I. **Overview** – The Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education seeks to attract and retain faculty who are engaging, collegial, productive and scholarly in all aspects of their professional career. Our first priority is excellence in teaching as acknowledged by our heavy teaching and advising load. We are a teacher education department and our teaching should exemplify our knowledge of pedagogy and our commitment to excellence in teaching.

Second, we must be scholarly in our teaching. In other words we should be current in the research of our discipline and engage in research and scholarship that informs our teaching and allows us to continue to hone our teaching skills. The department seeks to reach a level of synergy between our teaching, scholarship and service. In other words, these three components (while currently skewed toward teaching) should not be viewed as separate entities, but should be viewed as a rope that is woven together, with excellence in teaching as the shared outcome.

Certainly, we will differ with regard to specialty area within our discipline; and we will also vary in terms of the types of scholarship we emphasize, investment in service and engagement, and balance between research and practice. We should build to our strengths and honor our **differentiated practices** and our Collegial Review Document (CRD) should reflect our **differentiated strengths** while keeping in mind the notion that our teaching, our scholarship and our scholarly activities (service) are all connected and honored in this document. So while this process is complex, often abstract and difficult to quantify, we feel that it is important to provide faculty members with guidelines to help them develop productive and gratifying careers. The guidelines are intended to be practical, yet **flexible** enough to promote the individual differences that make our department a great place to live and work.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the **Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education**. The document is guided at the highest level by *The Code* of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some instances by the College of Education and Allied Professions. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures, the faculty member should have familiarity with *The Code* and with the **WCU Faculty Handbook** (section 4.0, see [http://www.wcu.edu/10372.asp](http://www.wcu.edu/10372.asp)). 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**, and the **EMGE Collegial Review Document Departmental Guidance** and the **Guidance for Faculty in Setting Annual Goals**.
The Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education offers degree programs for undergraduate and graduate students, including programs for elementary education, middle grades education and licensure in reading. The department resides in the fully accredited College of Education and Allied Professions. The department has fully embraced the Boyer model of scholarship as a means of supporting its commitment to the stewards of place model and integrated learning. As such, faculty members are expected to utilize the scholarship of engagement to enhance student learning and fulfill its mission to the region.

Graduates of our department are expected to meet the increasing demands of a highly diverse elementary and middle grades school population. Therefore, our department values colleagues with diverse backgrounds and experiences who can add to the level of preparation of our graduates to successfully teach in our rapidly changing society. It is our goal to prepare professionals who will contribute to the positive development of all persons, and to foster the development of effective schools for all children and youth.

In addition our faculty members highly value collaboration and diversity and are expected to teach general elementary and middle grades education as well as content methods courses (mathematics, language arts, science, literacy, etc.) at the K-8 grade levels. Each faculty member should be viewed as an individual with individual strengths that should be developed through differentiated expectations. As a department we expect our faculty members to develop and maintain an active research program in elementary/middle grades education or related field; have strong computer literacy knowledge, online teaching interests and/or experience and interest in learning new technology skills; advise undergraduate, and master's students; be responsible for providing local, state, and national service to the public schools and to the profession; be able to clearly articulate and implement a strong research agenda; and have specialty knowledge in student teacher internship supervision. However, the extent to which a faculty member chooses to emphasize one area over the other should be viewed in the cohesiveness of the department and how it supports department goals through a differentiated model.

Each academic year the faculty members in the Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education will submit their materials (described on page 20 of this document) for Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) to the Department Head no later than April 1st. The AFE will be used to provide faculty with annual evaluations of their performance, and provide detailed feedback on how the faculty member is progressing toward reappointment, promotion and tenure. Much like the Collegial Review Document (CRD) the AFE will focus on collegiality, teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition the AFE document will guide the department head in determining merit pay increases. The AFE materials will be evaluated annually by the department head except during the years that the faculty member submits their dossier to the collegial review committee.

In addition to submitting their materials for AFE, untenured tenure track faculty using the collegial review document will submit their dossier for review annually according to the CRD schedule provided by the provost. The CRD will be used to evaluate for reappointment, tenure and promotion purposes and submitted to the elected departmental *Collegial Review Committee*. On years that faculty members submit their dossiers for collegial review they will not be required to submit materials for AFE unless they would like to document progress toward goals which can be submitted as an addendum to the Collegial Review Dossier. Both the AFE and Collegial
Review materials will be evaluated using the following criteria and will be elaborated on throughout the remainder of this document.

II. Domains of Evaluation

Regardless of the Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education faculty members’ individual areas of responsibility, they should have and be able to demonstrate the following characteristics in the accomplishment of individual goals and responsibilities. These evaluative characteristics will be used as a guide in formulating comments for review during the AFE and the Collegial Review process in regard to the manner in which responsibilities of teaching, scholarship and service are executed. They may also be used as goals for a faculty member’s professional working relationships. Being a collegial member of the department is as valued as the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The following bulleted items will be considered during AFE and Collegial Review:

- **Collaborative and cooperative within the organization:** Works well with groups such as committees, colleagues, etc., and is an active participant. Makes connections and creates partnerships with others outside the department and the college (e.g. university faculty, the community and the education profession).
- **Committed to service:** Demonstrates a commitment to the service of students and colleagues and has a willingness to help others.
- **Creative:** Demonstrates creative problem solving and adapts well to change. Generates new ideas.
- **Demonstrates leadership abilities:** Uses good judgment in dealing with others. Follows through on tasks and meets deadlines. Deals effectively with administrative problems. Reacts quickly and appropriately to solve problems.
- **Effective communicator:** Communicates clearly and thoughtfully, listens actively, and adapts communication/presentation styles (both written and spoken) to particular audiences and students.
- **Forward thinking:** Recognizes one’s role within the “bigger process of making informed decisions.” Demonstrates good planning, defines goals (based on departmental and institutional mission, strategic plan, and core values), sets priorities, establishes a focus, and periodically evaluate goals.
- **Knowledge:** Demonstrates knowledge in one’s area of elementary and middle grades education. Shares expertise with both colleagues and students readily.
- **Respectful and concerned:** Shows respect, courtesy, and concern for both students and colleagues. Encourages and supports others. Aware of one’s own strengths and weaknesses. Faces problems with colleagues realistically.
- **Current with issues and trends:** Stays current with issues and trends in education developments, literature, and theories in the field of teaching and learning, as well as higher education in general.

In addition to collegiality faculty will also be evaluated using the following criteria:
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
As stated previously, teaching is highly valued in the department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education. Faculty members in the department have historically had a heavy teaching load. While we are moving toward a more differentiated work load policy that provides faculty members opportunities to focus on their strengths (i.e. teaching, research, service, advising, administrative duties, etc.) at the time this document is being developed, faculty have been on a 4/4 teaching load. Using this model it would be fair to state that faculty members have been concentrating their efforts on teaching and as a result the AFE and CRD should be aligned accordingly with teaching as the most significant aspect of their annual performance.

In relationship to teaching, faculty will demonstrate effective teaching, including instruction that connects their teaching with the scholarship of others in their field.
Through the Faculty Senate, the faculty at Western Carolina University has agreed upon a working definition of effective teaching that includes the following seven dimensions (Faculty Handbook, section 4.5, http://www.wcu.edu/10377.asp):

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 7 dimensions:
   a) **Content expertise** – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters. Content expertise includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.
   b) **Instructional delivery skills** – Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
   c) **Instructional design skills** – Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
   d) **Course management skills** – Effective teachers give timely feedback to students, make efficient use of class time, and handle classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately.
   e) **Evaluation of students** – Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
   f) **Faculty/student relationships** – Effective teachers display a positive attitude toward students, show concern for students by being approachable and available, present an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, sufficient support for student learning, and respect diversity.
   g) **Facilitation of student learning** – Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence
   a) **Self-evaluation** of teaching, addressing the 7 dimensions of effective teaching. (4.05B2C)
   b) **Peer review of teaching materials** – including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2b)
The Departmental Committee for Collegial Review will evaluate teaching materials for all instructional faculty going up for reappointment, tenure and promotion. These documents will be evaluated using the department’s protocol form. The department will elect faculty to the Collegial Review Committee. The committee will meet to review teaching materials (syllabi, assignments, etc.) and plan/schedule peer observations.

c) **Direct observation of instruction** using the departmental protocol (4.3.1.1). Tenure track faculty will follow the peer evaluation schedule (see attachment 1) and will be evaluated at least once each academic year up to the time of tenure and promotion. The untenured faculty member will observe another faculty member at least **3 times** prior to promotion and tenure. In addition to the observation of instruction, the faculty member will be observed a total of **7 times** prior to going up for promotion and tenure. The observations will be conducted by faculty members of choice, members of the collegial review committee, and the department head following the peer evaluation schedule. Feedback will be structured around the seven dimensions of teaching along with overall statements about the quality of work (needs improvement, meets expectations, exceeds expectations). In addition the tenure track faculty member will also document **3 professional development teaching activities** that they participated in prior to Promotion and Tenure.

d) **Student assessment of instruction**: All faculty members will include SAI’s using a form of the Senate approved 20 item university-wide SAI instrument for all sections of all courses that have an enrollment of 5 or more students (4.05B2A). Generally speaking, when faculty members are teaching courses with 5 or more students enrolled, we are looking for faculty members to earn an average score of 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught when the submission rate is greater than 60% of the course enrollment. On semesters when the return rate is fewer than 60% of the student enrollment the SAI instrument cannot be considered as providing reliable or valid data. Regardless of the return rate all data will be examined for each course taught.
e) **Table summary** – Sources of evidence related to teaching effectives and approved by the department are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>AFE</th>
<th>CRD</th>
<th>PTR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer review of teaching</strong> (based on direct observation and/or review of teaching materials)</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor's self-report and evaluation</strong> based on seven dimensions. Includes statement of teaching philosophy; description of goals, methods, and strategies used; with references to selected teaching materials and responses to input from students using SAI. Also includes professional development related to teaching.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samples of teaching materials</strong> (including syllabi, assignments, exams, learning modules, etc.) Provide samples rather than an exhaustive set of materials (e.g., one syllabus for each course taught during review period plus representative samples of other types of materials).</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Student Assessments of Instruction (SAIs)** Includes summary of data from the period of review.  
  - Faculty in EMGE will conduct SAIs in all sections of all courses.  
  - All quantitative SAI data will be included in AFE dossiers for courses with enrollment of 5 or greater.  
  - For CRD purposes, all SAI data will be summarized and provided in accordance with WCU requirements as specified in annual, written guidance from Office of the Provost. Faculty will provide responses to this data as noted above. | Required | Required | Required |
| **Teaching load reports** (list of sections of courses and their enrollments) | Required | Required | NA |
| **Teaching versatility** (diversity of) | Required | Required | NA |
### Other: Examples include
- *Narrative statement* with additional, objective evidence of effectiveness related to teaching (brief narrative summary describing the context of courses, the range of preparations, levels of courses, and other evidence such as student research; service learning projects; professional development related to teaching; formative course evaluation data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The three forms of evidence that contribute most to evaluation of teaching effectiveness are self-, peer, and student evaluations of teaching. Other sources of evidence are considered supplemental. Among the three primary sources of evidence, peer and self-evaluation bear equal weight. Given the limitations on validity of inferences that may be made from student course evaluations, SAIs are accorded less weight than self- and peer evaluations of teaching. However, when course enrollment has 5 or more students, faculty members should earn an average score of **3.0 on each of the 5** “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught when the submission rate is greater than 60% of the course enrollment. On semesters when the return rate is fewer than 60% of the student enrollment the SAI instrument cannot be considered as providing reliable or valid data. However, regardless of the return rate all SAI data will be examined by the Department Head.

3. **General comments** –
   a) **Professional Development** – The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution and also includes professional development activities used for the enhancement of teaching. Professional development activities designed to strengthen teaching expertise are positively valued and should be included in the self-evaluation of teaching.
B. (II.B.) Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four (4) types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.
   a) Scholarship of discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
   b) Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
   c) Scholarship of application – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
   d) Scholarship of teaching and learning – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review – Scholarship evidence is divided into works that show scholarly activity important to AFE documentation and external peer reviewed works acceptable for Tenure and Promotion. An activity that qualifies as scholarship, regardless of the type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) the activity is subjected to external peer review; (2) there is clear evidence of methodological rigor; (3) the activity results in substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and (4) the outcomes are disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community. These four criteria help to differentiate the scholarship of teaching and learning from teaching and the scholarship of application from service engagement.

Peer review can include traditional forms (e.g., journal reviews, conference proposal reviews, editors, committees awarding grants), but it can also include a broader community of external scholars (See Attachment 2 for guidelines for alternative external peer review). For example, it can include both blind and open reviews of items presented for publication or presentation, and it can include “substantial” invited addresses to conferences, text book chapters, themed issues, where the peers constitute members of program committee or body of editors.

**Broadening Scholarship:** The Boyer Model broadens the type of scholarship that can count toward promotion and tenure. Western Carolina University’s institutional policy recognizes four types: discovery, integration, application (sometimes called engagement) and teaching and learning. The departmental Collegial Review Document (CRD) defines discipline specific standards for each type of scholarship and may indicate a preference for a particular type. However, all forms of scholarship count toward promotion and tenure regardless of discipline.

**Scholarship of Discovery**

_The standards for reappointment:_ The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential that they will be met when the tenure decision is scheduled to be made.
The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Note: Standards marked with (*) are expected to be addressed by all tenure track faculty.

*1. Articulates a clearly defined scholarship agenda and focus through scholarship/research narrative
*2. Possesses expertise in methodologies appropriate to one's research agenda and focus as demonstrated through publications and presentations
*3. Possesses a record of conducting and reporting scholarship in one's field-or-historical/philosophical scholarship appropriate to one's field
4. Demonstrates knowledge about research design, data collection, data analysis, and reporting and interpreting results beyond one's own research methodologies through instruction and published scholarship
5. Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support research agenda through internal or external grants
6. Has recognition by others in the profession of the quality of one's research through external review of research dossier
7. Makes research contributions that reflect both collaboration and leadership over time. This can be evidenced by collaborative published pieces and lead authorship on selected publications
8. Has evolved as a scholar – sophistication and focus has progressed over time as demonstrated by the faculty member's vitae and the identification of their research strand
9. Engages in research that can be used to mentor and create opportunities for students and create scholarship opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students alike

The standards for promotion to Professor:

*10. Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field resulting in published collaborative scholarship
*11. Shows evidence that scholarly agenda has matured over time as evidenced in vitae and scholarship narrative
*12. Possesses a sustained record of conducting and reporting research/scholarship in one's field
13. Has had success in obtaining funding to support one's scholarship agenda
14. Possesses national recognition of the quality of one's scholarship through external review of research dossier
15. Demonstrates leadership and mentoring in scholarship at the national level, e.g., review panels, keynote presentations, membership on research panels, editorial review boards
16. Serves as editor or co-editor of a scholarly publication
17. Has membership on editorial boards of scholarly publications
18. Demonstrates leadership of research teams

*Potential evidence for a faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with the above standards:

- *A description of one's scholarship agenda
- *Selected products of one's scholarship, e.g., juried presentations at professional conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters, monographs, technical reports, invited presentations, instructional/curricular materials, modules, tests, equipment, inventions, and conference proceedings
- Publication list of manuscripts, research proposals, and other products of scholarship submitted for publication, funding, or dissemination
- Citations by others of your research and scholarship
- A summary of requests for reprints of publications
- Invitations to review the research and scholarship of others
- Receipt of competitive grants or contracts for research from external and internal funding sources (including an assessment of the competition)
- Reports of research in progress
- Awards and other recognition for the quality of research (including the text of those awards)
- Description of mentoring activities
- Support letters from members of research team (full professors)
- Presentation of topical scholarship through consultation or presentation to another educational institution
- Other scholarly work that has or can be presented through consultation or presentation through publicly observable forms, such as: Submission of a grant application (funded or unfunded) Editorship of scholarly publication Published conference proceedings Works in progress (e.g., manuscript drafts) Evidence of external peer review of unpublished scholarly work

**Scholarship of Integration**

*The standards for reappointment:* The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential that they will be met when the tenure decision is scheduled to be made.

*The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:*

**Note:** Standards marked with (*) are expected to be addressed by everyone.

*1. Has currency in the knowledge base that undergirds one's field of inquiry as demonstrated in publications and presentations*
*2. Possesses recognition by other faculty members of the quality of one's synthesis and integration of knowledge evidenced by the Collegial Review Committee
3. Disseminates knowledge and research at multiple levels, e.g., local, state, national, and international conferences as evidenced in vitae
4. Translates research into practitioner oriented materials as evidenced by selected publications
5. Produces evaluation [final] reports for funded projects
6. Develops new guidelines for research and practice through literature reviews and publications

The standards for promotion to Professor:

*7. Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to integrate knowledge in their field resulting in published collaborative scholarship with untenured peers
*8. Conducts comprehensive reviews of the knowledge base in one's field, identification of critical themes, and recommendations for extending that knowledge base as evidenced in vitae and research/scholarship narrative
9. Generates new theories and models grounded on the knowledge base in one's field demonstrated in selected presentations and publications
10. Possesses distinction in the quality of one's synthesis and integration of knowledge through external review of research dossier
11. Has a sustained record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels, e.g., local, state, national, and international conferences evidenced in vitae
12. Mentors graduate students in synthesizing literature knowledge bases evidenced by serving on research committees, presentations and publications with both undergraduate and graduate students
13. Mentors graduate students (undergraduate and masters) in presenting research at conferences

Potential evidence for a faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with the above standards:

*Selected products of one's synthesis and integration of knowledge, e.g., juried presentations at professional conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters, monographs, technical reports, invited presentations, instructional/curricular materials, modules, tests, equipment, inventions, and conference proceedings
*Bibliographical list of the synthesis and integration of knowledge, e.g., juried presentations at professional conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters, monographs, technical reports, invited presentations, instructional/curricular materials, modules, tests, equipment, inventions, and conference proceedings
Citations by others of one's synthesis and integration of knowledge
External evaluations and reviews of your work
Invitations to review the research and scholarship of others
Receipt of competitive grants or contracts to synthesize and integrate
knowledge (including an assessment of the competition)
Reports of work in progress designed to synthesize and integrate the
knowledge in your field
Awards and other recognition for the quality of the synthesis and
integration of knowledge (including the text of these awards)
Description of mentoring activities

Scholarly Activity vs. Scholarship: There is an important distinction between scholarly activity and scholarship. A scholarly activity is an action that has not been vetted to determine its value. Consider this example. A faculty member writes a review on the effects of global warming (integration). When she is finished, she sets the article on her bookshelf and lets it stay there. Is this a scholarly act? Yes. Is it scholarship that will count toward promotion/tenure? No. Why? It hasn’t been evaluated by discipline experts who can attest to the validity of the methodology or its scholarlyness. Let’s take another example. An engineering faculty member conducts a process redesign (application) for a major corporation. He prepares the specifications for change and collects data to evaluate the design. Is this scholarly activity? Sure. Is it scholarship that will count toward promotion and tenure? Not yet. The evaluation component is missing. (Memo from Provost, 2008)

Given Boyer’s model, it is possible that some examples of activities currently listed under service may be characterized as scholarship, especially if they are related to the faculty member’s scholarly agenda. For example, a faculty member may engage in a service activity with an educational agency, but develop a scholarly product based on that work. Each faculty member should identify the most appropriate category (scholarship or service) for the activity and explain in the appropriate AFE, CRD, or PTR narrative the rationale for characterizing activities as scholarly when they are listed as examples of service in this Departmental Collegial Review Document (CRD).

Scholarship of Application
Information about the Scholarship of Application
The scholarship of application can be described as the use of knowledge and research to solve problems. The problems of engagement, motivation and effective instruction at all levels can be examples of the focus of the scholarship of application.

Elements of Scholarship of Application

- Service, in a variety of forms, is a requirement of faculty in most universities including Western Carolina University and the Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education. The scholarship of application looks at service from the perspective of engagement noting that information is often first discovered...then applied through the act of service. Faculty members who focus on the scholarship of application often engage in the following question:
“How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?”
When answering this question theory, research and practice come together, and the engagement becomes scholarly.

- In one form, the scholarship of application seeks to discover how the university may assist with the problems being experienced by its constituencies.

_Evaluating the Scholarship of Application_

The evaluation of scholarship must be characterized by:
- Clear goals with definable objectives
- Adequate preparation with a clear understanding of the research in the field
- Appropriate methods that are wisely used to support the effort.
- Important results obtained.
- External peer review
- Effective dissemination of results. The effort is communicated in suitable forums.
- Reflective critique and evaluation of one’s own scholarship.

_Summary of the Scholarship of Application_

- In application scholarship, EMGE faculty members build bridges and collaborative relationships with their constituencies in order to apply theory and research to solve significant everyday problems. This process involves dynamic engagement and the translation of new knowledge in practical interventions that solve problems or improve the difficulties experienced by, such as, a school.
- EMGE faculty members engaged in applied scholarship seek to understand how knowledge can be responsibly and ethically applied to important problems, for example, the high school drop out rate in many of the counties in our region.
- Evaluating the scholarship of application is predicated upon identifying examples of applied scholarly activities and developing comprehensive reporting methods. There must be a direct correlation between the intellectual work of the scholar and the applied work, such as consultation, evaluation and analysis.
- Reporting applied scholarship should include the evaluation by the scholar, and by the recipients of the service, such as decision and policy-makers and organization personnel. Those assessing applied scholarship should ask whether the activity is directly related to the academic expertise of the scholar and whether project goals have been defined, whether procedures have been well planned and whether actions have been carefully recorded.
• Evaluation should include how the project has not only benefited the recipients, but also added to the faculty member's own understanding of their own professional expertise.

• Work with constituencies will only be defined as scholarship when there is clear evidence of links with current research findings and discipline specific knowledge, when the products are externally peer reviewed and are available for public scrutiny, use, evaluation.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Information about the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Advancing learning theory through the application of classroom research and mentoring teacher candidates in focusing on instructional practices that impact teaching and learning are examples of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Elements of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

• As stated throughout this document, teaching is the core of what we do in the Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education. The scholarship of teaching and learning looks at the art of teaching and learning from a practitioner viewpoint and shares a line of scholarship that focuses on best practice and influences the field of teaching though thoughtful discourse and reflection on teaching and learning. Faculty members who focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning often engage in the following question: "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to teaching and learning?" When answering this question theory, research and practice come together, to provide the answer.

• In one form, the scholarship of teaching and learning seeks to discover how the university may assist with the problems being experienced by its teacher candidates and the education field at large.

Evaluating the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The evaluation of scholarship must be characterized by:
• Clear goals which lead to improved instruction
• Adequate review of the literature and research on teaching and learning with a clear understanding of the current research in the field
• Strongly articulated implications for improved instruction that leads to increased student learning.
• Important results obtained.
• External peer review
• Effective dissemination of results and findings. The effort is communicated in suitable forums.
Reflective critique and evaluation of one's own conclusions and discussion.

Summary of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- In teaching and learning scholarship, EMGE faculty members build bridges and collaborative relationships with their teacher candidates and practicing teachers in order to apply theory and research to improve teaching and learning. This process involves dynamic engagement and the translation of new knowledge in practical interventions that lead to improved professional development initiatives aimed at solving problems or improving the quality of instruction.
- EMGE faculty members engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning seek to understand how knowledge can be responsibly and ethically applied to enhance instruction and the overall quality of learning.
- Evaluating the scholarship of teaching and learning is predicated upon identifying examples of current instructional methodologies and instructional strategies used to improve learning. There must be a direct correlation between the intellectual work of the scholar and the impact on the art of teaching and learning.
- Reporting scholarship on teaching and learning should show a clear relationship between teaching and learning.
- Evaluation should include how the research has benefited or has the potential to benefit the field of education.
- Work with constituencies will only be defined as scholarship when there is clear evidence of links with current research findings and discipline specific knowledge, when the products are externally peer reviewed and are available for public scrutiny, use, evaluation.

3. General comments –
   a) These examples provided throughout this description of scholarship are not exhaustive; rather they are just examples of the possible range of scholarship. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this department. The department recognizes that infrequently a candidate may present creative scholarship that is unique and does not fit well with these categories or activities yet are still legitimate scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary nature, utilizing an alternative external peer review process. The candidate may request prior review of the proposed project in order to get feedback from the Collegial Review Advisory Committee. If the candidate chooses to submit a project he or she should inform the Department Head and provide a list of five potential external reviewers by the beginning of the fall semester. The Department Head in consultation with the Dean will select two reviewers, at least one of which will be from
the candidate's list. Reviewers should have demonstrated expertise in the relevant specialty area, hold the doctoral degree, and be employed in an accredited college or university. The Department Head will send to the reviewers the candidate’s project, a copy of the departmental CRD to provide context, and an evaluation protocol to guide the review. Each external reviewer will review the project and complete the protocol. The candidate will be provided copies of both review protocols to include in the dossier (See attachment 2).

b) Grant proposals and awards — Grant proposals and awards are recognized as scholarly products that count toward expectations related to each personnel action described in Section IV. Pursuit of grants is the prerogative of the faculty member and should be reflected in his or her annual goals.

c) Professional development — Professional development activities designed to strengthen methodological expertise are positively valued and may be described in self-evaluative statements for AFE, Collegial Review, and PTR purposes. However, participation in professional development in this area does not count as evidence of a scholarly product according to departmental expectations unless the results of the professional development activity result in publication, or have been externally reviewed.

Alternative External Peer Review: The Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education recognizes that many faculty members will continue to vet their scholarly activity through traditional means like publications. However, the Boyer Model will allow faculty to engage in other forms of scholarship that may not lend themselves to traditional forms of evaluation. That is why our institutional policy provides for an alternative external review process. When faculty members engage in this type of scholarly activity, they need to submit their work in a form that can be evaluated by disciplinary experts, practitioners or both. Who the external evaluator(s) is depends upon the nature of the problem. However, evaluators must be external to the campus and must have the capacity to assign value to the project and attest to its scholarliness. The Chancellor and Provost have made it clear that they make no distinction about the relative value of the types of scholarship or the methods of evaluation, thus concluding that each department should develop their own criteria for evaluating scholarship (See Attachment 2).

Evaluating Scholarship

For promotion and tenure, the department expects that each faculty member from the time of their initial appointment generates at least **four (4)** units as described below with at least **three (3)** of the units coming from Category A. If the faculty member has previous years accepted as counting toward promotion and tenure during the initial hiring stage, then those years should also be counted toward promotion and tenure and it is up to the faculty member to indicate this.
Scholarship in the Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of a "unit" of work, which generally reflects the expectation of most faculty members for a normal academic year. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the Collegial Review Advisory Committee. Some scholarly activities are of such high value that they will be recognized as achieving two units, most activities will equate to one unit, and some activities will equate to a half unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be achieved. It is also important to recognize that units may accumulate over time. For example there may be academic years in which the faculty member does not reach the unit goal based upon the cycle of the review process, but over time will accumulate the four units expected for tenure and promotion. While annually the faculty member will be evaluated through the AFE schedule and annual performance may not meet or exceed the expectations of the department, their accomplishment toward reaching units at the 2 year, 4 year and 6 year mark will demonstrate their scholarship accomplishments over the course of time and may meet or exceed expectations at those points.

**Categories for Units:**

**Category A**

**Two Units** —

- Authorship of an article in a journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline. It is up to the faculty member to document the high status of the journal. Without this documentation it will be considered as a one unit publication. The publication does not have to be sole authorship but should be primary author to receive 2 units, otherwise it will be categorized as 1 unit.
- Editorship of an edited book, or a themed issue of a widely recognized journal. It is up to the faculty member to document the high status of the journal. The publication does not have to be sole editor but should be primary editor to receive 2 units, otherwise it will be categorized as 1 unit.

**One Unit** —

- Authorship of a peer-reviewed journal article (Does not have to be sole authorship or first author. However for promotion and tenure the faculty member should have at least one peer reviewed publication where they are the lead author).
- A chapter in an edited book
- A patent
- Authorship of subsequent editions of a scholarly book
- A substantial technical report for a program evaluation project (e.g., for accreditation) if subjected to formal external peer review as previously described under alternative peer review.
- Additional alternative faculty projects that have been externally reviewed using the alternative peer review process.
• Invited publications in a peer reviewed journal

Category B
One Unit -
• An invited address at an International or National conference
• A successful external grant proposal
• Serving as an editor or associate editor of a peer reviewed journal

One-half-Unit –
• A scholarly book review
• Presentation at a professional conference (Indicate International/National, Regional, State)
• A successful internal research grant proposal
• An unsuccessful substantial external grant proposal
• An invited address at a state or regional conference
• A published article in a non-peer review journal/or other professional outlet
C. Service

4. Types of service:

a) **Institutional service** – committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as department head, a major role in faculty governance, etc. at all levels, including department, college/school, and university. 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 the expectation at the department level is that during years 1-3 the faculty member’s responsibility for service to the institution should be primarily at the department level, during year 4 pick up some college service responsibilities and in the two years prior to going up for tenure begin to provide additional service to the university as a whole. Advisee training is recommended. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level, with an emerging pattern of focus on at least one area of service/engagement.

b) **Community engagement** – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level.

c) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership to the profession at large** - includes service in professional organizations, conference proposal reviewer, journal reviewer, chair of conference presentations and institutes, administrative roles in interest groups.

d) **Advising** – being informed 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.)

According to the Faculty Handbook: 5.17 Principles of Advisement, item #3 Advisement is part of the normal professional load for faculty at Western, and adequate time should be set aside for quality advisement. A reasonable full-time faculty advising load is between 20 and 33/1 (Advisor Load, N.D.; Habley, 2002). When evaluating faculty as part of the Annual Faculty Evaluation and when considering promotion, tenure and merit pay, department heads should consider both the quantity of advisees per faculty member and the quality of advising. **Faculty with unusually heavy advising loads, greater than 33/1 should be given special consideration, compensation or course release time to ensure the quality of advising.**

e) **Other** – The following are examples of service in each of the three categories. These examples are meant to help faculty establish annual goals and meet their AFE and Tenure and Promotion requirements. They are in no way meant to be seen as mandates or restrictions on service work.

1) **INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE (Viewed as Professional Responsibilities):**
• Program Coordination
• Department Head
• Service on department, college, university, or system committees and task forces
• Other governance or program administration responsibilities, including ad-hoc work at the department, college, university, or system level
• Delivering staff/faculty in-service
• Liaison to other departments, colleges, universities, school systems
• Student organization advisement
• Membership (non-chair) on dissertation and thesis committees
• Assistance to faculty/students based on disciplinary expertise
• Other service as defined in the approved annual goals

2) COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (Viewed as Outreach):
• Speeches, workshops, and invited presentations for schools/communities
• Newspaper editorials, interviews
• School/community/government boards, committees, or offices
• Sponsored services
• Consulting or teaching in the broader global community
• Other service as defined in the approved annual goals

3) SPECIAL EXPERTISE (Participation in organizations related to the discipline):
• Professional society memberships and offices
• Reviewer for professional conferences
• Conference or society committees
• Journal editorships and reviews
• Textbook review
• Speeches, workshops, and invited presentations at professional meetings (non-refereed talks, non-refereed papers)
• Guest lecture
• Other service as defined in the approved annual goals

5. 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 supportive commitment, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations (See Attachment 3) by students, etc.), and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix. Advising will be evaluated by the department’s submission of an advising survey to representative classes taught by the department as selected by the CRD committee. As soon as feasible, the department will make this survey available online and invite all declared majors to complete it.
6. General comments --

A) Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college/school, university) 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. For a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, service/engagement is typically considered to represent 20% of the workload, or about one day per week. Professional development activities designed to strengthen a faculty member's capacity to provide service to the institution, community or discipline are positively valued by the department and may be described in self evaluative statements for AFE, Collegial Review for Tenure and Promotion, and PTR purposes; they should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

B) All faculty members will accept professional responsibilities with the department, college, or university. Faculty members are encouraged to perform outreach to the community and to participate in organizations related to the discipline. Outreach should have a beneficial impact attributable to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge to real-world problems, issues or concerns addressed by the outreach contribution. Participation in organizations related to the discipline includes involvement in and service to regional, state, national, or international professional associations, and organizations. Service activities must fulfill the mission of the university through utilization of faculty members' academic and professional expertise. Service is expected to increase with years of employment.
III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

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

1. **Overview** – An evaluation of all teaching faculty, regardless of rank or participation in other review processes, is required annually in order to monitor teaching effectiveness. The Deans and Provost determine deadlines for completion of the review process.

2. **Composition of review committee** – The Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by the Department Head in consultation with CRD Advisory committee rather than by the committee. The departmental CRD Advisory Committee, elected annually, comprises of 3 tenured faculty members with the Department Head as non-voting chair. The committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending changes to the departmental CRD as needed. (described in III.B.2)

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   
a. **All full-time faculty members** must prepare an AFE document that includes (1) their AFE document and (2) a set of appendices with supporting documentation and artifacts as needed. This should be submitted in a 1-inch 3 ring binder, **and the AFE document should also be submitted electronically to the Department Head**. Include your name on the outside of the binder on a cover sheet, with AFE and year. In general, this file follows the structure of the TPR dossier but is limited to a single year rather than a cumulative record. The AFE document prepared by the faculty member should follow this outline:

   1) **Self evaluative statement** – One page maximum. Use this opportunity to describe the highlights of your year, focusing on collegiality, teaching, scholarship and service.

   2) **Teaching** – briefly address accomplishments of teaching by synthesizing the seven teaching dimensions of effective teaching in a 1 page narrative titled Instructor’s self-report and evaluation of teaching (as outlined in Section II.A.2a. above table beginning on page 5). In addition include Teaching Load Report and Teaching Versatility Report by listing all courses taught (differentiated by graduate and undergraduate) for the current academic year, including the preceding summer, along with enrollment. Include Student Assessment of Instruction (quantitative data only). Professional development artifacts may optionally be included in Appendix I.

   3) **Scholarship and Creative Activity** – supporting documents **(not required of fixed term faculty unless part of hiring requirements)**

      a) Articulates a clearly defined scholarship agenda and focus

      b) List scholarly activity completed during the academic year (previous 12 months from time of submission of file). 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 previously listed and how. (research proposals, and other products...
of scholarship submitted for publication, funding, or dissemination. Attempt to identify the unit qualification for each piece (See Attachment 3 to assist with Unit classification).
c) Department Head may request to see selected products of one's scholarship, e.g., juried presentations at professional conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters, monographs, technical reports, invited presentations, instructional/curricular materials, modules, tests, equipment, inventions, and conference proceedings. However it is optional for the faculty to include these artifacts in the preparation of their AFE report.
d) Faculty members may optionally include in Appendix G any reprints, conference submissions, compressed formats of posters, etc., to document scholarly activity.

4) Service – supporting documents. List service to the department, college, university, and external activities to the community and the profession at large. In addition include the number of undergraduate and graduate advisees and your work with student organizations etc. Document as appropriate in Appendix H.

5) Other pertinent information – Approved goals, preliminary goals for upcoming academic year; and other college and university documents as required (e.g., p-12 involvement survey, annual report of faculty activities, peer observations of teaching)

Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document - AFE files should contain evidence related to the faculty member's collegiality and activities in teaching, scholarship, and service since the previous year's AFE. The document should follow this framework:
2. Annual self evaluation, documentation and reflections on Teaching
3. Annual self evaluation, documentation and reflections on Scholarship
4. Annual self evaluation, documentation and reflections on Service.

Use the same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR Dossier, but to a more limited degree as follows:
1. Appendix A: (Not Used)
2. Appendix B: Current Curriculum vita highlighting annual progress
3. Appendix C: (Not Used)
4. Appendix D: Optional for AFE: Peer review of teaching. Include the written feedback from the departmental review of teaching materials. If direct observation of teaching was conducted, you may optionally include the feedback and comments from the observers. These observations should be for the current academic year.
5. Appendix E: SAI data. Because spring data will 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 quantitative data for each section including percentages of return
rate. DO NOT include narrative responses to open-ended questions in this appendix. If you choose to include such qualitative data to support self-evaluative statements, include it in Appendix I, taking care to avoid excessive bulk.

6. Appendix F: For AFE this is **optional**. Samples of teaching materials from the current year, including syllabi, tests, exams, projects, assignments and so forth. Avoid excessive bulk.

7. Appendix G: For AFE this is **optional**, but may be requested by the Department Head. Samples of scholarly products, including reprints, letters of acceptance, brief manuscripts or abstracts, or technical reports. Take care not to include the same products multiple years.

8. Appendix H: Documentation of service for the most recent 12 months. Include representative materials to document service/engagement activities.

9. Appendix I: **Optional**. Any other documentation you wish to provide including P-12 involvement survey.

**Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05 F) -**  
**Evaluation of adjunct teaching faculty**  
The department head will evaluate part-time faculty annually in accordance with guidelines in the WCU faculty handbook. Adjunct faculty will be told in writing at the time of their appointment how their work will be evaluated. All adjunct faculty members will conduct student assessments of instruction (SAIs) in all courses each semester. Adjunct teaching faculty will be evaluated once per year based on the following sources of data:

- Student assessments of instruction
- Syllabi and course materials

Once within the first two years of initial hire, the adjunct instructor will also be assigned a tenured or tenure-track faculty member who will be responsible for providing a written review of the instructor's teaching based on a review of teaching materials and direct observation. The department head may require additional peer reviews of teaching beyond the minimum, especially if the instructor teaches new courses or if past evaluations yielded areas of significant concern.

**Evaluation of model clinical faculty**  
Model clinical faculty will be treated as adjunct faculty in accordance with guidelines in the WCU faculty handbook. Model clinical faculty will be evaluated by **the instructor of record** once per year based on the following sources of data:

- Items from student assessments of instruction specific to model clinical faculty member
- Written evaluation from course instructor
Evaluation of student teacher/intern supervisors
Supervisors of student teachers and interns will be treated as adjunct faculty in accordance with guidelines in the WCU faculty handbook. Supervisors will be evaluated by the department head once per year based on the following sources of data:
- Written evaluation from cooperating teacher(s)

B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)
1. Overview - The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for promotion, tenure and reappointment.
2. Composition of review committee (4.07) - The departmental Collegial Review Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and shall be composed of three tenured faculty members elected annually by the department’s full-time faculty. In the event that we have fewer than three tenured faculty, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, providing that the resultant committee shall consist of at least three members. In the event that there are fewer than three tenured faculty, the Provost, in consultation with the department and dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three tenured faculty.
3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – As noted above, the candidate list is prepared by the Office of the Provost for each college and distributed to the Deans for review. The Office of the Provost finalizes the list in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)
1. Overview - These guidelines are based upon section 4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event (other than AFE).
2. Composition of review committee - The departmental PTR Advisory Committee shall consist of the same members as the Collegial Review Advisory Committee, excluding the department head and any faculty members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review during the current academic year. The committee shall be composed of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty eligible to serve on the PTR Advisory Committee, the Provost, in consultation with the department and dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
3. Procedures and preparation of documentation - The PTR file consists of an introductory statement and the faculty member's five most recent AFE files, including the four most recent years and the current year. The
PTR file replaces the AFE file in the year of review. The introductory statement by the faculty member, not to exceed two, double-spaced pages, should include an explanation of the file contents, an overview of productivity over the last five years (or since the most recent review), and an explanation of quality and impact of service. The remaining contents of the PTR file should include the contents of Section 1 of AFE files. The faculty member should also include the AFE document prepared for the past 4 years prior to going up for post-tenure review. (This is required by the Faculty Handbook).

4. The committee shall meet to discuss each case and shall present its written evaluation to the department head, including a recommendation of “Satisfactory” or “Not Satisfactory.” 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 or her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.

5. See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. Expectations and Criteria – The criteria specific to each form of review and each type of promotion are described in detail below.

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation: (4.05)

1. Collegiality – To meet expectations in collegiality, the faculty member should: document their ability to collaborate with others, commitment to service, creative problem solving, leadership ability, effectiveness at communicating with others, progressive thinking and respect for other members of the department.

2. Teaching – To meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should: submit their self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions in a satisfactory manner. Generally speaking, when faculty members are teaching courses with 5 or more students enrolled, we are looking for faculty members to earn an average score of 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught when the submission rate is greater than 60% of the course enrollment. On semesters when the return rate is fewer than 60% of the student enrollment the SAI instrument cannot be considered as providing reliable or valid data. Regardless of the return rate all SAI data will be examined by the Department Head or the Collegial Review Committee (See appendix A for the protocol.)

3. Scholarship – One unit as previously described (See Attachment 3).

4. Service – The tenure-track or tenured faculty member is expected to participate in institutional service at all levels (department, college/school, university, profession at large and community). They should exhibit exceptional performance in at least one category, which may be internal service or engagement with external constituencies. The time and energy commitment should approximate 20% of the total workload. Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract which includes teaching and service. The expectation on service to the institution is that during years 1-3 the faculty member’s responsibility for service to the institution should be primarily at the department level, during year 4 pick up some college service responsibilities and in the two years prior to going up for tenure begin to provide additional service to the university as a whole. Department Heads should meet regularly with untenured faculty to discuss their service load and expectations.

5. General comments – In general, for most faculty members, teaching counts approximately 60%, scholarship 20% and service 20%. As more tenure track faculty members are hired and faculty workloads become differentiated this percentage will change. Our goal, in general, for most faculty members would be a model where teaching counts as 50%, scholarship 35% and service 15%, but currently we are not there yet. Some roles, such as Department Head require a different balance, and this may also be true in other special
cases. Part-time and fixed-term faculty members are in most cases evaluated entirely on teaching. It is possible in some cases that individual part-time or fixed-term faculty members have contracts stipulating expectations other than teaching, and they should be evaluated accordingly. Copies of their contractual agreement should be included in their evaluation file.

B. Reappointment: (4.06)

As previously noted faculty members submitting material for reappointment are exempt from AFE reports that year. However, the faculty member may submit an addendum to document performance occurring post submission of reappointment documents.

1. Teaching – To meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the Collegial Review Committee and annual AFE reports; and satisfactory self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions; and satisfactory ratings on the SAI. Generally speaking, when faculty members are teaching courses with 5 or more students enrolled, we are looking for faculty members to earn an average score of 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught when the submission rate is greater than 60% of the course enrollment. On semesters when the return rate is fewer than 60% of the student enrollment the SAI cannot be considered as providing reliable or valid data. However, regardless of the return rate that SAI data will still be examined by the Collegial Review Committee. Additionally, faculty members should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching from at least three of the seven of the scheduled peer observations by the time they go up for tenure and promotion.

2. Scholarship – One unit, as described above. Special note: while faculty may not achieve a unit during each annual evaluation during the reappointment process the faculty member has the opportunity to demonstrate scholarship over time. At the time of reappointment the faculty member should demonstrate progress toward reaching 4 units and will receive feedback on the attainment of that goal.

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 the expectation at the department level is that during years 1-3 the faculty member’s responsibility for service to the institution should be primarily at the department level, during year 4 pick up some college service responsibilities and in the two years prior to going up for tenure begin to provide additional service to the university as a whole. Advisee training is recommended. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level, with an emerging pattern of focus on at least one area of service/engagement.
4. **General comments** – As a conceptual guide to this evaluation, currently, teaching counts approximately 60%, and scholarship and service 20% each. As more tenure track faculty members are hired and faculty workloads become differentiated this percentage will change. Our goal, in general, for most faculty members would be a model where teaching counts as 50%, scholarship 35% and service 15%, but currently we are not there yet. Teaching should be at an acceptable level of performance by the end of the 2nd year. Note gradually increased expectations for scholarship and service described above (and below, regarding tenure). Collegiality will also be considered during the time of each reappointment period.

C. **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (The expectations are the same.)**

(4.07)

Overall, faculty must demonstrate high levels of achievement in teaching, scholarship and service as well as demonstrate collegiality over time.

1. **Teaching** – Overall, candidates must demonstrate teaching that is effective and scholarly. To meet these expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the Collegial Review Committee; satisfactory self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions of effective teaching; and satisfactory ratings (3.0 or greater) on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught when the submission rate is greater than 60% of the course enrollment and the number of students enrolled in the course are 5 or greater. On semesters when the return rate is fewer than 60% of the student enrollment the SAI instrument cannot be considered reliable or valid data. Regardless of the return rate faculty members need to submit their SAI data to be examined by the Collegial Review Committee. Additionally, they should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching, from at least three of the seven scheduled peer observations. Candidates for early tenure must demonstrate exemplary performance.

2. **Scholarship** – Candidates must demonstrate expected activity appropriate to one or more types of the Boyer model. To meet expectations in scholarship, the faculty member must acquire a minimum of 4 units. At least 3 units must be from category A under the section evaluating scholarship. By the time a faculty member goes up for tenure and promotion they should be the primary author on at least one publication from Category A (See page 17 and Attachment 3).

3. **Service** – By the time of tenure application, the faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level with an increasing degree of external engagement to the region. In regard to institutional service faculty should use the following model to guide their service. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load. Advisee training is recommended. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level, with an emerging pattern of focus on at least one area of service/engagement. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor. Professional development in areas of service and engagement, including advisement, are valued, and should be documented appropriately.
4. **General comments** – As a conceptual guide to this evaluation, teaching currently counts approximately 60%, and scholarship and service 20% each. As more tenure track faculty members are hired and faculty workloads become differentiated this percentage will change. Our goal, in general, for most faculty members would be a model where teaching counts as 50%, scholarship 35% and service 15%, but currently we are not there yet. Faculty with exemplary performance and endorsement of their department head and dean may apply for early consideration of tenure. Faculty who fail in the application for early tenure may reapply during the standard probationary period.

**D. Promotion to Associate Professor (see Section C. The expectations are the same.) (4.07)**

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

Overall, candidates must demonstrate superior teaching, scholarship and service.

1. **Teaching** – To meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive exceeds expectations on the overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the Collegial Review Committee; critically reflective self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions; and exceed department expectation ratings (3.0 or greater) on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught. Additionally, they should receive a high overall rating on direct observation of teaching, if used, from at least one of the observers.

2. **Scholarship** – To meet expectations in scholarship, the faculty member should present the following documentation:
   - Invited blind letters of review from colleagues at other institutions (addressed to Department Head or Dean)
   - **A minimum of 5 Units** subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor with significant presence of first authorship from some combination of the four levels of the Boyer model: journal articles, published proceedings at a conference, books, book chapters, and other examples of Boyer scholarship. At least 4 of these units should come from Category A.

3. **Service** – The faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level and external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor. Professional development in areas of service and engagement, including advisement, are valued, and should be documented appropriately.

4. **General comments** – For promotion to Full Professor, currently, the record of teaching activity counts 60%, scholarship and service 20% each. As more tenure track faculty members are hired and faculty workloads become differentiated this percentage will change. Our goal, in general, for most faculty members would be a model where teaching counts as 50%, scholarship 35% and service 15%, but currently we are not there yet.
F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)
For an acceptable performance rating, faculty must demonstrate professional compliance and conscientious execution of duties including efforts to improve. For an exemplary performance rating, faculty must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship and service.

1. Teaching -- To meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the Collegial Review Committee; satisfactory self-assessment on each of the 7 dimensions; and satisfactory ratings (3.0 or greater) on each of the 5 "factor scores" of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught. Additionally, they should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching, if used, from at least one of the observers.

1. Scholarship -- One unit for each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review.
2. Service -- The faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor. Professional development in areas of service and engagement, including advisement, are valued, and should be documented appropriately.
3. General Comments -- Currently, teaching counts approximately 60%, scholarship and service 20% each. As more tenure track faculty members are hired and faculty workloads become differentiated this percentage will change. Our goal, in general, for most faculty members would be a model where teaching counts as 50%, scholarship 35% and service 15%, but currently we are not there yet.
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Attachment 1: Peer Observation Schedule and Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Peer Observation Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature/s of observer/s and observer</th>
<th>Teaching Discussions and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Semester</td>
<td>1. Observe a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation to Peer Observation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Be observed by mentor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Semester</td>
<td>1. Observe mentor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Observed by Department Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two</td>
<td>Observed by mentor or other faculty member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Semester</td>
<td>Observed by Peer Review Committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st or 2nd Semester</td>
<td>Observed by Peer Review Committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Development (select as previously noted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Three</td>
<td>Observe a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Semester</td>
<td>Observed by Peer Review Committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Development (select as previously noted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st or 2nd Semester</td>
<td>Observed by Peer Review Committee member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Four</td>
<td>Observed by mentor or other faculty member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st semester</td>
<td>Observed by department chair + one Peer Review Committee Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Teacher workshops may be included and documented.
Attachment 2: Alternative Peer Evaluation of Scholarship

September 11, 2008

Dear Dr. XXX,

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the scholarly product accompanying this letter. WCU has formally adopted the “Boyer Model” of scholarship into our tenure and promotion process, which expands the traditional definition of research to include, most relevantly, activities classified as “scholarship of application.” These tend to be research projects based on disciplinary knowledge and expertise that are focused on an applied problem, often local or regional, for the benefit of some external constituency. Often these projects are labor-intensive, substantial, and methodologically rigorous, but with a narrow and local focus that precludes traditional publication outlets.

In the Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education, we value such projects and count them as meeting expectations for scholarly activity with regard to the Annual Faculty Evaluation process pertaining to all faculty. For tenure and promotion, though, the university requires that these products have an external peer review in order to “count.” You will find attached our departmental Collegial Review Document describing this issue in much more detail (see section II.B.(Scholarship of Application, and relevant criteria, for example, in section IV.C.2). Briefly, the question facing you is this: Based on its overall quality, as rated using the attached protocol, does this scholarly product warrant being elevated from its current Category B status to Category A, which includes more traditional publications?

Please note that unlike the external review process employed by many universities, you are not being asked to evaluate the candidate’s overall dossier or eligibility for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The question focuses on this one product. Is it substantially rigorous, methodologically sound, and sufficiently useful to constituents that we should consider it as equivalent to traditionally peer-reviewed activities?

We really appreciate your willingness to evaluate this product, and we look forward to your comments and ratings.

Sincerely,

William Dee Nichols, Ph.D.
Head, Department of Elementary and Middle Grades Education
Alternative Peer Review of Scholarly Activity
Review Protocol

Scholar: ____________________________
Evaluator: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Note: In responding to these questions, please consider any explanatory material provided by the scholar in addition to the scholarly product itself.

Goals
1. Is the basic purpose of the work clearly described, including its value for public good?
   Very Much So  7  6  5  4  3  2  1  Not at all
   Comments:

Context
2. Does the scholar appear to have knowledge of content areas appropriate to the project at hand?
   Very Much So  7  6  5  4  3  2  1  Not at all
3. Does the scholar bring necessary skills to the project?
   Very Much So  7  6  5  4  3  2  1  Not at all
4. Does the scholar make significant contributions to the work?
   Very Much So  7  6  5  4  3  2  1  Not at all
   Comments:

____________________________
____________________________
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Method

5. Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions, and context of the work?

Very Much So 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

Comments:

Results

6. Does the scholar achieve the goals?

Very Much So 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

7. Does the scholar’s work add meaningfully to the discipline and/or the professional community?

Very Much So 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

Comments:

Dissemination

8. Does the scholar use suitable styles and effective organization to present the work?

Very Much So 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

9. Does the scholar disseminate to appropriate academic and/or public audiences consistent with the goals of the project?

Very Much So 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all
10. Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?

Very Much So 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please free to make any additional general comments about the scholarly value of this product.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
## Attachment 3 Scholarship Units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AFE Academic Year Unit Totals</th>
<th>While in tenure track position at WCU (Indicate number of academic years) Unit Totals</th>
<th>Number of Units based on Academic Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For promotion and tenure, the department expects that each faculty member generates at least **four** units as described below with at least **three** of the units coming from Category A.

**Category A**

Two Units –
- Authorship of an article in a journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline. It is up to the faculty member to document the high status of the journal. Without this documentation it will be considered as a one unit publication. **The publication does not have to be sole authorship but should be primary author to receive 2 units, otherwise it will be categorized as 1 unit.**
- Editorship of an edited book, or a themed issue of a widely recognized journal. It is up to the faculty member to document the high status of the journal. **The publication does not have to be sole editor but should be primary editor to receive 2 units, otherwise it will be categorize as 1 unit.**

One Unit –
- Authorship of a peer-reviewed journal article (Does not have to be sole authorship or first author. However for promotion and tenure the faculty member should have at least one peer reviewed publication where they are the lead author).
- A chapter in an edited book
- A patent
- Authorship of subsequent editions of a scholarly book
- A substantial technical report for a program evaluation project (e.g., for accreditation) if subjected to formal external peer review as previously described.
- Invited publications in a peer reviewed journal

**Category B**

One Unit -
- An invited address at an International or National conference
- A successful external grant proposal
- Serving as an editor or associate editor of a peer reviewed journal
One-half-Unit —
- A scholarly book review
- Presentation at a professional conference (Indicate International/National, Regional, State)
- A successful internal research grant proposal
- An unsuccessful substantial external grant proposal
- An invited address at a state or regional conference
- A published article in a non-peer review journal/or other professional outlet

### Category A Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>09-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Category A:**

### Category B Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>09-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Category B:**

### Yearly Break Down of Units Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>09-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:**
**Yearly Average:**
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Attachment 4: Academic Advisor Evaluation

Advisor’s Name: ________________________________

Current Semester: ______________________________

Number of semesters that you have been advised by this person: ______________________

Advisees: Please take a few minutes to complete this evaluation form of your academic advisor. Answer the questions below using the following scale: (A= Strongly Agree, B= Agree, C= Disagree, D= Strongly Disagree, E= Not applicable). Circle only one response for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My advisor keeps appointments with me or when a conflict has arisen; my advisor has worked with me to reschedule the appointment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My advisor is familiar with the Liberal Studies requirements for the university or is willing to find answers to questions I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My advisor is familiar with the requirements for my program or follows up and finds the information I need when he/she does not know something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My advisor demonstrates knowledge of university services available to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My advisor focuses on me during an appointment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I have a school related problem, my advisor is willing to help me solve it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My advisor informs me of other possible licenses within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My advisor returns my phone calls or emails in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My advisor follows up on concerns or questions I have about degree audit, transfer credits, scheduling conflicts, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments about advising: