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

I. Overview

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

Faculty performance is reviewed and evaluated each year by two formal processes. In the fall, faculty members are considered for reappointment, tenure and promotion (tenure track faculty in their 1st year at WCU are considered for reappointment in early spring). At that time, the cumulative record is appraised. In the late spring, the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) review is made of performance over the most recent year of service.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

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

   a) Pedagogical Content Knowledge -- Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. 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. An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline’s central concepts, skills and recent advances through a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. Teachers become more effective as they repeatedly engage in these teaching acts and find out what is easiest and most difficult for their students and modify their teaching accordingly.

   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 (4.05)**

a) **Self-evaluation.** A narrative statement addressing Pedagogical Content Knowledge, particularly with regard to currency. What are you doing to help students understand the most important material in your field? How have you changed your teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and advancements for the courses you teach? Faculty members are not expected to incorporate major changes every year, but maintaining currency should be evident over time. Self-evaluation of teaching is a component of all evaluation processes other than Post-Tenure Review. Each year during the AFE process, each faculty member will prepare a brief written report evaluating their pedagogical content knowledge. The questions posed above should be used as a guide. The report should also include items such as a description of goals, teaching methods used, and currency of teaching materials for the courses taught during the AFE review period (4.05B2C).

b) **Peer review of teaching materials.** Each faculty member will receive a minimum of one peer review of teaching materials, (including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc.) using a department-approved protocol form. The peer-review of teaching materials committee is composed of the undergraduate and graduate program directors and may include an additional faculty member should specific content expertise be needed. The review committee does not include the department head. *(4.05B2B)*

c) **Direct observation of instruction.** All tenure track and fixed term faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of classroom teaching annually by a faculty member selected in conjunction with the Department Head. Classroom observation should never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. The department will use developed protocols to guide classroom observation. Faculty members may also include additional direct observations in support of their AFE *(4.05B2B)*

d) **Student assessment of instruction (SAI).** All sections of every course taught by each faculty member will include SAI's using the Senate-approved university-wide SAI instrument. Faculty may also choose to use additional student evaluation tools *(4.05B2A)*

e) **Other methods of evaluation and sources of evidence may include:**

1) **Correspondence** from students, alumni or other faculty
2) **Published or presented work** on teaching methods, materials and strategies.

3) **Teaching awards and nominations**

3. **General Comments:** Professional development activities in the domain of teaching are valued by the department; they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix. When evaluating a candidate’s dossier, credit will be given to *extraordinary teaching efforts* such as developing a new course with related syllabus and teaching materials, presentation of a new teaching technique to peers, and development of a website or curricular materials to disseminate teaching innovations. Teaching assignments will be allocated with reference to current department workload policies and other factors such as administrative appointments, teaching overload, and other duties assigned which may allow for course release.

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

1. **WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer.** Faculty should demonstrate regular productivity in one or more types of the following types of scholarship:
   a) **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
   b) **Scholarship of integration** – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
   c) **Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
   d) **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence:** Scholarship in the Department of Social Work will be evaluated on the concept of a “unit” of work. The unit will be determined with reference to such criteria as “degree of difficulty,” “potential impact,” and value to the mission of the department. For example, published outcomes are more highly valued than unpublished outcomes, peer reviewed journals are valued more than non peer reviewed publications, and national and regional conferences are more valued than local ones. Scholarship which is not published but demonstrates community engagement is subject to the alternative peer review process. The alternative peer review process examines the significance of the project as well as the impact, dissemination, and any innovation present in the project. Please see Appendix A for guidelines on the alternative peer evaluation process. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be comprehensively defined, the following guidelines should be useful to the candidate and review committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Two Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Article published in a peer-reviewed journal and the candidate is the sole or first author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. First edition book that is not self-published and the candidate is sole, senior, or second author.
3. Invited address at a state, national or international conference.
4. Submission of a funded external research grant or contract totaling at least $10,000 and the candidate is the principal investigator or co-principal investigator. (first year, thereafter this counts as one unit per year)

B. One Unit
1. A multi-authored article in a peer-reviewed journal and the candidate is the second or third author.
2. A first edition of a multi-authored book or textbook (not self-published, not 2nd edition or later textbook) and candidate is not the sole, senior, or second author.
3. A later edition of a book and candidate is sole, senior or second author.
4. An edited book with contributions from other scholars and the candidate is the sole, senior, or co-editor.
5. A chapter in an edited book and the candidate is a sole, senior, or second author.
6. Member of a research team (principal or co-principal investigator) on a funded external research grant or contract totaling at least $10,000 per year while actively collecting data and writing scholarly reports. Thereafter this will count as service.
7. Unsuccessful submission of an external research grant or contract totaling at least $10,000 per year and the candidate is principal or co-principal investigator.
8. Service learning project linked with an academic course which results in alternative peer review. See Appendix A for alternative peer review criteria.
9. Presentation at a regional, national, or international conference where abstracts were peer reviewed.
10. Conducting a study for a local organization or government agency (e.g. to solve a community problem) related to the discipline and has documentation of findings, subject to alternative peer review. See Appendix A for alternative peer review criteria.
11. Development of major educational multimedia presentations (i.e., podcasts, e-guides) that are widely disseminated and document significant impact in the field. This type of scholarship is subject to alternative peer review. See Appendix A for alternative peer review evaluation criteria.

C. One-Half Unit
1. Presentation at a state or local conference where abstracts were peer reviewed.
2. Peer reviewed poster presentation or facilitation of a round table discussion or symposium; organizer at a regional, national, or international conference.
3. Submission of a successful internal research grant proposal.
4. Unsuccessful submission of an external research grant or contract, totaling under $10,000 per year and candidate is the principal or co-principal investigator.
5. Book review or editorial published in peer reviewed professional journal.
6. Provision of off-campus consulting services related to discipline that result in written product subject to alternative peer review. See Appendix A for alternative peer review criteria.
7. A multi-authored article in a peer-reviewed journal and the candidate is the 4th or later author.
8. Article published in a non peer-reviewed professional journal and the candidate is the sole,
3. General comments: These guidelines are not exhaustive. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this department. We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present other activities that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimately scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship based on their extraordinary nature, or justifying why an activity should be moved to a higher classification. Professional development activities in the domain of scholarship are valued by the department; they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix. Any form of outreach or engagement that the candidate wishes to present as scholarship is subject to the alternative peer review process outlined in Appendix A.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service
   a) Institutional service – committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring at all levels, including department, college/school, and university.
   b) Community engagement – providing expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, national or international level. Providing a talk on a current disciplinary topic to a local radio or television station, service organization, business organization, or nonacademic professional organization, public school, or community college; testifying or consulting as an expert witness
   c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership Work on accreditation documents, administrative duties such as program director, a major role in faculty governance, or a major role in developing and/or writing a new program (e.g. graduate or certificate program) in existing department
   d) Advising – Giving accurate information about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, assistance with academic and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation committee service as well as advising student professional organizations.)
   e) Mentorship: Faculty demonstrates mentorship to students of a non-academic advising nature (i.e. life issues, transitions, career opportunities, referral source for student crises, etc.)
   f) Service to the profession: Editor of a peer-reviewed journal, or reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal. Serving on board or committees for organizations such as NCSWCLB, NASW, CSWE, SSWR, and/or organizations in the faculty member’s substantive content area.

2. Methods of evaluation – The faculty member’s listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations by students, etc.), and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix.
3. General Comments – Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity in various levels (department, college/school, university and external) and to be active and competent advisors to students. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. Service/engagement is typically considered to represent 20% of the workload, or about one day per week.

D. Collegiality

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

Evidence of collegiality will include:

a) Collaborative and active participation in committees, workgroups, and other mechanisms used to further the objectives of the department of social work as well as the college and the university
b) Demonstration of creative problem solving
c) Positive adaptation to change
d) Use of good judgment in dealing with others.
e) Following through on tasks and deadlines to further departmental objectives
f) Working to maintain positive relationships within the department, with the college, university, and the community
g) Communicating in a clear, respectful, positive, and non-judgmental manner with all constituents of the department, including other faculty and staff.
h) Showing respect, courtesy, and concern for colleagues and students.
i) Being accessible to colleagues, staff and students through office hours and maintaining a visible presence on campus

(Adapted in part from Hunter Library’s “Evaluative characteristics for accomplishments”)

2. Methods of Evaluation

Based on the evidence above, collegiality will be evaluated via the candidate’s AFE, TPR reviews and separate documents (should they be needed) attesting to strengths and weaknesses in this area.

3. General Comments

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

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
1. **Overview** – The Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) is the primary process for evaluating faculty member performance in teaching, service and scholarship. The AFE provides information for merit salary increases, feedback to faculty members about their annual and multi-year or cumulative performance, and documentation for tenure, promotion, reappointment, and post-tenure review.

2. **Review of AFE**: The Annual Faculty Evaluations are completed by the department head in collaboration with the candidate and reviewed by the Dean of the College of Health & Human Sciences.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:

   1) **Teaching**
      a) Self-evaluation addressing Pedagogical Content Knowledge (as outlined in II.A.1 above), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review
      b) Copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials
      c) Reports of direct observation of classroom teaching
      d) Student Assessments of Instruction (SAI) for the time period covered

   2) **Scholarship and Creative Activity** – List and description of scholarly or creative activity completed during the academic year categorized by presentations, publications peer-reviewed or other.

   3) **Service** – List of service activity completed during academic year, divided up by level of service (e.g. department, college, university, community, etc.)

   4) **Professional Development Activities** – List and description of professional development activities completed during the academic year

   5) **Collegiality**- Self-assessment of collegiality

   6) **Assessment of progress toward previous year's goals**

   7) **List of goals** for the next academic year

   b. **Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document** - Faculty will be asked to submit an electronic copy of documentation listed above at least 5 days prior to meeting with department head to discuss AFE.

   c. **Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track faculty/instructors (4.05 F)**
      - Department head will review the self-evaluation of pedagogical
content knowledge, student evaluations, committee evaluation of teaching materials, and peer review of classroom teaching of fixed-term and part-time instructors. Fulltime non tenure-track instructors will be evaluated using the guidelines listed in section IV below.

d. Evaluation of Director of Field Education

The student field practicum is an important part of social work education and the Council on Social Work Education mandates it for program accreditation. Faculty who have responsibilities for field education have duties that vary from the traditional teaching obligation. The work load reflects different assignments that should be taken into account when reappointment decisions are made. Therefore it is necessary to establish specific reappointment criteria in addition to those listed above.

Criteria for Evaluation of the Director of Field Education

- Agency visits are made in a timely manner, with additional meetings scheduled as needed.
- Meetings and workshops are organized appropriately; For example, participants are notified in a timely manner, rooms are reserved, refreshments are ordered, etc.
- Deadline dates for students and agencies are reasonable and appropriate.
- Students are informed and involved in the field placement process.
- There are few, if any, valid criticisms or complaints from agency officials about the Field Education Program.
- All field education materials are updated appropriately and distributed to agency officials and students.
- Correspondence and documentation of agency visits are organized and filed.

Sources of Data for Evaluating the Director of Field Education

- Student evaluations and comments
- Evaluations by field agency officials and supervisors
- Evaluation by the department head
- Evaluations by field liaisons
- Evaluations of training workshops by participants

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

1. Overview — Recommendations for type of appointment and rank are made by Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees, administrators at various levels, and finally, by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. Candidates who join the faculty with credit for time served elsewhere should include that credit when attending to the guidelines. A schedule of faculty personnel actions will be published and distributed at the beginning of each academic year.

2. Composition of Review Committees
a. The departmental review committee shall be constituted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the *WCU Faculty Handbook*. The departmental Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment committee shall consist of three tenured elected members and the Department Head as Chair. The elected representatives are chosen by the departmental faculty as a whole. If the department does not have three tenured members, the department head, in consultation with the dean, will nominate tenured faculty from other departments within the College or University to be elected or appointed to serve as a representative(s) for that department. Committee members may not be present when their own dossiers are being considered. When the department head is the person being considered by the committee, the department head shall be excused and the committee shall elect a pro tem chair (voting) from its membership. The pro tem chair shall submit the committee’s recommendation to the dean. Absentee ballots will not be allowed for TPR committee members.

b. The College of Health and Human Sciences Review Committee shall be composed of the Dean as the nonvoting Chair, and eight full-time faculty members. Half of the committee is elected by the college faculty and half is appointed by the Dean. Elected members must be tenured and shall be elected by the full time faculty of the College to staggered three-year terms; appointed members must be tenured and are appointed by the Dean for three year terms. All members shall be eligible for reelection or reappointment. Each department shall have one elected representative on the Committee.

The Associate Dean (s) and the Department Heads are not eligible to serve on this committee either as appointed or as elected members. The Committee shall review all candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion within the College following the procedures in the *WCU Faculty Handbook*. The committee shall make recommendations to the Dean on all candidates for tenure and promotion, and any reappointment candidate receiving a negative recommendation at the department level. The Committee will provide written feedback to the department head/school director and fourth year candidates on their progress towards meeting goals for successful tenure and the quality of their dossier. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Dean and two thirds of the membership will be required for a quorum. Absentee ballots will not be allowed for TPR committee members.

c. The University Review 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. The purpose of post tenure review (PTR) is to determine the extent to which tenured faculty members have exceeded, met, or not met the departmental criteria for teaching, service, and scholarly/creative contributions in the five years since the last TPR/PTR action.

2. Composition of review committee - The departmental advisory post tenure review committee shall be constituted in a manner consistent with the provisions of the WCU Faculty Handbook. The committee shall consist of three tenured elected members and the Department Head as Chair. The elected representatives are chosen by the departmental faculty as a whole. If the department does not have three tenured members, the committee will be constituted as in B2(a) above.

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 should generally follow the structure and format of both the TPR Dossier and the departmental AFE File described above in section III.A.3. Faculty should use a 1-inch 3-ring binder, with name and PTR on the cover.
      i. Prepare a brief (2-3 page) Self-evaluative statement highlight teaching, research, and service achievements over the past 5 years, since the most recent promotion or Post-Tenure Review.
      ii. Include the AFE document prepared by the faculty member for each of the past 4 years. (This is required by the Faculty Handbook.)
      iii. Finally, prepare a single set of appendices and include: The 4 most recent AFE Statements written by the department head, plus any rebuttals. SAIs should be provided for the past 3 years as well as ratings of the peer review of teaching materials.
   c) The committee shall present its written evaluation to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head shall add his/her review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.

Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review
IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the Department of Social Work

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on self evaluation of pedagogical content knowledge, teaching materials and observations according to their peer reviews and they should earn a mean score on SAIs of at least 3.0 overall the for at least 75% of the sections taught. Because the AFE takes place prior to the end of the spring semester, the SAIs from the preceding fall and spring semesters will be used. The cumulative record and progress toward tenure and promotion where applicable is included.

2. Scholarship - To be considered for reappointment, candidates on tenure track must complete a minimum of one unit, as described in IIB 2. The cumulative record and progress toward tenure and promotion is included. Special note: Faculty with fixed term appointments are exempt from this category unless otherwise noted in their contracts.

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

4. Collegiality - To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as described in Section II.D above.

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on self evaluation of pedagogical content knowledge, teaching materials and observations according to their peer and committee reviews and they should earn, on SAIs, a mean score of at least 3.0 on at least 75% of the sections taught. The cumulative record and progress toward tenure and promotion where applicable is included.

2. Scholarship - To be considered for reappointment, candidate must complete one unit, as described in II B 2. The cumulative record and progress toward tenure and promotion is included. Special note: For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that a scholarship agenda is being developed.

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

4. Collegiality - To be considered for reappointment the candidate must show evidence of collegiality as described in Section II.D above.

C. Tenure (4.07)
1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review: receive satisfactory overall rating on, teaching materials and observations according to the consensus of the committee and peer reviews; candidate’s self-assessment of pedagogical content knowledge should be satisfactory; candidate should earn a mean score on SAIs of at least 3.0 overall on at least 80% of the sections taught. The Annual Faculty Evaluations for the three years prior to tenure should reflect positive evaluation of teaching overall. The candidate must show evidence of high levels of achievement in teaching beyond those necessary for reappointment.

2. **Scholarship** - To be considered for tenure, the candidate must have completed a minimum of one unit for each of the years prior to tenure except for year 1, as noted above. In addition, the successful candidate will have a minimum of four publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) with two of them published as sole, first or second author. No more than two of these publications may be from the 10 months preceding the candidate’s application for tenure unless there are sufficient publications throughout the probationary period.

3. **Service** - The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels, including department, college, university, and external levels. By the time one is up for tenure, there should be at least some service activity at each internal level for the proceeding two years. In addition, the candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor. Advising will be evaluated annually by the advising evaluation distributed in spring to all students in the department of social work. The candidate must show evidence of high levels of achievement in service.

4. **Collegiality** - To be considered for tenure the candidate must show strong evidence of collegiality and a willingness to work collaboratively with others to help meet departmental goals. S/he will provide positive representation for the department in the college and university, and within the Social Work profession. Collegiality extends to interactions between faculty members, faculty and staff, faculty and students, and faculty and administrators. The candidate must show evidence of satisfactory achievement in collegiality.

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

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review: receive excellent overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the committee and peer reviews; candidate’s self evaluation of pedagogical content knowledge should be satisfactory; candidate should earn a mean score on SAIs of at least 3.0 on at least 80% of the sections taught; the Annual Faculty Evaluations for the three years prior to tenure should reflect positive evaluation of teaching overall.

2. **Scholarship** - To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must have completed a minimum of one unit for each of the years prior to tenure, except for year 1, as noted above. In addition, the successful candidate will have a minimum of four publications (e.g. peer reviewed articles, text books or book chapters) with two of them published as sole, first or second author. No more than two of these publications may be from the
10 months preceding the candidate’s application for promotion unless there are sufficient publications throughout the probationary period.

3. **Service** -- The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. By the time one is up for promotion to Associate Professor, there should be at least some service activity at each internal level for the preceding two years. In addition, the candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor.

4. **Collegiality** -- To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor the candidate must show strong evidence of collegiality and a willingness to work collaboratively with others to help meet departmental goals. S/he will provide positive representation for the department in the college and university, and within the Social Work profession. Collegiality extends to interactions between faculty members, faculty and staff, faculty and students, and faculty and administrators. The candidate must show evidence of satisfactory achievement in collegiality.

**F. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** -- In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review: receive satisfactory overall rating on teaching materials according to the consensus of committee and peer reviews; candidate’s self evaluation of pedagogical content knowledge should be satisfactory; candidate should earn, on SAI's, a mean score of at least 3.0 overall on at least 90% of the sections taught; The Annual Faculty Evaluations for the four years prior to the promotion application should reflect positive evaluation of teaching overall and the candidate should be able to illustrate a sustained record of superior teaching and instruction. In addition, the successful candidate will demonstrate leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching and/or research.

2. **Scholarship** -- To be considered for promotion to full professor, the candidate must have one and a half units for each of the four years prior to the promotion application. The successful candidate will have a superior and sustained record of substantial contributions to scholarship, as defined in the Boyer Model and as evidenced in at least three sole or first authored publications.

3. **Service** -- The faculty member is expected to participate in superior service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external). There should be at least some service activity at each internal level for the proceeding four years or substantial contribution toward administrative duties. In addition, the candidate should be an effective and proficient academic advisor.

4. **Collegiality** -- To be considered for promotion to Professor the candidate must show strong evidence of collegiality and a willingness to provide leadership in the department. S/he will provide positive representation for the department in the college and university, and within the Social Work profession. S/he will demonstrate the ability to work independently and enthusiastically toward meeting departmental, college, and university goals. Collegiality extends to interactions between faculty members, faculty and staff, faculty and students, and faculty and administrators.
G. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching—The Annual Faculty Evaluations for the four years prior to review should reflect positive evaluation of teaching overall. The faculty member should provide evidence that s/he is an effective teacher through the use of student, committee, peer, and self evaluation of pedagogical content knowledge. In addition, the faculty member will demonstrate leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching and/or research. Select student evaluations representing the past four years should be submitted.

2. Scholarship—Candidate should have a minimum of one unit for each of the four years prior to post-tenure review.

3. Service—The faculty member is expected to participate in service at various levels (department, college/school, university, and external). Primarily, service requires general expertise and is done as an act of good citizenship. Service at the department, college/school and university levels includes serving on committees (e.g., search committees, curriculum committees, and collegial review committees), recruiting students, mentoring new faculty members, and advising administrators. Service may also require special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership. Examples of such service include exercise of special technological, research or pedagogical skills, involvement with students in extracurricular activities, leadership in university governance, or taking on special administrative assignments (e.g., being department head, directing a graduate program, administering a grant obtained by the University).

4. Collegiality—The faculty member is expected to receive overall positive evaluations related to collegiality on their Annual Faculty Evaluations.

Approved by:

[Signatures]

Department Head

Date: 5-29-12

Dean

Date: 5/30/12

Provost

Date: 6-5-12
Appendix A

Alternative Peer Review of
Community-Engaged Scholarship Portfolio:

Process: The social work department head, in conjunction with the faculty candidate and Dean, will identify three portfolio reviewers. These peer reviewers must be external to WCU and not have a direct connection to the faculty candidate (e.g. no supervisors, former supervisors, co-authors, mentors, or former colleagues). The department head will solicit participation from each reviewer. When reviewers are unable to provide a timely review, the department head will consult with the candidate to identify additional reviewers. All reviewers must have substantive content expertise in the candidate’s research/engagement area.

Please Print

Portfolio written by: ________________________________

Portfolio reviewed by: ________________________________

Instructions:

Western Carolina University’s Department of Social Work emphasizes scholarly research that will have an impact on the community. You are being asked to assess this faculty member’s portfolio of community-engaged scholarship on the following criteria: A) Significance of the portfolio B) scholarship of the portfolio and C) the scholar’s reflective critique of the portfolio.

Please review the questionnaire before reading and evaluating the outreach portfolio.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to a great extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each question, circle the number that best represents your judgment. If there is inadequate information to make a judgment, circle NA.

At the end of each section, you are asked to provide explanatory comments for low ratings or superior performance. Since the purpose of this survey is to provide developmental feedback, please take time to provide this information. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>adequately</th>
<th>to a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Significance**

1. To what extent does the scholar identify issues which are important to the scholarly community, specific stakeholders, and the public?

2. To what extent will there be significant consequence or impact if the project’s goals are accomplished?

3. To what extent do the stakeholders agree that the goals and objectives are valuable?

   Overall, to what extent does this project demonstrate Significance?

   Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement:

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

**B. Scholarship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>adequately</th>
<th>to a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field?

2. To what extent is the project and its objectives well-defined?

3. To what extent are the objectives realistic and achievable?

4. To what extent is there innovation in the application of knowledge and methodologies?

5. To what extent was new knowledge generated?
6. To what extent is the knowledge generated by the project available for dissemination, utilization, and possible replication? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Overall, to what extent does this project exhibit Scholarship? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement:

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

C. Reflective Critique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>adequately</th>
<th>to a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent does the scholar critically evaluate his/her own work? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

2. To what extent does the scholar bring the appropriate breadth of evidence to his/her critique? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

3. To what extent does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Overall, to what extent does the scholar Reflectively Critique his/her work? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement:

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