional scholarship, certain publishers and journals serve as validation for the work. In an analogous sense, work which is optioned or produced by reputable companies (theatrical or cinematic) can be considered to have the same "superior" quality that is given to scholarly publications.

- Within the world of theatre and film, there are established companies that serve a similar purpose to recognized academic publishers. Multiple productions of a stage work or multiple, repeated hires of an artist by the same institution can also serve as validation of the superior quality of an artist's work, as can acceptance into festivals or national distribution of a film. As in academia, the quality of one's collaborators can be used as an indication of superior achievement.

- That said, there will be situations in which extremely high-quality work is performed by members of the department without easily used indicators of high or superior achievement. Contemporaneous reviews may well be helpful in this regard, as can the assessment of outside evaluators. Given the professional nature of Stage and Screen’s faculty, such independent evaluators are more likely to come from within the ranks of the film and theatre industries rather than other, comparable educational institutions. The candidate for tenure and the head of the
department shall consult upon what constitutes the proper pool of peer reviewers should the college committee believe that such a review is necessary for the candidate’s success.

- For a creative work to be considered “scholarship of discovery” within the School of Stage & Screen it must:
- Either create something new in the world or be part of something new in the world OR
- Be part of a significant interpretation of a pre-existing work

For those who pursue more traditional scholarly activities, the School would expect the publication of two juried articles or the publication of a single multi-chapter book either by a reputable academic or trade press.

Candidates must submit copies of all artifacts and/or documents of any productions that are to be considered “scholarship of discovery.” Electronic records of such work is encouraged. In the case of material which for contractual or other reasons cannot be copied (e.g., an unreleased film), copies of contracts for the work may be substituted.

2. Scholarship of Integration

In all cases a peer review is mandatory for artistic efforts to be considered as scholarship. They may be listed as scholarly activity but they will only count as scholarship if they are peer reviewed. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the level of peer review. In some cases prior approval for the scope, content and peer review qualifiers must be secured. Significant evidence submitted for promotion and tenure must have prior approval from the School CRC and Department Head and may involve the Dean at the full professor level.

The same collaborations that set our department apart from others in the College and University actually make us more likely to produce scholarship of integration. Our work crosses boundaries by its very nature. With a few exceptions, members of our department are either producing literary work or interpreting literary work. That act of interpretation is, by its nature, “making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too.”

- The act of producing a play is an act of integration – reaching across colleges so that something taught within English is presented to either the entire university community or to the larger, non-restricted community. The design elements of a film or play are often based on cultural analysis of communities (historical, contemporary, contained, or vernacular). The cinematography of a motion picture is frequently drawn from art history.

---
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Following the Boyer model, the School of Stage & Screen gives equal weight to those endeavors that follow a scholarship of integration as those that follow a scholarship of discovery. As is often the case, an artist’s contribution may be both original and inter-disciplinary. The department encourages those candidates whose work is especially redolent of multiple disciplinary work to declare their scholarship of integration their major area of achievement.

Special note must be made of the role artists play in “illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists.” Traditional scholars often produce work which is comprehensible only to fellow specialists. This is never the case of an artist. Work may be rarified, require an educated audience, or be narrowly targeted, but it is always produced with a “nonspecialist” as a potential viewer. Even a university theatre production includes audience members who are not members of the university.

The art of drama (here defined to include theatre, film, and dance) is an act of communicating complex and sometimes difficult ideas, which is merely another way of saying “making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context.” When discussing major issues of the day, asking complex moral questions, or confronting viewers with the emotional impact of bodies moving through space, dramatic artists are involved in the scholarship of integration.

Because of the collaborative nature of our school’s activities, it is often easier for candidates to provide proof of scholarship of integration rather than scholarship of discovery. A designer of a truly trivial play may well bring to bear a scholarship that integrates art history, class distinctions, historical context, and technical mastery (be it of fabric, scenery, or lights).

In a situation in which a member artist can only work within the confines of something produced by a theatre or film company, scholarship of integration is considered by the School of Stage & Screen to be a standard by which an artist’s work can be measured within its own specialty apart from the overall quality of the work. Thus a great lighting design for a poorly staged production or great cinematography for a poorly written movie can receive full credit for the designer or cinematographer.

“Superior” examples of scholarship of integration are those works which seamlessly reach across the disciplines, illuminating ideas, cultures, and other works of art, while presenting something which is a work of art itself.

“High” examples of scholarship of integration are those works which clearly illuminate ideas, cultures, and arts otherwise found in other disciplines without necessarily achieving status of a work of art. Work that is merely didactic or commercial would fall into this category.
Candidates for tenure and promotion who wish to put forward a case based upon “scholarship of integration” are strongly urged to document each part of their creative process. A costume designer, for example, should submit her research (whether historical or contemporary), her sketches, her designs, etc.

3. Scholarship of Application

In all cases a peer review is mandatory for artistic efforts to be considered as scholarship. They may be listed as scholarly activity but they will only count as scholarship if they are peer reviewed. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the level of peer review.

Film and theatre are arts of the possible – they are by nature “scholarship of application” since they cannot exist in theory. While an unproduced stage or screenplay may be a work of art (indeed, may even be a transformative one, in the manner of Peter Eisenman’s unbuilt architecture), a cinematographer’s art must be rendered as an image, a costume designer’s efforts must fit on the human body.

Boyer is at his least precise in defining “scholarship of application,” although it is the rubric under which he includes service, broadly defined to stretch well beyond the boundaries of the academy. “To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity.”

- The production of a film, stage play, or dance clearly falls within this definition of service (and, not inconsequentially, adheres to the aims of the QEP). When produced within the University, it is an example of the professors serving the immediate community. When produced outside the university, it is an example of serving the region.

- Because of the collaborative and hierarchical nature of our disciplines, “scholarship of application” is especially important to members of the School of Stage & Screen. A cinematographer must conform his work to the conceit of the director, whether or not he believes it to be the best possible approach to the script. Candidates are strongly urged to submit clear and cogent statements of the “concept” of a film or stage production and to document how their work was tailored to fit the endeavor.

- This notion of scholarship of application extends beyond individual productions. Thus, for example, founding a theatre company is an extreme (and clearly superior) example of scholarship of application. Working with an existing company is significant as well.

---
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• Work which significantly raises the artistic level of the community or work which maintains an already superior artistic community level should be considered superior scholarship of integration.
• Work which supports a moderate artistic level of the community should be considered high scholarship of integration.
• Artistic work which enhances the economic status of the community (e.g., the production of a film or the measurable impact of a dance company’s presence) should be considered superior scholarship of integration.
• The establishment of a new arts organization (e.g., theatrical company) should be considered superior as should measurable enhancement of an existing institution (e.g., film festival).
• The advancement of education in dramatic and cinematic art within the region should be considered superior scholarship of integration.
• Work which helps to maintain the level of dramatic and cinematic art within the region should be considered high scholarship of integration.
• Work with students in production and outreach settings is a high form of application, as it also promotes their ability to synthesize and reflect on content from an authentic vantage point.

In addition to professionals conversant with the scholarly activity being performed as scholarship of integration, outside evaluators for such activities might include critics familiar with the artistic level of work within a community, economists who could document the economic impact of the endeavor, or educators able to assess the impact of the endeavor.

4. Scholarship of Teaching

It is clear that Boyer intends “scholarship of teaching” to apply specifically to comprehensive universities such as ours (indeed, Western Carolina University is even mentioned by name). Nevertheless, for work to count as “scholarship of teaching,” it must extend beyond normal classroom duties.

1. Designing an entire program would constitute superior scholarship of teaching.
2. Designing a new sequence of courses would constitute superior scholarship of teaching.
3. Designing a new course (especially an innovative one which remained current within the curriculum) could qualify as high scholarship of teaching.

Because there are not accepted benchmarks for judging such work, examples such as the above must be subject to external peer review.

A juried journal article concerning such scholarship of teaching would constitute peer review and would be considered superior. A non-juried presentation or workshop at a conference would be considered high.
Absent such an article, new program, sequences, and innovative courses would need to be evaluated by outside experts. Unlike the other areas of scholarship detailed above, as academic activity, review should be made not by professionals in our disciplines but by tenured faculty at other institutions with existing film and/or theatre programs. Faculty members may utilize research models such as action research, critical reflective practice, or case study to document Scholarship of Teaching.

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

Service is qualified as those expectations above the normal teaching load. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to clearly indicate teaching load release time for designated service activity. Release time for service may fulfill expectations in the service category but it may not replace ongoing expectations for high and superior level work for tenure and promotion.

Service is defined as University service, service to the community, and service to the profession. Service must be distinctive from (while the activity may be related to one’s scholarly work -- service is intended as a not for profit and not for scholarly review activity -- justification is predetermined) scholarly and/or creative activity as a qualifier for requested personnel actions.

University service is more than committee work and often times in the arts is reflected through recruiting activities, arts applications in support of other university events or initiatives, and arts applications for communities outside of WCU.

A continuous record of service activities is expected with the expectations that initial appointments will be involved more in home unit activities and committees would constitute a high level service. A continuous record of service with emphasis on regional service (multi-state) in one’s professional area would constitute a superior level of service.

1. Types of service:
   a) Institutional service -- committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring, at all levels, including department, college/school, and university such as:
      1) Teaching activities within the university but outside the instructor’s regularly assigned courses, such as guest lectures and other special instructional presentations given to students, faculty, and staff.
      2) Non-teaching activities at the school, college, and university levels
         (a) Committee memberships
         (b) Committee chairmanships
         (c) Assigned responsibilities, such as technical support
         (d) Administrative responsibilities
(e) Other professional service activities, including consulting for building renovations, preview performances for fund raising or recruiting activities
3) Mentoring for faculty or individual students
4) Supervision of student employee or volunteer work experiences
5) Recruitment of students

b) Community engagement – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level such as:
1) Presentations, workshops, guest lectures, etc., in the faculty member's area of expertise for groups outside the University
2) Judging of competitions, festivals, etc.
3) Consultation and support in the faculty member’s area of expertise
4) Benefit performances and other services provided free of charge
5) Participation in professional organizations, including positions of leadership, attendance at professional meetings, contributions and recognition of achievement

c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership – includes service in professional organizations, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as department head, a major role in faculty governance such as:
1) Chair of Faculty, Chair of accreditation or program reviews or self-studies
2) Office holder in Professional organization
3) Academic advising
4) Serving on thesis committees
5) Career/professional advising
6) Serving as faculty advisor or consultant to student professional organizations

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 (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations by students, etc.) and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix.

a) Listing, in reverse chronological order beginning with the most recent, of all service activities for the period under review grouped by area or subject heading. Headings listed above may be used
and modified as needed to provide a clear demonstration of service activities.

b) Summary of academic advisor evaluations should be included in chart format with total number of assigned advisees listed by semester. Narrative comments, typed, will be included as a separate document.

c) Additional documentation of service may be in the form of letters of thanks, articles, news announcements, video, awards, certificates, or other forms of acknowledgement, support, or recognition that may relate to activities considered to have regional or national significance.

3. **General comments** – Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college/school, university), be active and competent advisors to students, and exhibit significant contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies.

   a) Professional development – Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department; they should be described and documented as appropriate.

**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. Deadlines for completion of the review process are determined by the Dean.

2. **Composition of review committee** – In the School of Stage & Screen, AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by the departmental Collegial Review Committee. The CRC, elected annually, comprises four full-time faculty. At least two members of the CRC must be tenured, two non-tenured from the full-time tenure-track or term faculty with the Director as non-voting chair. This committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending changes to the departmental CRC as needed. This committee also serves to review teaching materials as a portion of the AFE process. At least two members of the committee shall review each candidate’s materials. Each reviewer will submit his or her own Peer Review of Teaching Materials form, the results of which the Director will include in his own summary. The forms themselves will be made available to the candidate and the Dean.
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3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
   a) All faculty members prepare an AFE file that includes:
      1) Teaching
         a. self-evaluation will include 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. The
            statement should address the issue of Pedagogical
            Content Knowledge described above, particularly with
            regard to currency. List courses taught for the current
            academic year, including name, credits, enrollment
         b. copy of peer evaluations of teaching materials.
         c. direct observation of classroom teaching (if required)
         d. Student Assessment of Instruction

   2) Scholarship and Creative Activity - List scholarly/creative
      activity completed during the academic year (previous 12 months
      from time of submission of file). Include specific information
      regarding peer reviewed activities: internal and external, traditional
      and alternative reviews. Clearly distinguish between outcomes and
      work in progress. Take care not to duplicate entries from previous
      years. If an item appeared previously with a different status (e.g.,
      article submitted), clearly indicate that it was listed previously, and
      how. Include in Appendix G any reprints, conference submissions,
      compressed formats of posters, brief documentation of production
      activity (pictures, drawings, other sample production organizational
      material), etc., to document scholarly/creative activity.

   2) Service/Engagement –
      a. List service to the department, college, university, and
         external community during the immediately previous 12
         months. Address advising activities, including number of
         undergraduate advisees, work with University Players and
         other departmental organizations, and so forth. Document
         as appropriate in Appendix H.
      b. Engagement/Professional Development Activities. List
         workshops, training institutes, and related activities, and
         describe/document as appropriate. Artifacts may optionally
         be included in Appendix I.
      c. Other pertinent information. Describe additional
         information that does not fit into the categories above, or
         simply indicate N/A.

b) Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document - AFE
   document and a set of appendices with supporting documentation and
artifacts are to be submitted to the School's “H-Drive” in a folder with the candidates name on it. AFE document should also be submitted electronically to the Director. This file follows the structure of the TPR dossier but is limited to a single year rather than a cumulative record. Use this opportunity to describe the highlights of your year, focusing on teaching, scholarship, and service. Use the same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR Dossier, but to a more limited degree, as follows
i. Appendix A. (not used)
ii. Appendix B. Current vita.
iii. Appendix C. (not used)
iv. Appendix D. Peer review of teaching. Include the written feedback from the departmental peer review of teaching materials. If direct observation of teaching was conducted, you may optionally include the ratings and comments of observers. These peer ratings should be for the current academic year.
v. Appendix E. SAI data. Because Spring data may not be available in time for the AFE file, include SAI data for the calendar year, including any Summer courses. Prepare a concise tabular summary of the average scores on the 5 factors for each course taught. Follow this with a 1-page presentation of quantitative data for each course. It is up to the candidate to decide if to include narrative responses to open-ended questions in this section, however it is not required.
vi. Appendix F. Samples of teaching materials from the current year, including syllabi, tests, exams, projects, assignments, and so forth. Avoid excessive bulk.
vii. Appendix G. Samples of scholarly products, including reprints, letters of acceptance, brief manuscripts or abstracts, or technical reports, contracts for external professional activities, etc. Take care not to include the same products in multiple years.
viii. Appendix H. Documentation of service for the most recent 12 months. Include representative materials to document service/engagement activities.
ix. Appendix I. Optional. Any other documentation you wish to provide.

Note: The School’s CRC and the Director shall each prepare a written AFE Statement addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty member will be provided with a copy of the evaluation prior to meeting with the Director to review the results of the evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance. Faculty must read and sign the AFE Statement to confirm that a copy has been provided to them. Signing does not necessarily signify agreement and faculty may respond with
a written rebuttal statement. The faculty member’s self-evaluation, peer review of teaching materials, the Director’s summary, and any rebuttal will be submitted to the Dean of the College of Fine and Performing Arts.

B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 & 4.)
1. Overview - The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment
2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) -
   a) The School TPR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the Director (non-voting) and shall be composed of three tenured faculty members elected annually by the School’s full-time faculty. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty, the Director, in consultation with the School and Dean of the College, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
   b) The College TPR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of faculty members of the college as specified in the Faculty Handbook.
   c) The University TPR Advisory Committee shall consist of the Provost as chair (non-voting); the Dean of the Graduate School, and faculty members of the University as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The 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 - 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 - The School’s post tenure review committee shall comprise all tenured members of the School, including the Director who will act as the Non-voting head of the committee and any members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty in the School, the Director, in consultation with the department and the dean of the college, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
a) The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.

b) The documentation prepared by the faculty member follows the structure and format of both the TPR Dossier and the departmental AFE File described above in section III.A.3. Submit all material in electronic “word” or PDF files onto the School’s “H-Drive” in a folder with the candidates name on it. Include the following:
   i. Brief (2-3 page) Self-evaluative statement highlighting teaching, research, and service achievements over the past 5 years, or since the most recent promotion or Post-Tenure Review. Also include future plans for Teaching and Scholarship.
   ii. Candidate’s AFE documents for each of the past 4 years. (Faculty Handbook.)
   iii. AFE Committee & Director statements from the past 4 years.
   iv. SAI and Peer Evaluations past 3 years.
   v. Current Vitae
   vi. Other teaching and scholarship materials and supporting evidence at the candidate’s discretion.

c) The CRC shall present its written evaluation to the 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 Director shall add his or her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.

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

D. Evaluation of Adjunct instructors (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. Deadlines for completion of the Annual Faculty Review (AFE) process are determined by the Office of the Provost along with the timetables for TPR.
   i. Adjunct faculty’s teaching material shall be reviewed (by CRC) during the first semester of the academic year in which they teach.
   ii. If Adjunct faculty only teach Fall semester, they should complete the self-evaluation near the end of that semester; faculty teaching only Spring semester or both semesters should follow the regular schedule for annual faculty review.
   iii. The Director, in consultation with the School CRC, shall write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during the preparation of other AFEs in the spring.
iv. The Director shall place in the part-time faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer review of teaching materials, and all available SAI reports.

2. **Composition of review committee** – Review for part-time faculty will be as part of the AFE review process. The committee will be the AFE committee.

3. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence** - These procedures and guidelines are based upon the assumption that the **Adjunct** faculty member is responsible only for teaching. Those with contractual agreements specifying other expectations will be evaluated based on those expectations.

All **Adjunct** teaching instructors will be evaluated with regard to effectiveness of teaching using data from the following sources:

   c) All faculty members prepare an AFE file that includes:

      1) **Teaching**

      d. **Self-evaluation** will include 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. The statement should address the issue of **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** described above, particularly with regard to currency. List courses taught for the current academic year, including name, credits, enrollment

      e. **Copy of peer evaluations of teaching materials.**

      f. **Direct observation of classroom teaching** (if required)

      g. **Student Assessment of Instruction**

   c) **Self-evaluation. (4.05.B.2.C)**

The self-report and assessment is to be completed once per academic year after the faculty has been provided course evaluations from at least one semester. This task is considered a portion of Boyer’s critically reflective process and should discuss weaknesses, strengths, successes, failures and methods to improve each course. “As to self evaluation...Faculty might be asked to step back and discuss...their impressions about the gains and losses experienced in the classroom – what worked well, what barriers were encountered, what steps might be taken to improve the course the next time around.” (Boyer, 1990, p. 37)

**In the self-evaluation the faculty member must address**

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge** described above, particularly with regard to currency. List courses taught for the current academic year, including name, credits, and enrollment.
d) Peer review of teaching materials. (4.05.B.2.B) reviewed by S&S CRC annually

The School’s Collegial Review Committee will evaluate, for all teaching faculty, using the department’s protocol form, teaching materials, including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc.

This activity is considered to be part of critical and reflective teaching discussed by Boyer. Performing this task assists other faculty in improving their teaching and reviewing others’ materials is beneficial to both the reviewer and reviewed.

c) Direct observation of instruction. (4.05.B.2.B)

Teaching faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually in conjunction with AFE using the School protocol.

This activity is considered to be part of critical and reflective teaching discussed by Boyer. Performing this task assists other faculty in improving their teaching and reviewing others’ classroom management is beneficial to both the reviewer and reviewed.

d) Student assessment of instruction. (4.05.B.2.B)

All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAIs using a form of the Senate-approved university-wide SAI instrument.

E. General comments

1. The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution, but we attach the greatest weight to the peer review of substantive teaching materials and quantitative SAIs along with such measures as student evaluations conducted by the Director during individual and group discussions with departmental students and formal exit interviews by the program director/Director with graduating students. The Stage & Screen faculty view student evaluations as a tool for individuals to use to improve their teaching (formative uses). Due to the large number of factors empirically shown to affect teacher student evaluations (i.e. gender of instructor, number of times the course meets in a week, time of day the course meets, the student’s perception of the importance of the course to the major, instructor’s personality, etc.) comparison across faculty using student evaluations is not considered appropriate (summative uses).

2. The Stage & Screen faculty values both rigor and acceptable teaching practice. However, the faculty does not believe that standards and difficulty should be
lowered to increase student evaluations. Due to the multiple issues which arise with student evaluations, rating teaching as poor if a faculty member’s rating is below school, college or university averages is not an acceptable use of the student evaluations. Instead the committee should look for trends over different courses and/or terms.

3. Low response rates make course evaluation scores less reliable and reduce validity. Courses with low enrollments and/or those with low response rates should be very carefully considered. Each faculty member should maintain a comprehensive table of course evaluation scores.

4. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate. These activities could include attending seminars, developing new teaching methods, or materials. Activities should relate to the faculty member’s current assignment, support an initiative in an area that will enhance Stage & Screen’s services to students and its image in the community.

Section IV: Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

A. Reappointment

1. Teaching: Significant progress toward a tenurable record in Teaching. See page 4 part D, expectations for promotion. Also see Appendices A,B,C. The candidate shall provide evidence of thoughtful consideration of teaching evaluations (including student, peer and administrative evaluations) and of concrete and effective steps taken to address any areas of weakness.

2. Scholarship/Creative Activity: Significant progress toward a tenurable record in Teaching. See page 4 part D, expectations for promotion. Also see Appendices A,B,C. Significant contributions beyond the university campus is expected.

3. Service: Significant progress toward a tenurable record in Teaching. See page 4 part D, expectations for promotion. Also see Appendices A,B,C. While in the early years of tenure-track service, it is understandable that a candidate’s service record be largely within the School, as the tenure year approaches, the scope of service activities should reflect a broadening range of activities and commitments that include service to the College, University, Community and Profession.

4. General Comment: The criteria for reappointment are based on a continuous record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service as appropriate to the candidate’s assigned responsibilities that, in the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee, shows significant progress toward the awarding of tenure. In the first years of service, one or more areas, such as service, may be significantly less developed than the others. Beginning with the
third full year of service, the record is expected to show significant progress toward tenure in all three areas.

5. **Academic Qualifications:** A Terminal Degree, PHD or MFA, in the primary teaching field or a lesser degree with SIGNIFICANT professional experience in the field is required. See page 2 “Earned Academic Degrees” and pg 3 “Alterative Qualifications.”

**B. Tenure:** Requires that the candidate meet the “High” expectations in each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, service). See page 4 part D, expectations for promotion. Also see Appendices ABC for College and School’s criteria.

**C. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:** Requires that the candidate meet the “High” expectations in each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, service). See page 4 part D, expectations for promotion. Also see Appendices ABC for College and School’s criteria.

**D. Associate Professor to Professor:** Requires that the candidate meet the “Superior” expectations in each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, service). See page 4 part D, expectations for promotion. Also see Appendices ABC for College and School’s criteria.

---

**APPENDIX A**

College of Fine and Performing Arts

Protocols: Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, Multiple Year Contract Renewal

The following statements are verification standards related to peer review and scholarship/creative activity benchmarks. The Boyer model has four differentia categories. It is up to the applicant to reasonably document a choice of category for scholarship and creative activity credit. In all cases outside peer review is required. Term qualifiers may be found at the end of this document. The examples are not intended to be a laundry list and one is not expected to fulfill them all; they are intended to be a guide.

Scholarship and creative activities for which faculty teaching load is received are consider of lesser value and must be labeled as part as such. In all cases peer review is interpreted to mean outside the WCU
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community acknowledgement of the specificity and quality of the scholarship. This outside peer review may take place on the campus as the College is an arts centered academy with professional works often times in exhibition or in review in a time based media. The validity of such reviews must be secured through the Dean. Outside reviews on-campus of creative activity may carry weight in reappointment, but may not be used as the chief peer review for tenure, promotion and renewal of multiyear contracts.

Peer Review
Level I: Appointment / 1-3 years Reappointment
- Validation by: Context should be related to primary teaching assignment
  - Articles in journals submitted to be reviewed by editor only
  - Performances through self scheduling in community and surrounding area
  - Adjudication in community and surrounding area for pay
  - Clinics, workshops, master classes for state wide meetings / regional arts organizations / regional professional societies
  - Exhibitions in regional venues by invitation outside of peer review
  - Performances in regional professional ensembles for pay
  - For hire work and commissions related to teaching assignment in region
  - Creative works performed, staged, etc. for regional venues
  - Regional acknowledgement of scholarship of application
  - Application of SOTL research in one’s own courses – evidence of outcome
  - Application of Scholarship of Integration in workshop and/or ones own teaching – evidence of outcome
  - Evidence of Institutional and local grant success with application in ones own teaching or creative activity

Level II: 4-6 years Reappointment / multiple year contract renewal
- Validation criteria focused on multiple peer reviews
  - Articles in journals submitted for review to multiple member review panels
  - Works in discipline recognized scholarly publications
  - Adjudication in regionally recognized venues (i.e. southeast)
  - Clinics, workshops, master class for regional (multi-state) venues
  - Exhibitions in recognized venues and facilities outside of local and immediate region
  - Performances in ensembles with a multi-state reputation and/or national call for member auditions
  - For hire work and commissions with demonstrated competition from a multi state context
  - Creative works performed, staged, etc. for documented venues of regional (multi-state) venues
  - Honors and awards and acknowledgement of scholarship of engagement with related publication
  - Peer reviewed scholarship of application by juried publication, workshop presentations, guest artist engagements
  - Application of SOTL research in one’s own teaching and peer reviewed through juried publication and/or invitational venues
  - Application of scholarship of integration in ones own teaching, evidence of outcome peer reviewed through juried publication and/or invitational venues
  - Evidence of outside grant writing success with application in ones own teaching or creative activity, must exceed $5,000.

Level III. Tenure - PTR
- Validation same as 4-6 years with continuous record

Level IV. Associate Professor
- Validation based on 4-6 year recommendation with emphasis on continuous record in one’s area of faculty teaching assignment and the following
  - Systemic evidence of continuous record of achievement in identified field of expertise with application implicit in one’s teaching assignment
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- Clear evidence of professional reputation in a field of study (leadership in professional societies and organizations, and/or multi-state to national reputation in field of study, continuous for hire work with multi-state implications, commissions and exhibitions exhibiting regional competition)
- Specific record in one of the four Boyer models of scholarship
- Collegial verification of one promise for sustained work in scholarship

Level V. Full Professor

- Acknowledge as the mentor for scholarship, teaching and service in the academy and college
  - Includes expectations of all levels
  - Continuous record of achievement with national and/or international reputation in field of study
  - Office holder in defined national professional organization related to one’s teaching field, elected by membership
  - Recognized as professional expert in field of study by participating as the peer reviewer
  - Exhibitions in a national recognized gallery for a particular field of inquiry or artistic endeavor
  - Performances, workshops, clinics, master-classes, adjudication, exhibitions, at annual or semi-annual professional meeting, organization sponsorship, and or web recognized competition
  - For hire work that brings national attention to the area of one’s specialty
  - Collegial leadership in verification of work in scholarship and indicator for to this effect in the professional and teaching academy
  - National recognition in application of SOTL research to one’s own teaching and leadership within the unit for this type of scholarship
  - National recognition for scholarship of integration as it applies to one or more of the following: teaching, community venues, economic development, and new art (must reflect synthesis across disciplines either in the arts or others)
  - National recognition for scholarship of application as it applies to one or more of the following: undergraduate research and creative activity, community venues, economic development

Glossary / Working Definitions

National/International Recognition

- Indicated by national organization, meetings, workshops, etc. in one’s field of study or discipline
- Competitive as it applies to exhibition venues, performance organizations and/or sites
- Competitive as it applies to competitions
- Competitive as it applies to for hire work
- Competitive references calls and announcements for participation and submission at the national and international level

Regional

- Western most counties in NC for Level I
- Multi-state for levels II-V
- Publications, exhibitions, juried work, panel peer reviewed, in a recognized region of the US

For Hire

- Pay for services
- Level of competition depends on local, state, national, international calls for work
- Level of competition includes exhibition at reputation of facility or web placement as indicated form past participants and level of reputation (the applicant must verify this through collegial acknowledgment)

Faculty Load Scholarship/Creative Activity
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● Individuals receiving faculty load for an activity that is creative in nature and listed in this area must acknowledge this condition
  ○ Director of Museum, Conductors, Exhibition Coordinators, Designers, etc.
● It carries lesser value in consideration for promotion to associate and full professor

Peer Review
● Recognized only if outside the University
● Inclusive of region acknowledgement to professional society panel review
● Inclusive of stature of for hire work – calls for applications, auditions, portfolios, etc
● Inclusive of noted field of experts within one’s professional field of inquiry

Continuous
● Acknowledged in annual AFE Summary Reviews
● Indicators of involvement over three years and promise for continued efforts in a specific field of inquiry or particular Boyer model
● Understood that fruition may be outside an academic year, but evidence of ongoing and progress clearer peer reviewed

Collegial Verification
● Acknowledge within the University Community
● Acknowledge within a society or professional organization

Examples
The following are indicators of specific types of inquiry within the Boyer model. Many inquiries cross-over the specifics. One’s intent in classification is primary for consideration and acceptance as valid scholarship and/or creative activity submitted for support of action.

Discovery
● New creative venues, commissions, research
  ○ Lesser value on reworking or use of already prepared of completed art in new venues
  ○ Displays, commissions for hire performances etc.
● Emphasis on new

Integration
● Cross discipline in the arts or greater fields of study
● Clear indicators of the interrelationship of the disciplines and the application associated
● May include new works such as publications, exhibitions, etc.
● May be inclusive of Discovery but emphasis must be clearly indicated by intent

Application
● Use of one’s expertise (field of scholarship in teaching specialty area) in application
● Must include intent or indicator of applied to what
● Benchmarking results a clear indicator of intent
● Peer review may included results, promise for further study, or acknowledgement in the profession, community, region, nation, world
● Intent is referenced by longitudinal context and differentiated from isolated service events

SOTL
● Specific application of research into one’s own teaching required and clearly stated as intent
● Thesis or statement of Intent must be clearly indicated at the onset of study
● Expectations are that this may be a two to three year cycle and progress reports must include peer review
● Indicators must include participation in SOTL activities and may be leveled by region, state, multi-state, national and international
APPENDIX B

College of Fine and Performing Arts: School of Stage & Screen
Collegial Review: Expectations for High and Superior Performance

*Arts includes fine arts, performing arts, entertainment arts and may be demonstrated in traditional as well as emerging or innovative mediums – in both process and product – in the creative act and in teaching.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High Level</th>
<th>Superior Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching:</strong></td>
<td>Five (&gt; 40%) of the following should be met for this designation</td>
<td>Eight (&gt; 50%) of the following should be met for this designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to teaching and learning is REQUIRED.</strong></td>
<td>1. Taught a new course in the past three years</td>
<td>Designators same as high level with the inclusion of the following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations.</td>
<td>2. Received an average of 3 on the 4 point scale for all courses taught in the past three years</td>
<td>1. Served on University wide CRC within the past three years -- if used may not use for service qualifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one’s teaching and learning through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.</td>
<td>3. Developed a new on-line course in the past three years</td>
<td>2. Coulter Faculty Center Fellow in activity directly related to improving teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Peer review of teaching meets or exceeds expectations in the past three years</td>
<td>3. Received an average of 3.5 on the 4 point scale for all SAI for all courses taught in the past three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Served as faculty mentor for the past three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Sponsored three students at the national undergraduate research conference in the past six years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Student advisee accepted into a masters or doctorate at a recognized arts program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Professional employment by student advisee in the respective field of art shall be considered equivalent to acceptance into a recognized art program for graduate study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. School, Department, College or University award for teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Cited for a service learning course by an outside agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Teacher for three students who submitted creative work to competitions, in the past three years, whose work garnered high honors or recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Cited as high level in peer review committees and/or Directors or Department Heads Summary Statement for each of the last three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sponsored three guest artists working with assigned classes in the past three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High Value</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholastically and/or creative activity</td>
<td>Four (&gt; 40%) of the following should be met for this designation -- a continuous record of achievement is mandatory but may be attained in one or combination of the following list-- must identify Boyer model(s) applicable -- must be peer review outside of WCU</td>
<td>Six (&gt; 60%) of the high value designators should be attained - a continuous record of achievement is mandatory but may be attained in one or combination of the following list-- must identify Boyer model(s) applicable -- must be peer review outside of WCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations. | 1. Continuous record of activity off campus for the past three years  
2. Regional (multi-state) reputation in field of inquiry or art in primary teaching area or as designated and approved by the School or Department through exhibitions, digital artifacts or web based media  
3. Continuous record of activity on-campus for the past three years  
4. Juried publications in regional and/or national journals related to one’s teaching field  
5. Publish book or teaching method in one’s teaching area  
6. Grant writing in excess of $5,000 from outside University consideration  
7. Presentation of work shops, master classes, exhibitions, etc. at state wide or regional meetings related to one’s teaching area  
8. Continuous record of significant for hire work in one’s area of teaching assignment (commitment contributing to the regional, multi-state and national reputation of the home unit, college and University  
9. Adjudication or critic in a regional (multi-state) arena  
10. Commissions for art artifacts which bring significant image enhancement to one’s program assignment | National reputation in one’s primary teaching area required and defined by one or more of the following  
1. Presentations, exhibitions, performances at recognized national meetings, workshops, festivals  
2. For hire work in venues associated with a national regional context (Northeast – Mid-west, etc.)  
3. Clients in for-hire work associated with six figure ($) projects related to one’s teaching area  
4. Publicaion in national and/or international journals and/or national level visual arts critics and/or programs  
5. Books, screenplays, plays, or manuscripts syndicated at national level or produced for national mediums, ie: Movies, TV, Internet, and etc.  
6. Works of art reviewed by national peers, documented in regional and national publications |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>High Level</th>
<th>Superior Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service is defined as University service, service to the community, and service to the profession. Service must be distinctive from (while the activity may be related to one’s scholarly work -- service is intended as a not for profit and not for scholarly review activity – justification is predetermined) scholarly and/or creative activity as a qualifier for requested personnel actions.</td>
<td>A continuous record of service activities is expected with the expectations that initial appointments will be involved more in home unit activities and committees. Three (&gt;40%) of the following should be documented to warrant high level of service to support personnel actions.</td>
<td>A continuous record of service is expected with emphasis on regional service (multi-state) in one’s professional area required. Five (&gt;70%) of the following should be documented to warrant superior level of service to support personnel actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University service is more than committee work and often times in the arts is reflected through recruiting activities, arts applications in support of other university events or initiatives, and arts applications for communities outside of WCU. | 1. Continued record of university or college wide committee and/or taskforce or other planning group for the immediate past three years 2. Record of two university wide service committee commitments that reflect monthly commitments in the past three years 3. Positive qualifiers by Director or Department Head and student survey reviewed advising for 10 or more students annually for the past three years 4. Annual performances or artistic support for other University events, excluding commencements annually 5. Recruiting off campus three or more times annually in each of the past three years 6. Holding professional office in state and/or region or national professional organization related to discipline 7. Use of arts expertise in communities outside of WCU -- continuous annual activities | 1. Continued record of university or college wide committee and/or taskforce or other planning group for the immediate past three years 2. Record of serving on two University wide committees that reflect monthly commitments in the past three years 3. Positive qualifiers by Director or Department Head and student survey reviewed advising for 10 or more students annually for the past three years 4. Annual performances or artistic support for other University events, excluding commencements annually 5. Recruiting off campus three or more times annually in each of the past three years 6. Holding professional office in state and/or region or national professional organization related to discipline 7. Use of arts expertise in communities outside of WCU -- continuous annual activities |
APPENDIX C

CRD: School of Stage & Screen - Boyer Model Scholarship Examples

Scholarship for Stage & Screen within the framework, as outlined by Boyer and as interpreted by the School of Stage & Screen. Examples are intended to be representative and are not limitations, nor do they constitute a singular pathway. Many inquiries crossover the specifics.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document outside peer review at a high or superior level and completion of an activity in and of itself does not constitute peer review. This is especially true for curriculum design listed under SoTL for high and superior level. Note: A new course sequence in and of itself is not peer reviewed unless it is presented or review by outside sources.

For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to scholarly and/or creative activity is REQUIRED. Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations. Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one’s scholarly and/or creative activity through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>SoTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication in regional and/or national journals related to one's teaching field, such as an original work (screenplay, novel, stage play)</td>
<td>An artist's contribution may be both original and interdisciplinary. The act of producing a play is an act of integration.</td>
<td>Film and theatre are arts of the possible – they are by nature &quot;scholarship of application&quot; since they cannot exist in theory.</td>
<td>A juried journal article concerning such scholarship of teaching would constitute superior level peer review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing a motion picture, television episode, or stage play is considered a superior achievement, as is playing a key, decision-making role in a theatrical or cinematic project.</td>
<td>&quot;Superior&quot; examples are works which seamlessly reach across disciplines, illuminating ideas, cultures, &amp; other works of art - presenting what is a work of art itself.</td>
<td>Presentation of work shops, master classes, exhibitions, etc. at state wide or regional meetings related to one's teaching area would constitute a high level of scholarship.</td>
<td>A presentation at a professional conference concerning such scholarship of teaching would constitute high level peer review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating in a production in a non-decision making role (e.g., camera operator or assistant stage manager) is considered evidence of high achievement. Evidence must be provided as to the scope and scholarly activity status. If this is for hire work the regional or national significance must be provided.

"High" examples are works which clearly illuminate ideas, cultures, and arts otherwise found in other disciplines without necessarily achieving status of a work of art.

Work which significantly raises or maintains the artistic level of the community is superior, as is the enhancement of education in dramatic and cinematic art.

Designing an entire program, degree, or curriculum would constitute superior scholarship of teaching.

For performers, appearance in a significant role, whether leading or supporting, is considered evidence of superior scholarship of discovery. A review is required or significance of for hire work (continuous record, reviews, etc).

The design elements of a film or play are often based on cultural & historical analysis. The cinematography of a motion picture is frequently drawn from art history.

Artistic work which enhances the economic status of the community (e.g: production of a film or the impact of a dance company's presence) is superior scholarship.

Designing a new sequence of courses would constitute superior scholarship of teaching.

For performers, appearance in a minor role is considered evidence of "high" achievement.

Establishing a new arts organization (theatrical company or arts academy) or the measurable enhancement of an existing institution (film festival) would be superior.

Designing a new course (especially an innovative one which remained current within the curriculum) would qualify as high scholarship of teaching.

In all cases a clear indication of peer review as well as standard of peer review is required for an activity to be included under scholarship.

---

**CRD: School of Stage & Screen – Teaching Examples**

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document outside peer review at a high or superior level and completion of an activity in and of itself does not constitute peer review. This is especially true for curriculum design listed under ScTL for high and superior level.

For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to scholarly and/or creative activity is REQUIRED. Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations. Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one's scholarly and/or creative activity through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Comments</th>
<th>High Examples</th>
<th>Superior Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to teaching and learning is required for both high</td>
<td>Engaged teaching in which students apply course content in real-world context with the product or presentation subject to internal review by faculty peers. A design class</td>
<td>Engaged teaching in which students apply course content in real-world context and is subject to outside review by professionals in the field for which the work was created and/or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and superior.</td>
<td>project that is used to enhance or integrate learning across discipline lines or as a service-learning project would constitute significant student/mentor achievement.</td>
<td>discipline. A documentary class project that is used for industry or educational purposes would demonstrate excellence in achievement by the students and faculty mentor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A designation of high or superior is determined according to number and complexity of designations documented.</td>
<td>Student creative projects or presentations that emerge from course teaching or mentoring and demonstrate excellence in skill and critical thought and are subject to public review within the institution or local region. A student using course skills to assist an area school group to with a theatrical production would demonstrate significant student/faculty achievement.</td>
<td>Student creative projects or presentations that emerge from course teaching or mentoring and demonstrate excellence in skill and critical thought and are subject to outside review such as at a national conference. A script that is accepted for performance at an invited conference would demonstrate superior student/faculty achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples are intended to be representative and are not limitations, nor do they constitute a singular pathway.</td>
<td>Student advisee accepted into a masters or doctorate at a recognized arts program.</td>
<td>Professional employment by a student advisee in the respective field of art during their academic career or at matriculation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples should be considered in concert with other benchmarks used to evaluate teaching noted in the CRD.</td>
<td>Developed a new course (or re-designed an existing one) in the review period.</td>
<td>Design or re-design a full program curriculum that is accepted by departmental and university-level committees for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional administrative, service or scholarship requirements may affect evaluations if they limit teaching time.</td>
<td>Sponsored students at regional or national undergraduate conference during review period.</td>
<td>Coulter Faculty Center Fellow in activity directly related to improving teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant teaching and learning is grounded in intention and promotes student engagement and synthesis.</td>
<td>Peer review of teaching meets or exceeds expectations in the past three years.</td>
<td>Received an average of 3.5 on the 4 point scale for all SAI for all courses taught in the past three years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRD: School of Stage & Screen – Service Examples**

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document outside peer review at a high or superior level and completion of an activity in and of itself does not constitute peer review. This is especially true for curriculum design listed under SoTL for high and superior level.

For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to scholarly and/or creative activity is REQUIRED. Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations. Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one’s scholarly and/or creative activity through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Comments</th>
<th>High Examples</th>
<th>Superior Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service is defined as University service, service to the community, and service to the profession.</td>
<td>A continuous record of service activities is expected with the expectations that initial appointments</td>
<td>A continuous record of service is expected with emphasis on regional service (multi-state) in one’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised: 8/17/12
| Service must be distinctive from scholarly and/or creative activity as a qualifier for requested personnel actions. | will be involved more in home unit activities and committees. | professional area required |
| University service is more than committee work and often times in the arts is reflected through recruiting activities, arts applications in support of other university events or initiatives, and arts applications for communities outside of WCU. | Continued record of university or college wide committee and/or taskforce or other planning group for the immediate past three years. | Use of arts expertise in communities outside of WCU – continuous annual record |
| While the activity may be related to one's scholarly work – service is intended as a not for profit and not for scholarly review activity – justification is predetermined. | Record of serving on two University wide committees that reflect monthly commitments in the past three years | Holding professional office in state and/or region or national professional organization related to discipline |
| Examples are intended to be representative and are not limitations, nor do they constitute a singular pathway. | Recruiting off campus three or more times annually in each of the past three years | Annual performances or artistic support for other University events, excluding commencements annually |
| Examples should be considered in concert with other benchmarks used to evaluate teaching noted in the CRD. | Positive qualifiers by Director or Department Head and student survey reviewed advising for 10 or more students annually for the past three years | Continued record of university or college wide committee and/or taskforce or other planning group that results in the implements a new program or recurring event. |
| Additional administrative, teaching, or scholarship requirements may affect evaluations if they limit time allocated for service | Membership and service to local/regional arts organizations that promote and serve as arts advocates. | |