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I. OVERVIEW - The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the School of Art and Design. The document is guided at the highest level by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. Reference is also made to policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, or the College of Fine and Performing Arts as appropriate. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to school-level criteria and procedures, faculty members should have familiarity with The Code and with the WCU Faculty Handbook (section 4.0). Further, in preparing materials for one of the review processes described here, faculty members should also have available any relevant guidelines external to this document. For example, in the case of tenure, reappointment and promotion dossiers, the guidelines are in a separate document issued by the Office of the Provost. Guidelines for other evaluation processes are included in the body of this document.

The School’s faculty has adopted this document as a means of providing guidance to faculty members involved in this process. In addition, this document should assist the AFE/TPR faculty committee and administrative members involved in faculty evaluation in making critical personnel decisions, in communicating to the review committees beyond the School level and in providing clear criteria for the appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review of the faculty. For all candidates involved in the TPR or PTR processes, the School of Art and Design supports the inclusion and review of the AFE Committee Statement at the college level review (in tandem with the School Director’s AFE statement).

The School of Art and Design endorses the University’s missions of teaching, professional and scholarly development and service. The major mission of the program is to provide quality teaching. The definition of scholarship must give faculty the freedom to inquire and discover, using methodologies and skills that are recognized in their specialized discipline. Artists and designers often use methods of inquiry that reach beyond traditional research into various forms of creative scholarship. This document advocates the universal inclusion of creative practice and professional practice as equal to traditional research in the tenure and promotion process. In that the School of Art and Design is made up of artists, designers, art educators and art historians, this document is written to define creative scholarship and its value within the tenure and promotion process and to provide criteria and methods for evaluating the significance of scholarly work in creative fields. Creative scholarship requires the same consideration for expert judgment as any other field of study. Therefore, scholarship as defined by the Boyer model should be evaluated by external peer reviewers who are familiar with and can recognize the value of discipline specific work. Peer review is defined as:

… the evaluation of creative work or performance by other people in the same field in order to maintain or enhance the quality of the work or performance in that field. It is based on the concept that a larger and more diverse group of people will usually find more weaknesses and errors in a work or performance and will be able to make a more impartial
evaluation of it than will just the person or group responsible for creating the work or performance (http://www.linfo.org/peer_review.html).

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

Research and scholarly development are essential to quality teaching. This document recognizes the work of Ernest Boyer and the Carnegie Foundations for the Advancement of Teaching. In an effort to clearly recognize the contributions of faculty to their profession, periodic references will be made to the definitions of scholarship provided in Boyer’s work, Scholarship Reconsidered. These definitions are the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, the Scholarship of Application and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

II. DOMAINS OF EVALUATION

A. Teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated by faculty members for all stages in the review process for reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure evaluations.

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

   a) Pedagogical Content Knowledge -- Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman (1987) has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and usable by their students.

   b) Professional Aspects of Teaching -- Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise -- and different disciplines often approach teaching differently -- teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.

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

1. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence

   a. Self-evaluation of teaching (4.05A) Faculty members will provide a self-evaluation
document following the general guidelines published in the Faculty Handbook. This
evaluation must include a description of the pedagogical content knowledge of the
discipline.

   b. Peer review of teaching materials (including syllabi, examinations, study guides,
handouts and assignments, etc. (4.05B2b) The School will evaluate syllabi and
other teaching materials, including examinations, study guidelines and other
materials. Evaluation of teaching materials in the School will be done by the Annual
Faculty Evaluation (AFE) Committee as part of the annual review process.

   c. Direct observation of instruction, using the school protocol (4.3.1.1)
All tenure-track faculty, post-tenure review candidates, new part-time instructors and
part-time instructors on a rotational basis as reflects the needs of the school will be
evaluated annually by direct observation of teaching, using the School protocol. The
observer will be a full-time faculty member from the School’s Annual Faculty
Evaluation (AFE) committee. The specifics of this process for the School of Art and
Design are provided in Appendix A, “School of Art and Design Peer Classroom
Observation Guidelines for Process and Protocols.”

   d. Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the University-wide Student
Assessment Instrument (SAI) (4.05A) All sections of all courses taught by all
faculty will include assessments using a form of the Senate-approved University-wide
SAI. Faculty may submit School-approved course evaluation instruments in addition
to the required SAI.

   e. Assessment of quality of student work Assessment of quality of student work can
come from both internal and external sources. Internal review would include the
School Scholarship Committee, other faculty reviews or critiques and AFE
Committee review of student work documented in the annual faculty evaluation
process. External review could include professional portfolio review, acceptance of
student art into juried exhibitions, works chosen for public display, purchased for
public collections, recognized with awards or written about in a published review, or
other written documentation by an external reviewer. For student research and
scholarship, recognition could also include publication or acceptance into a juried
research presentation.

   f. Discussions on course content and educational philosophy with Director
During the annual AFE process the School Director will have at least one annual
opportunity to consult with a faculty member regarding teaching efforts.

   g. Additional considerations In evaluation of teaching, mitigating factors affecting
student and peer evaluations either positive or negatively should be taken into
account. For example:
   • The number of students and hours taught by the faculty member;
   • The nature of the courses taught (required vs. elective, upper vs. lower
division, seminar vs. large lecture, liberal studies vs. specialized course, etc);
   • The number of preparations, new courses, innovations in which the faculty member
has been involved;
• Any resource problems the instructor may have had (e.g. unavailability of books, equipment, space, etc.);
• Other aspects of assigned workload that enhance or detract from teaching.

2. **General comments** – When teaching effectiveness is in serious contention, classroom observation will take precedence over other evaluative procedures. Classroom observation is mandatory for new, non-tenured and continuing part-time faculty members. The School values professional development activities in the domain of teaching. These activities should be described in 4.05 A-G.

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

WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four areas described by Boyer. Specific School perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity and School-specific examples of each are described below. In all cases a continuous record of work must be evident.

The College of Fine and Performing Arts recognizes a difference between scholarly activity and scholarship. Scholarly activity is required and may encompass the many facets of activities covered under the umbrella of the Boyer model. For scholarly activity to be accepted as scholarship in the deliberations for reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit it must meet the standards of external peer review and dissemination as set forth in this document. Faculty members are advised to check with the Director if there is a question about the scope of the activity. All external peer reviews must be documented.

Faculty members are advised to check with the Director if there is a question about the scope of the activity. All external peer reviews must be documented.

1. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence**—All activities submitted for personnel actions must be peer-reviewed. It is up to the candidate to substantiate the level of peer involvement in this review. The Dean’s Office criteria document, “Protocols: Appointments, Reappointments, Tenure and Promotion and Multi-Year Contracts,” must be reviewed as a resource. Scholarship and creative activities that are not peer-reviewed should generally be listed within the responsibilities of service or the faculty member should provide justification of their validity as scholarship. Representative samples of scholarly or creative works will be examined, with consideration to issues such as rigor of peer review, relative productivity, significance and impact on the field.

2. **Research, Publication, Creative Work and Other Activities** — It is expected that faculty will participate in activities that contribute towards scholarship and creative activity. The unique nature of each faculty member will be honored. Studio artists and designers may be involved with traditional scholarly research and publications and, similarly, art history faculty may be involved with creative activities. These cases will also be externally peer-reviewed and evaluated case-by-case with the resulting professional activity held to the same standards set by the School.

For creative work that is presented to document professional achievement it is critical that external peer evaluation be clearly documented. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to explain the selection process and how it meets the standards of peer review.
Questions regarding peer evaluations should be addressed to the Director, as well as to the AFE and/or TPR committees.

3. Areas of Scholarship as Described in the Boyer Model

a. Scholarship of Discovery

Research is at the heart of academic life and it needs to be celebrated as an essential ingredient of that life. Research is a creative process that is crucial for advanced scholarship. Creative processes involve research in that research is a concerted effort to test, combine or apply with concerted effort what is known in order to discover what is new or unknown. Discovery, however, is not a product but rather a key intermediary moment of the research process. While the discovery might be considered to occur in the “during” phase of creative/scholarly research, the dissemination of this discovery is the lynchpin of the before and after of the quest for knowledge and should be publicly disseminated as such. Thus, the Scholarship of Discovery for the School of Art and Design may include the following:

- Creative and scholarly production involving input or application of new materials, ideas, or methods that leads to creative epiphanies that may be captured in artist’s statements, peer reviews of artist’s work, professional critiques of artist’s work, etc.;
- Workshops presented wherein the production of original works by the faculty member are explained as revolving around the causes and effects of discovery;
- Professional honors (including display or collection in museums, corporate collections, galleries, etc.) based on the production of original artwork or design that focuses on the impetus of creative discovery;
- Production of articles, books, essays or electronic media that chronicle the process of discovery for the artist, art historian, art educator or designer, as well as its importance to the development of their work and/or to their professional area/field at large.
- External peer-reviewed original work resulting from consultations in which the artist/designer had to synthesize project parameters with client or personal vision in order to produce a distinct result.

b. Scholarship of Integration

The Scholarship of Integration is the process of making connections within and across disciplines. The process is closely related to the Scholarship of Discovery. As is often the case, an artist’s or designer’s contribution may involve both original and interdisciplinary collaboration. Research is conducted in areas where disciplines or media or ideas may converge and/or be combined. Integration involves fitting one’s own research with that of others into larger intellectual patterns. The Scholarship of Integration often involves scholarly collaboration between experts in the field with tacit or field-specific knowledge fused toward new, original results. It is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret and bring new insight to original research as synthesized phenomena, whether that phenomena emanates from across disciplines, across topics, across methods/materials of art and design or across time. Sources of evidence for the Scholarship of Integration include but are not limited to:

- Creative and scholarly production involving input or application of new materials, ideas, or methods that leads to creative epiphanies which may be
captured in artist statements, peer reviews of artists' work, professional critiques of artists' work, etc.

- Workshops presented wherein the production of original works by the faculty member are explained as revolving around the cause and effects of discovery.
- Professional honors (including displays or collections in museums, corporate collections, galleries, etc.) based on the production of original artwork or design that focuses on the impetus of creative discovery.
- Production of articles, books, essays or electronic media that chronicle the artist's or designer's process of discovery and its importance to the development of their work and/or professional area/field at large.
- External peer-reviewed original work resulting from consultations in which the artist/designer had to synthesize project parameters with client or personal vision to produce a distinct result.
- The creation of designs, including space planning, graphic communications, furniture, architectural designs, pedagogical systems, etc., that have scholarly significance in terms of offering new and innovative concepts in specific design fields and are authenticated through external peer review.
- Forums attended or hosted that focus on specific issues in art and design in which the presenter/participant contributes details of their experience with integrated scholarship as authenticated by conference proceedings.
- Adjudicated publication of a book, book chapter, article, review, or participation in an invitational, juried or solo exhibitions in which the Scholarship of Integration is detailed.

c. Scholarship of Application

Substantial evidence of some type of external peer review of the creative and/or scholarly contributions of the faculty member is mandatory. Examples of the Scholarship of Application include but are not limited to:

- Participating in artists' residencies and leading workshops
- Mounting exhibitions for the community
- Commissions in which work is created in collaboration with other agencies
- Grants for creative work
- Participating in academic conferences as a presenter or panelist, etc.
- Public art projects
- Writing reviews and criticism
- Jurying exhibitions, grant applications or competitions
- Client presentations
- Jurying design competitions as consultants
- Reviews and criticism
- Studio art exhibitions
- Participating in academic conferences as a presenter or panelist, etc.
- Designing exhibitions or organizing professional trade show presentations that are substantive examples of the creative and scholarly work of the faculty member
- Reviewing manuscripts for presses, symposia and journals
- Serving as a guest curator for a museum or gallery
- Obtaining research grants
- Serving as consultant to a major venue at state or national level
• Leading professional creative development workshops
• Assisting with community efforts at improving art and design education

d. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Sources of evidence must include external peer review and, as such, may involve other areas of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the nature of activity, as well as scope and level of scholarship for tenure, promotion, post-tenure review and reappointment. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning include but are not limited to:

• Designing new courses with specific strategies to improve learning outcomes
• Redesigning existing courses with specific strategies to improve learning outcomes
• Developing new approaches to enhance technical and aesthetic development in students’ creative work
• Developing new approaches to assist students’ understanding and presentation of traditional scholarship
• Organizing professional lectures, residencies, or other engagements with visiting artists, scholars, critics, designers and educators to enhance students’ overall educational experience
• Conducting and professionally disseminating longitudinal studies to improve learning outcomes
• Formally researching experiential learning to determine its efficacy
• Conducting classroom and case studies to examine and analyze learning styles and presenting these formally through external peer-reviewed processes

C. Scholarly Activity (Non-reviewed efforts are valued and would be listed in the area of Scholarly Activity.)

• Creative works of art that augment the teaching breadth of studio faculty
• Professional field experience/case studies that serve to augment curricula
• Manuscripts and/or articles in progress
• Professional consulting

D. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

Excellence in Service includes many concepts similar to the Scholarship of Integration and the Scholarship of Application. Collaborative, integrative services are necessary to the maintenance and growth of institutions, ensuring accountability and service to constituents, including students, citizens, agencies, business and industry.

1. Types of Service
• Institutional service
• Committee service
• Recruiting
• Faculty governance
• Search committees
• Mentoring, at all levels: including School, College and University
2. **Community Engagement** – service to community may include:
   - Service to governmental and nonprofit organizations related to issues concerning interior design or art
   - Active participation in committees at all levels
   - Service across disciplines
   - Committee service
   - Recruiting
   - Faculty governance
   - Search committee
   - Mentoring, at all levels: including School, College and University

3. **Administrative Engagement**
   - School director
   - Area coordinators
   - Faculty advising for clubs and organizations
   - Service in professional organizations
   - Work on accreditation documents
   - Taking a major role in faculty governance

4. **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 organization)

5. **Personal Mentoring**

6. **Grants Related to Institutional and Community Applications** - Grant work used as a type of service to the profession and University (depending on the scope and content as defined by the event and the School)

7. **Service to the Profession**
   - Advisory and review boards
   - Service with accrediting agencies
   - Membership in professional organizations

8. **Supervisory Activities** – being in charge of shop, lab, exhibition space or other significant facility, shared resource or program

9. **Other Service** – service in other categories, making contributions and serving in ways that may be beyond this scope of above list

**Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence for Service**
The faculty member’s listing of service activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative
Examples of Service Activities:
- Critiques of exhibitions: one person, two person, invitational and competitive group exhibitions
- Jurying exhibitions and competitions on a regional, national or internal level
- Community non-credit classes
- Leading profession-based workshops
- Leading groups to museum and exhibitions
- Obtaining special grants to assist in community outreach
- Community outreach as classroom assignments
- Public lectures, demonstrations, or gallery talks
- Loaning or donating of artwork or art services
- Working with schools and open houses
- Administrating off-campus internships regionally, nationally and internationally
- Teaching continuing education classes
- Collaborating with professionals outside one’s specific disciplines
- Serving as a graduate faculty member
- Design services for University/School benefit

General Comments
Faculty members are expected to participate in service activities. Faculty are encouraged to document service activities and describe them in a self-evaluation statement. Service expectations will be less for faculty in the first through third year of appointments. After this period it is expected that faculty will expand their service engagements with the University and community.

E. Specific Procedures for Review Events for all TRP/PTR Candidates and Full-Time Faculty

Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

Overview – All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. Deadlines for completion of the review process are determined by the Dean and Provost. The School AFE Committee is asked to look at both quantitative and qualitative measures to make a determination of the effectiveness of a faculty member’s professional development.

Note: The following comes from a memo from the Chancellor and Provost from Fall 2008 clarifying the difference between Scholarly Activity and 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 scholarliness. 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.

1. **Composition of review committees** - The School AFE Advisory Committee will consist of four elected faculty members and one alternate, all of whom will have tenure. A minimum of one of the committee members will be from the Interior Design program. The elected members will serve in staggered four-year terms with the most senior person serving as chair. The committee will serve as an advisor to the Director.

2. **Procedures and preparation of documentation per rank**

   **Full-time Faculty**: All full-time faculty members prepare an AFE file that includes their AFE documentation and a set of appendices with supporting documentation and other support materials. This should be submitted in a one-inch three ring binder and the AFE document should also be submitted electronically to the School Director. The applicant's name should be on the outside of the binder and there should be one cover sheet that lists AFE and year. In general, this file follows the structure of the TPR dossier but is limited to a single twelve-month period, from May 1 to May 1. It may begin with a self-evaluation statement—one page maximum focusing on teaching, scholarship and service. Additional items should be included as follows:

   a. **Teaching**
      
      The materials should include:
      
      - self-evaluation of teaching that includes a narrative on pedagogical knowledge (as outlined in Section II.A.1.)
      - a statement of teaching philosophy
      - a description of goals, methods and strategies used
      - selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review
      - a list of courses taught for the current academic year and the courses taught during the preceding summer, with enrollments
      - Copies of course syllabi and other teaching materials
      - Direct observation of classroom teaching (if required)
      - Documentation of student works, projects or in-class activities
      - Student Assessment of Instruction (student evaluations of faculty) and as an option the School-approved instrument

   b. **Scholarship/Creative Activities**
      
      - List scholarly activity completed during the past year (12 months from May to May).
      - Clearly distinguish between outcomes and work in progress.
      - Do not duplicate entries from previous years.
      - If an item appeared previously with different status (e.g., article submitted), clearly indicate it was listed previously and how.
      - Include in Appendix G any reprints, conference submissions, compressed formats of posters, exhibitions, etc., to document your scholarly/creative activity.
      - List workshops, training institutes and related activities and describe/document as appropriate.
• Support material may be included in Appendix I.
• The scope of the activities must be clearly defined in relation to the Boyer method, peer review indicators and promise for sustained activity.

c. Service
• List service to the School, College and external community during the immediately previous 12 months.
• Address advising activities, including number of undergraduate and graduate advisees, work with student art/interior design student organizations and so forth. Document as appropriate in Appendix H.
• The College-wide advising evaluation must be included with summative results.

d. Professional Development Activities
• Provide other pertinent information.
• Describe additional information that does not fit into the categories above, or simply indicate N/A.

F. Specific Guidelines for Preparation of AFE Document for Full-Time Faculty

Use the same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR dossier, but in a more limited degree as follows:

• Appendix A (not used)
• Appendix B: Current Vita
• Appendix C (not used)
• Appendix D: Peer review of teaching of non-tenured faculty.
  • Include the written feedback for the School peer review of teaching materials.
  • If direct observation of teaching was conducted, you may optionally include the rating and comments of the observers.
  • These peer ratings should be for the current academic year.
• Appendix E. Student Assessment Instrument (SAI) or School approved student evaluation instrument data.
  • Because Spring data will not be available in time for the AFE file, include evaluation instrument data from May to May for each year, including any summer courses.
  • Prepare a concise tabular summary of the average scores on the five factors for each course taught.
  • Follow this with a one-page presentation of quantitative data for each course.
  • Faculty should not include students' narrative responses to open-ended questions in this section.
  • If you choose to include qualitative data to support self-evaluative statements, include it in Appendix I.
• Appendix F: Samples of teaching materials from the current year
  • Syllabi
  • Tests and exams
  • Assignments
  • Images of student work, projects, class activities, portfolios
• Appendix G: Samples of scholarly products from May 1 to May 1 of the year being reviewed.
  • Reprints
• Letters of acceptance
• Brief manuscripts
• Abstracts
• Technical reports
• Exhibition announcements and catalogs
• Articles
• Critical reviews

• Appendix H: Documentation of service from May 1 to May 1
  • Include representative materials to document service/engagement activities.
• Appendix I. Optional. Any other documentation you wish to provide.

Note: The School Director will prepare a written AFE Statement and provide the candidate with the AFE Committee's statement, both of which will accompany the candidate’s file at the College-level review. These statements will address the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service in the context of School expectations. The faculty member will meet with the Director to read and sign the Director’s AFE Statement and may prepare a rebuttal statement.

G. Evaluation of Part-time Instructors
These procedures and guidelines are based upon the assumption that part-time faculty members are responsible only for teaching. Those with contractual agreements specifying other expectations will be evaluated using appropriate aspects and weightings. All part-time instructors will be evaluated with regard to teaching effectiveness using data from the following sources:

• Annual peer review of teaching materials, using the School protocol
• Student Assessment of Instruction, using the University instrument for each course taught
• Part-time faculty should have peer review of materials during the first semester of the academic year in which they teach and similarly, they should complete the self-evaluation near the end of that semester. This self-evaluation must include some narrative on pedagogical content knowledge.

The School Director will place the following in the part-time faculty member's file:
• Evaluation summary
• Peer review of teaching materials
• All available student evaluation reports

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

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

Composition of review committees
• The School TPR Committee shall be chaired by the School Director (non-voting) and shall be composed of up to six tenured faculty members elected annually by the School’s full-time faculty.
• In the event that there are six or fewer tenured faculty, the committee shall be composed of the School Director and tenured faculty, providing that the resultant committee shall consist of at least three members, exclusive of the Director.
In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Provost, in consultation with the School Director and Dean, will select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

The College TPR Committee shall be chaired by the Dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of faculty members of the College as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

The University TPR Committee shall consist of the Provost as chair (non-voting), the Dean of the Graduate School and faculty members of the University as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

**Procedures and preparation of documentation**

As noted above, detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually by the Office of the Provost. The candidate will need:

- School Collegial Review Document
- Guidelines for Preparation of the Dossier
- Timetable for the review process

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

**Overview**

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

**Composition of review committee**

- The School’s Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be comprised of all tenured members of the School, excluding the School Director and any member being considered for Post-Tenure Review.
- In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty in the School, the Provost, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Fine and Performing Arts, will select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

**Procedures and preparation of documentation**

The Office of the Provost provides the timetable for the Post-Tenure Review Committee along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.

- The documentation prepared by the faculty member should generally follow the structure and format of both the TPR dossier and the School AFE file described previously.
- Prepare a brief (2-3 page) self-evaluative statement highlighting teaching, research and service achievements over the past five years since the most recent promotion or Post-Tenure Review.
- Include the AFE documents you prepared for each of the past four years (required by the Faculty Handbook.)
- Prepare a single set of appendices following the labeling and structure described above (III.A.3.c) for the AFE file. In this case, include the four most recent AFE Statements written by the School Director, plus any rebuttals, in Appendix C.
- SAIIs should be provided for the past three years, as should ratings of the peer review of teaching materials committee.
- In instances where the instructions above focus on a 12-month period, expand this to the full period of the Post-Tenure Review, but no further.
Both the AFE Committee’s and the Director’s evaluations will be presented to the faculty member in a meeting with the Director. The Director will forward these reviews and any written response from the faculty member to the Dean.

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

J. **Expectations and Criteria for All TPR/PTR Candidates and Full-Time Faculty**

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

**Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)**

- **Teaching**
  - Faculty should earn a score of satisfactory or better on student evaluations. If there are specific reasons for scores lower than these, they should be addressed by the faculty member in their self-assessment.
  - When peer review of teaching and teaching materials is conducted, the review should reflect a positive impact the faculty member has on their classes. (See Appendix A for processes and protocols for classroom observations.)
  - Evaluated faculty should receive an overall rating of satisfactory or better on direct observation of teaching.

- **Scholarship**
  - Faculty should have a continuous record of scholarship and/or creative activity with annual external peer review documentation of a scholarly activity that shows promise for external peer review validation.
  - The results of these efforts are reflected in activities listed in II.B.
  - If the quantitative reporting seems substantially low, the faculty member should address the reasons for the lack of reported activity in the self-evaluation statement.

- **Service**
  - Faculty are expected to participate in institutional service at all levels: School, College, University and external community.
  - Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract.

**General comments**

Overall balance of full-time faculty members’ workload may vary at the discretion of the Director of the School of Art and Design in response to the needs of the unit. In general, teaching will count approximately 40%, scholarship/creative activity 40% and service 20% of a full-time faculty member’s workload. A workload that varies substantially from this balance should be discussed and agreed upon with the Director during the AFE process and documented in the AFE report. Part-time and fixed term faculty will be evaluated entirely on teaching. However, it is possible in some individual cases that contracts will stipulate expectations other than teaching and those cases should be evaluated accordingly. Copies of any such contractual agreements should be included in AFE review materials.
K. Reappointment (4.06)

- **Teaching**
  - Faculty should earn a score of satisfactory or better on student evaluations. If there are specific reasons for lower scores, these should be addressed by the faculty member in their self-assessment.
  - Faculty should receive an overall rating of satisfactory or better on direct observation of teaching.
  - The AFE summary statement by the Director should indicate a promise for sustained quality in teaching with specific examples of quality and, if warranted, improvement statements.

- **Scholarship**
  - Faculty should establish and maintain a continuous record of scholarship and/or creative activity as reflected by the activities listed in II.B.
  - At a minimum, faculty should produce or have an ongoing involvement with at least three major efforts outlined in II.B.
  - If the quantitative reporting seems substantially low, the faculty member should address the reasons for the lack of reported items in the self-evaluation.
  - Major efforts in this case could be a group or series of works or extensive projects that lead to one-person exhibitions or juried national publications.
  - The AFE Summary statement by the Director should indicate a promise for sustained quality in scholarship with specific indications of quality and if warranted needs improvement statements.

- **Service**
  - All tenure-track or tenured faculty are expected to participate in academic advising and other institutional service at all levels: School, College, University and external community.
  - A continuous record is expected with greater University, professional and community service expected as a candidate approaches tenure considerations.
  - Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract.
  - The AFE Summary statement by the Director should indicate a promise for sustained quality in service.
  - The scope and quality indicators of the advising load must be addressed.

**General Comments**
In evaluations, teaching counts about 40% scholarship/creative activity 40% and service 20%.

L. Tenure
The maximum number of years of continuous full-time probationary service shall be seven years except as provided in Sect. II, 4.02.01, Sub-section III, B.2.b of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty must hold professional rank in order to be considered for permanent tenure. Probationary faculty must be considered in the year preceding the end of the maximum probationary period, but have the option of requesting consideration earlier.
Teaching
- Faculty should earn a score of better than satisfactory on the Student Assessment Instrument.
- If there are specific reasons for lower scores, these should be addressed by the faculty member in their self-assessment.
- They should receive an overall rating of satisfactory or better on direct observation of teaching.
- The peer review of teaching and teaching materials is required. The observations should reflect a positive impart the faculty member has on their classes.
- They should receive a satisfactory rating on direct observation of teaching.
- The AFE summary statement should reflect a high level of success in teaching.
- Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for high level of teaching, Appendix B.
- The AFE Summary statement by the Director should indicate a record of high level of expectation and the promise for continued success in teaching.

Scholarship
- It is expected that faculty have a continuous record of external peer-reviewed and disseminated scholarship and/or creative activity.
- The results of this effort are reflected in activities listed in II.B.
- If the quantitative reporting seems substantially low the faculty member should address the reasons for the lack of reported items in the self-evaluation.
- The annual summary AFE statements should include indicators of sustained quality and/or promise for sustained quality.
- Faculty members must provide evidence of qualitative external peer review.
- Expectations are at the local, regional, national and international levels.
- The AFE summary statement should reflect a high level of success in scholarship or creative activity.
- Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for high level of scholarship of creative activity, Appendix B.
- External peer review indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Office reference document, Appendix C.
- All forms of scholarship are valued but Scholarship of Discovery must be part of the requirements for tenure and promotion.

Service
- All tenure-track or tenured faculty are expected to participate in institutional service at all levels, School, College, University and external community.
- Indicators of sustained quality should be evident in the summary AFE statements with specific mention of advising.
- It should be noted that advising may or may not be part of the expectations of the faculty member and this should be indicated.
- The AFE summary statement should reflect a high level of success in service.
- Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for high level of service, Appendix B.

General comments
Teaching counts approximately 40%, scholarship/creative activity 40%, and service 20%.
M. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

- Teaching
  - Faculty should earn a score of better than satisfactory on the Student Assessment Instrument.
  - If there are specific reasons for lower scores, these should be addressed by the faculty member in their self-assessment.
  - They should receive an overall rating of satisfactory or better on direct observation of teaching.
  - The peer review of teaching and teaching materials is required.
  - The observations should reflect a positive impact the faculty member has on their classes.
  - They should receive a satisfactory rating on direct observation of teaching.
  - The AFE summary statement should reflect a high level of success in teaching.
  - Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference Chart for high level of teaching, Appendix B.

The AFE Summary statement by the Director should indicate a record of a high level of performance and the promise for continued success in teaching. Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for high level of teaching, Appendix B.

- Scholarship
  - It is expected that faculty have a continuous record of external peer-reviewed and disseminated scholarship and/or creative activities.
  - The results of this effort are reflected in activities listed in II.B.
  - If the quantitative reporting seems substantially low the faculty member should address the reasons for the lack of reported items in the self-evaluation.
  - The annual summary AFE statements should include indicators of sustained quality and/or promise for sustained quality.
  - Faculty members must provide evidence of qualitative external peer review.
  - Expectations are that there are local, regional, national and international levels.
  - The AFE summary statement should reflect a high level of success in scholarship or creative activity.
  - All forms of scholarship are valued but Scholarship of Discovery must be a part of the requirements for tenure and promotion.
  - Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for high level of scholarship or creative activity, Appendix B.
  - External peer-level I indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Office reference document, Appendix C.

- Service
  - All tenure-track or tenured faculty are expected to participate in institutional service at all levels: School, College, University and external community.
  - Indicators of sustained quality should be evident in the summary AFE statements, with specific mention of advising.
  - It should be noted that advising may or may not be part of the expectations of the faculty member and this should be indicated.
• The AFE summary statement should reflect a high level of success in service. Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for high level of service, Appendix B.

General Comments

Teaching counts approximately 40%, scholarship/creative activity 40%, and service 20%. The Dean of the College of Fine and Performing Arts has also compiled a list of activities that should help guide the candidate. Copies of their contractual agreement should be included in their AFE review materials.

N. Promotion to the Rank of Professor:

• Teaching
  • Faculty should earn a score of better than satisfactory on the Student Assessment Instrument. If there are specific reasons for lower scores, these should be addressed by the faculty member in their self-assessment.
  • They should receive an overall rating of better than satisfactory on direct observation of teaching.
  • The peer review of teaching and teaching materials should reflect a positive impact the faculty member has on their classes.
  • They should receive a superior rating on direct observation of teaching.
  • The AFE statement should reflect a superior level of success in teaching.
  • Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for superior level of teaching, Appendix B.
  • The AFE Summary statement by the Director should indicate a record of superior performance and the promise for continued success in teaching.
  • The AFE summary statement should reflect a superior level of success in teaching.
  • Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for superior level of teaching, Appendix B.

• Scholarship
  • It is expected that faculty have a continuous record of successful external peer-reviewed and disseminated scholarship and/or creative activity at the highest level in the profession.
  • This must be documented through either national or international venues inclusive of external peer review.
  • A national reputation in one’s field of work is expected unless qualified by accepted regional scholarship activities with external peer review.
  • The results of this effort are reflected in activities listed in II.B.
  • If the quantitative reporting seems substantially low, the faculty member should address the reasons for the lack of reported items in the self-evaluation.
  • The commitment to the activities listed in II.B. can include substantial efforts in one area, such as producing an original book or substantial studio work involved with the creation of a major one-person exhibition.
  • A typical minimum indicating a superior level of achievement would be in-depth involvement with at least one major activity, along with accomplishments in two other areas.
• AFE summary statements must include references to quality and continuous record.
• Faculty members must provide evidence of qualitative peer review indicators at the local, regional, national and international levels.
• The AFE summary statement should reflect a superior level of success in scholarship or creative activity.
• All forms of scholarship are valued but the Scholarship of Discovery must be part of the requirements for tenure and promotion.
• Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for superior level, Appendix B.
• External peer level I indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Office reference document, Appendix C.

• Service
  • Tenured faculty are expected to participate in institutional service at all levels: School, College, University and external community.
  • Indicators of sustained efforts should be evident in the summary AFE statements with specific mention of advising. It should be noted that advising may or may not be part of the expectations of the faculty member and this should be indicated.
  • Multiple levels of service on and off campus are required for superior performance.
  • The AFE summary statement should reflect a superior level of success in service.
  • Indicators should reflect the College of Fine and Performing Arts Dean’s Reference chart for superior level of service, Appendix B.

General Comments
Teaching counts approximately 40%, scholarship/creative activity 40%, and service 20%.

F. Post-Tenure Review

• Teaching
  • Faculty should earn a score of satisfactory or better on the Student Assessment Instrument.
  • If there are specific reasons for lower scores, these should be addressed by the faculty member in their self-assessment.
  • They should receive an overall rating of satisfactory or better on direct observation of teaching.
  • The peer review of teaching and teaching materials should reflect that the faculty member has a positive impact on their classes.
  • They should receive a satisfactory rating on direct observation of teaching.
  • A promise for sustained high quality of teaching is expected and should reflect a high quality of teaching as outlined in Appendix B.

• Scholarship
  • It is expected that faculty have a continuous record of external peer-reviewed and disseminated scholarship and/or creative activity.
  • The results of this effort are reflected in activities listed in II.B.
  • A typical indication of this continuous record of scholarship would be the in depth involvement with at least one major external peer-reviewed or intent of peer-review activity per year.
  • If the quantitative reporting seems substantially low the faculty member should address the reasons for the lack of reported items in the self-evaluation.
• Service
  • All tenure-track or tenured faculty are expected to participate in institutional service at all levels: School, College, University and external community.
  • Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract.
  • A promise for sustained high quality of services is expected as outlined in Appendix B.

General Comments
Teaching counts approximately 40%, scholarship/creative activity 40% and service 20%. Acceptable performance is indicated by maintaining a high quality of teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. The exemplary qualifier must be reserved for those individuals maintaining a superior level of work in one of or more of the three areas of investigation, Teaching Scholarship and Creative Activities and Service. (Appendix B)

Approved by:

[Signatures and dates]

Director, School of Art and Design

Dean, College of Fine and Performing Arts

Provost
Appendix A
School of Art and Design
Peer Classroom Observation Guidelines for
New, Non-Tenured and Continuing Part-Time Faculty

Peer classroom observations will be required for new, non-tenured and part-time faculty members once a year, starting with the first semester of employment.

The Chair of the AFE Committee will appoint/select peer reviewers from the School’s tenured faculty.

Classroom observation forms will be used for studio and lecture courses.

Peer observers will familiarize themselves with appropriate course syllabi on file in the School office prior to the classroom visit.

Faculty should have their teaching philosophy statements, which include a statement on pedagogical content knowledge, on file.

Observation will take place within eight weeks after the beginning of the semester.

Each observed faculty member and the School’s Director will receive a copy of the peer observation report within one week after the observation.

Each observed faculty member may request a second classroom observation within four weeks after receiving the observation report.

The results of these classroom observations will be placed in the personnel files of the faculty members observed.

This guideline supports the Department of Art’s TPR CRITERIA AND AFE GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, Section I, B., 3., b., 6.

This guideline, along with the Department of Art’s TPR/AFE document, will be provided in writing and discussed with each new, non-tenured and continuing part-time faculty member before initial appointment and at the beginning of each semester of employment.
(Feb. 1994)
Appendix B:

College of Fine and Performing Arts: Dean’s Office Reference Document
Collegial Review: Expectations for High and Superior Performance

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

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

The following statements are verification standards related to a review by peers and scholarship/creative activity benchmarks. The Boyer model has four differentia categories. It is up to the applicant to reasonably document a choice of Boyer category which a particular activity represents for scholarship and creative activity credit. In all cases outside peer review is required. Terminology examples may be found at the end of this document. The examples are not intended to be a complete list and are intended to be a guide. A faculty member is not expected to show evidence in each Boyer category, but only identify into which category a particular activity falls.

Scholarship and creative activities for which faculty teaching load is received are considered of lesser value and/or greater expectations assumed for personnel actions and must be clearly identified as such. In all cases ‘peer review’ is interpreted to mean outside the WCU community acknowledgement of the specificity and quality of the scholarship. In specific cases ‘outside peer review’ may be associated with a campus event as the College is an arts centered academy with professional works often times in exhibition or in review in a time based media. The validity of such reviews must be confirmed by the Dean. Outside reviews of on-campus creative activity may carry weight in reappointment, but may not be used as the chief peer review for tenure, promotion and renewal of multiyear contracts.

Peer Review

Level I: Appointment / 1-3 years Reappointment

- Validation by: Context should be related to primary teaching assignment
  - Articles in journals submitted to be reviewed by editor only
  - Performances self scheduled in a community and surrounding area
  - Adjudication in community and surrounding area for pay
  - Clinics, workshops, master classes for state wide meetings / regional arts organizations / regional professional societies
  - Exhibitions in regional venues by invitation
  - Performances in regional professional ensembles for pay
  - For hire work and commissions related to teaching assignment in region
  - Creative works performed, staged, etc. for regional venues
  - Regional acknowledgement of scholarship of application
  - Application of SOTL research in one’s own courses – evidence of outcome
  - Application of Scholarship of Integration in workshop and/or one’s own teaching – evidence of outcome
  - Evidence of Institutional and local grant success with application in one’s own teaching or creative activity
  - Grant writing > $5,000

Level II: Reappointment 4-6 years, multiple year contract renewal

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

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty Load Scholarship/Creative Activity
- Individuals receiving faculty load for an activity that is creative in nature and listed in this area must acknowledge this condition
Director of Museum, Conductors, Exhibition Coordinators, Designers, etc.

It carries lesser value in consideration for promotion to associate and full professor than similar work engaged in without load reduction.

Peer Review

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

Continuous

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

Collegial Verification

- Acknowledge within the University Community
- Acknowledge within a society or professional organization

Examples

The following are indicators of specific types of inquiry within the Boyer model. Many inquiries include aspects of more than one Boyer category. One’s intent in classification is primary for consideration and acceptance as valid scholarship and/or creative activity submitted for support of action.

Discovery

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

Integration

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

Application

- Use of one’s expertise (field of scholarship in teaching specialty area) in application.
- Must include intent or indication as to relationship of one’s expertise to event, work and/or subject of inquiry.
- Benchmarking results a clear indicator of intent.
- Peer review may included results, promise for further study, or acknowledgement in the profession, community, region, nation, world.
- Longitudinal context, differentiated from isolated service events

Teaching and Learning

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