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I. Overview—As the field of communication is diverse in its nature, the Department of Communication requires a faculty with diverse expertise and experience. The department needs to balance teaching, scholarship and service. Quality teaching is the number one priority for all faculty; however, individual faculty members will differ in terms of the types of scholarship pursued, investment in service, and balance between research and practice.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Communication. With the exception of stipulated departmental criteria listed below, the Department of Communication will follow Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook and any approved supplements or addenda to the Handbook, which prevail on any matter not covered herein.

II. Domains of Evaluation
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
   1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 3 criteria:
      A. Teaching

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 importantly, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman (1987) has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.

An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline’s central concepts, skills and recent advances through a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. Teachers become more effective as they monitor and modify their teaching accordingly.
B. Professional Aspects of Teaching

Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise – and different disciplines often approach teaching differently – teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include 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, holding classes and making suitable use of class time.

C. Student Response to Instruction

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

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence
   a. Instructor’s self-evaluation of teaching, which addresses the faculty member’s pedagogical content knowledge, should discuss how instruction has changed or developed in relation to his/her discipline. The Communication faculty member should answer the following questions: “What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?” and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?”
   b. Colleagues’ review of teaching materials will be used to assess both pedagogical content and professional aspects of teaching. The AFE Committee as defined in Section III, A, 2 will review syllabi, exams, study guides, handouts, classroom exercises, assignments, etc. (94.05B2b). The committee will complete a protocol/rubric developed to guide the review of teaching materials.
   c. Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. (4.3.1.1). All departmental faculty will have direct observations in their classes at least once a year. The procedure for conducting these observations is as follows:
      • Each faculty member will choose a colleague to serve as an observer of their teaching
      • Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the communication field, peers may be identified from various programs across the university. Therefore, faculty colleagues outside the Communication Department may be called upon to observe classroom performance. The classroom observer will complete
a protocol/rubric developed to guide the review of the classroom observation.

- This protocol/rubric will include categories that reflect how instructors have used pedagogical content knowledge in the design of their instruction. Peer reviewers may also assess the professional aspects of teaching by evaluating a faculty member’s organizational and administrative performance in the classroom.
- The faculty member and the faculty observer will agree on the criteria/scope of the observation.
- After the observation, the faculty member and the observer will discuss the experience.
- The classroom observer will forward the completed observation form to the Department Head to be included in the faculty member’s file.
- Note: Other options are available for direct classroom observations: (1) observers not employed at WCU approved by the Department Head, (2) Faculty Center observers, and (3) non-departmental teaching awards committee. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc., hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.
- Outside observers or the Faculty Center observers will fill out the departmental-approved form. If a teaching awards committee observes the faculty member, the faculty member should request from that committee any evaluation of the observation be sent to the Department Head.

d) Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument. (4.05A) All sections of courses will be evaluated using a form of the Senate-approved 20 item university-wide SAI instrument.

3. General Comments—The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, peer review of substantive teaching material and quantitative SAIs. Recognition of quality work performed on-campus and off-campus, including guest lectureships, the judging of activities, and work with students in experiential activities will also be considered appropriate to teaching. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. Faculty members will be rated on a 5-point scale with the following ratings: 5=exemplary; 4=superior; 3=satisfactory; 2=needs improvement; 1=unsatisfactory.
B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 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. The Department of Communication recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than other, and all Boyer categories are valued equally. Scholarship must include external peer review by experts in the discipline.

a. Scholarship of discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works. The Department of Communication will consider as research and creative works all work accomplished for the production of television programs, radio programs, motion picture production, and professionally related consulting, as well as traditional journalistic, historical (where new discoveries or knowledge claims are made) and empirical research leading to publication. Publication is defined as all presentations to the public, including books, brochures, journals, conference papers, exhibitions, performances (live, recorded or mediated communication such as podcasts, streamed audio/visual, or new media defined by leading authorities in the discipline), expert interviewee for television or radio, magazine and newspaper stories, op-ed pieces, editorial work, design or directing for public performance (television, radio), published software (commercial or publicly distributable), etc.

b. Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time. Examples include textbooks, literature reviews, or documentary pieces presented to the public in such forms as described for discovery.

c. Scholarship of application – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers. Publications in this area may be written or oral reports where the presentation of such is made “in the field” to professional, civic, or academic organizations. Professional consulting including, television, radio, or other broadcasts (either as expert interviewee or production consultant), public relations, marketing, training and development or other communication-related endeavors for academic, governmental, and professional organizations will be considered as scholarship of application.

d. Scholarship of teaching and learning – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes. The department recognizes that faculty research and scholarship in teaching, learning, and educational technology is of great importance to this department, the College of Arts and Sciences, WCU, and the State of North Carolina; therefore,
the department will consider faculty activities in these areas in its tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions.

2. Methods of evaluation – Scholarship and creative works in the Department of Communication, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of a “unit” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. Scholarship must include external peer review by experts in the discipline.

For creative and scholarly works with no extant peer review process, the faculty member will submit to the department head up to five names and contact information for potential external reviewers. These external reviewers must have demonstrated knowledge and expertise in the faculty member’s discipline or that of the scholarly work. In the case of creative works, the names of both qualified professionals and academicians may be included. From this list, the department head, in consultation with the Collegial Review Committee (CRC) members, will identify two reviewers. Each reviewer will provide a written assessment of the faculty member’s work, resulting in two written evaluations to be placed in the candidate’s file. In the case of scholarly engagement activities, excellence may be documented through additional reports from community stakeholders and/or clients involved in the engagement work. Such reports must explicitly address the impact or outcomes of the engagement activities as a result of the application of the faculty member’s expertise.

The department’s CRC will judge whether a unit has been achieved on a case-by-case basis, but the following provides general guidelines:

a. Published pieces (as defined in Section II B1a above) are valued more highly than unpublished pieces.

b. The quality of the journal in which an article appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.

c. The department values multi-disciplinary research but candidates should show competence in the field of Communication.

d. The department values collaboration and co-authorship as well as single-authorship.

e. Presentation at national or international conferences is valued as well as presentations at prestigious regional or local conferences.

f. At conferences where symposiums are selected by a competitive or juried method, organizing a symposium and participating in it is valued more highly than just participating in a symposium.

g. Professional speaking engagements other than at Western Carolina University (e.g., at other academic institutions, government agencies, etc.) where the speaker’s research, creative, or professional works are highlighted.

h. Professional consulting, including public relations, marketing, training & development, or other communication-related endeavors for
academic, governmental, and professional organizations are highly valued. Note: it is important that non-traditional refereed scholarship be documented in a manner that will clearly indicate the impact of the scholarship.

i. Publishing the first edition of a book is valued more highly than publishing subsequent editions of that book except when subsequent editions require significant revision.

j. With published books, scholarly treatises that involve some degree of original research are valued more highly than the production of textbooks (i.e. the scholarship of discovery over the scholarship of integration).

k. Technical reports or “white papers” will be evaluated according to the impact of the scholarship (e.g., international, national, regional, state, or local) and according to the type of scholarship (discovery, application, integration, etc.)

l. When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.

m. Applying for a grant, and being unsuccessful, is valued more highly than not applying for any grants.

n. Scholarship must identify Western Carolina University as the author’s institution.

o. The department expects faculty to have a well formulated program of scholarship and refereed creative works indicating future projects and activities.

Using these general guidelines, the department’s CRC will determine “unit” totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the CRC. Some items are of such high value that they will be awarded two or more units, most items will earn one unit, and some items will earn a half unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be earned.

**Category A - four units:**
- Authorship of a first edition book with a university press or equivalent (i.e. no “self-publications”)

**Category B – three units:**
- Authorship of the first edition of a textbook
- Original research or creative works that reach an international or national audience involving WCU students and that brings national recognition to the department
Category C - two units:
- Authorship of an article in a refereed journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (Journal of Communication, Journal of Broadcast and Electronic Media, Human Communication Theory, etc.)
- Editorship of an edited book with a university press or equivalent
- Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a national network audience.
- Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a national network audience.
- Receiving a national award for the production of a radio or television product, original research, or book from organizations that are widely recognized as having high status within a discipline (International Communication Association, National Communication Association, Broadcast Education Association, Intercollegiate Broadcast Service, etc.)

Category D - one unit:
- Authorship in a refereed journal other than those named in category C
- A chapter in a scholarly edited book
- Authorship of a refereed academic conference paper
- A successful external grant proposal (excluding travel grants) of $1,000 or more.
- Presentation at a prestigious refereed professional conference at the state, regional, national, or international level.
- An article in a prestigious magazine or other publication
- Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a regional multi-state audience.
- Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a regional multi-state audience.
- Receiving a national award for the production of a radio or television product, original research, or book from an organization other than those in category C
- Professional consulting or creative works that includes WCU students, reaches a national audience, and brings recognition to the Department

Category E - one-half unit:
- Authorship in a refereed state-level journal or equivalent (e.g., Florida Journal of Communication)
- A scholarly book review
- Presentation at a professional conference at the state, regional, national, or international level (other than Cat. D above).
- Professional speaking engagements as defined in 2.g above
- Professional consulting as defined in 2.h. above
- A successful internal grant proposal (excludes travel grants)
- An opinion-editorial piece for a newspaper
- An article in a magazine or other general readership publication
o An encyclopedia entry in a scholarly publication
o A technical report for a program evaluation project or government agency
  (e.g., Citizen Satisfaction Survey)
o Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program
  segment that airs to a local audience.
o Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of
  announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program
  segment that airs to a local audience.

3. General comments – These guidelines and examples are not intended to serve as an
  exhaustive inventory, nor do they focus on “borderline” cases. The activities listed are
  intended to be typical examples of scholarship in the Department of Communication.
  We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present “interesting things” that do
  not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimate scholarship. It will be up to
  the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary
  nature, presenting their work in sufficient detail and with evidence of external peer
  review. The candidate may request a prior review of the proposed project in order to
  get feedback from the CRC. The CRC may solicit outside reviewers if necessary. In
  these cases of prior review, the CRC will provide written feedback to the faculty
  member for inclusion in their dossier or other evaluation materials, and a copy will
  also be provided to the Department Head for placement in the faculty member’s
  departmental file. Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are
  also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the
  specific review event.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)
1. Types of Service
   a. Institutional service—committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search
      committees, mentoring, at all levels, including department, college/school, and
      university.
   b. Community engagement—providing disciplinary expertise to an academic,
      professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or
      national level. The department will recognize extension instruction workshops
      given in the community, any fieldwork, guest speaking, judging for contests or
      similar activities in the specific areas of communication.
   d. Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional
      leadership/membership, activities and leadership roles in professional
      organizations from the state, regional, or national level such as service as an
      officer, participation in conference planning, service as journal editor or reviewer,
      academic conference paper reviewer, service on accreditation teams, serving as an
      officer in area-specific academic or professional organizations (e.g., the National
      Communication Association’s Organizational Communication Interest Group),
      etc. Recognition of quality work performed in on-campus and off-campus service
      such as department head or a major role in faculty governance will also be
      considered as appropriate.
e. Advising—advisement of students, advisement of or work with co-curricular and extracurricular student groups, and the supervision of individual projects in the various communication areas.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—The faculty members listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regards to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees) and other indicators of quality of service.

3. General comments—Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college, 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 area 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 15% of the workload. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department; they should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview—All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. The Deans and Provost determine deadlines for completion of the review process.

2. Composition of review committee—The Departmental AFE Committee will consist of the department head and three faculty members (at least two tenured or tenure-track faculty) nominated by the department head from the full-time permanent faculty at the beginning of the academic year and approved by vote of all faculty. The positions are to be rotated (among all areas in the department) among the faculty each year as practical. The Department Head will serve as a non-voting chair. This committee will also be responsible for reviewing the department Collegial Review Document and recommending changes as needed. These changes will be submitted to the departmental faculty at one of the first meetings of the academic year. The faculty will discuss and vote on the proposed changes. If adopted, the changes will be written into the following year’s valuation procedures.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
   a. The evaluation weighting percentages applied to teaching, scholarship, and service are typical guidelines recognizing that some faculty may be assigned differential loads.

   All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes 1) the Annual Report of Faculty Activities and (2) a set
of appendices with supporting documentation and artifacts. The Annual Report will include a self-evaluative narrative statement that addresses the following aspects:

1) Teaching (60% of Evaluation)
   - Teaching loads
   - Teaching versatility—range of preparation and level of courses
   - Teaching effectiveness—brief summary of student assessment of instruction, and other indices used to measure effectiveness.
   - Other information: include objective information to illustrate teaching commitment and effectiveness (e.g., graduate students supervised, service learning projects, engagement activities, directing student research)
   - The 3 criteria for teaching; pedagogical content knowledge, professional aspects of teaching, and student response to instruction

2) Scholarship and Refereed Creative Work (25% of Evaluation)—Faculty will list the total cumulative record in chronological sequence for the year from most recent to the most dated with regard to scholarship and creative works, as defined by above. Items with projected publish dates may also be included if publication is projected to occur within the year. Items should be clearly designated as referred, non-referred, or non-traditional referred.
   NOTE: Public recognition is also considered. Public recognition is defined as any activity, which brings positive recognition to the department and the university. Consideration will be given to the balance between quantity and quality. Also, differing needs, career opportunities, and professional obligations may change the formula for limited periods of time during a faculty member’s career. Such changes will take the form of a letter of agreement between the individual faculty and the Department Head in the individual’s AFE file stating the time period covered as well as the purpose and terms of the adjustment.

3). Service (15% of Evaluation)—Consideration will be given to the balance between quantity and quality as well as to willingness to contribute. Faculty will list the cumulative record of their service/engagement activities in chronological sequence from most recent to most dated with each category:
• Service to the University—departmental, college and institution;
• Service to external constituencies—engagement activities, delivering workshops, professional consulting, teaching professional continuing education courses, service to professional disciplines, etc.; and
• Service to students—advisee load, work with student organizations, etc.
• Note: Expectations for service is based on years of experience (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College or University level committees)

b. Specific Guidelines for Preparation of the AFE Document—See Section III.A.3.a above.
c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05F) Part time (including adjunct) and Lecturer positions shall be evaluated in a similar procedure as tenure-track faculty. Part time (including adjunct) and Lecturer positions shall be evaluated based 100 percent on their teaching. Fixed term Instructors will be evaluated in the same procedure as the tenure/tenure-track faculty. Eighty percent of an Instructor evaluation will be based on teaching and the remaining 20 percent on either scholarship or service. All faculty will complete the elements of the Annual Report of Faculty that is applicable to them (scholarly activity and service may not be required). For those teaching the Liberal Studies course COMM 201, the Director of that program does classroom observation and confirmation of the observation will be placed in the faculty member’s file.
d. General Comments: Procedures for the AFE Committee
The AFE committee will elect a secretary among its membership. The committee will meet and evaluate each faculty member in accordance with university procedures and the provisions of this document. The committee will confer and discuss all of the submitted materials and enter a rating and rationale to be placed on the Faculty Evaluation Scale. (See appendix). The committee will act in an advisory capacity to the Department Head. During committee deliberations, the Department Head will be a non-voting member. When the Department Head is the person being considered, he/she will excuse him/herself. The AFE Committee Secretary will submit the committee’s recommendations directly to the appropriate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Based on the committee deliberation and ratings, the Department Head
will prepare a written AFE Statement for each faculty, addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty members meet with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement and may prepare a rebuttal statement if they wish. The AFE Statement is then submitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)
1. Overview—The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment. The Dean’s office will review and consult with the Provost’s office on any changes.
2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) - The Departmental TPR Advisory Committee will be chaired by the Department Head (non-voting) and will be comprised of three tenured faculty members elected annually by the department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with Department tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean of Arts & Sciences, selects tenured faculty from other closely-related departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)
1. Overview—Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.
2. Composition of review committee — The departmental post-tenure review committee shall be comprised of the Department Head (non-voting) and all tenured members of the department, excluding any member scheduled for Post-tenure Review. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with Department tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean of Arts & Sciences, selects tenured faculty from other closely-related departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
3. Procedures and preparation of documentation— The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.
b. The faculty member under review should provide the following information for the committee to review:
   1) A current curriculum vitae
   2) The four most recent AFE statements written by the Department Head, plus any rebuttals.

c. The committee will discuss and determine a rating of exemplary, superior, satisfactory, needing improvement or unsatisfactory based on the previous four AFE Statements. The Department Head will provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head will add his/her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.

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

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in Department of Communication

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation

1. Teaching – Each full and part-time faculty member must be evaluated annually for teaching effectiveness. The departmental faculty evaluation committee (AFE committee) must reach consensus on each faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on the following criteria:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 3 criteria of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
   b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.2 on a 4.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
   c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching evaluations at WCU as defined in Section II, 2, c.

2. Scholarship – Minimum one unit per year, as described in Section II B 2.

3. Service: Tenure and tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in each of the following levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair). Total commitment to all service areas should be approximately 15% of tenured and tenure track faculty workload. (Note: Expectations for service is based on years of experience (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College of University level committees) Part-time and fixed term faculty commitments to service are contingent on individual contract terms.

4. General Comments: In general, time and work efforts for tenured & tenure track faculty should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service. Unless the faculty contract stipulates differently, part-time and fixed term faculty are considered as 100% teaching. Exceptions to this full-time teaching commitment are dependent on individual contract. In these cases, the part-time or fixed term faculty member is expected to submit a copy of their contractual agreement with their AFE file.

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching – Each full and part-time faculty member must be evaluated annually for teaching effectiveness. The departmental faculty evaluation committee (AFE committee) must reach consensus on each faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on the following criteria:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 3 criteria of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.2 on a 4.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.

c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc., hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship – Minimum of one unit per year, as described in Section II B 2. As the candidate progresses through the probationary period, expectations increase with regard to scholarly activity. On a case-by-case basis, the candidate may need to exceed the yearly minimum to maintain sustainable progress towards tenure. Special note: Typically, for the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectations for the completion of scholarly activity during the first year, only the clear indication that plans have been initiated to establish a pattern of scholarly activity in compliance with Section IV, C, 2 that will lead to tenure.

3. Service: The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service (departmental; college; university; external/regional service), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College or University level committees). There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. Total commitment to all service areas should be approximately 15% of faculty workload. Exposure to all levels of institutional service is desirable; however, exceptions approved by the Dept. Head and AFE committee are acceptable. Examples of approved service that might exempt a faculty member from traditional levels of varied institutional service includes: large outreach projects, funded research projects, faculty fellowships, etc. Tenure track faculty members should gradually accrue a share of advisees.

4. General Comments: In general, time and work efforts for tenured & tenure track faculty should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching – To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to tenure application, have an overall “excellent” rating based on AFE committee reports. The overall “excellent” rating is based on an AFE committee consensus decision on the
faculty member’s following teaching materials:

a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 3 criteria of teaching to be “excellent.”

b) Receive a minimum average score of 3.2 on a 4.0 scale on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75 percent of the courses taught.

c) One “excellent” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include:
    - departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching awarc committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc., hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship-- Six units, as described in Section II B 2. Faculty are expected to initiate scholarly work upon appointment, but these units may be completed during the latter four years of the probationary period. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. The faculty member should have experience in each level of service before receiving tenure. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of advisees by the year prior to submission for tenure.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching – To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to promotion for Associate Professor, have an overall “excellent” rating based on AFE committee reports. An overall “excellent” rating is based on AFE committee consensus of the following candidate teaching materials:

   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 3 criteria of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
   b) Receive a minimum average score of 3.2 on a 4.0 scale on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75 percent of the courses taught.
c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc., hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship-- Six units, as described in Section II B 2. Faculty are expected to initiate scholarly work upon appointment, but these units may be completed during the four years preceding the requested promotion. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees by the year prior to submission for promotion.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching –To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should for three consecutive years prior to promotion to Full Professor, have an overall superior rating in all categories based on AFE committee reports. The overall superior rating is based on an AFE committee consensus decision of faculty member submissions of the following teaching materials
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 3 criteria of teaching to be “satisfactory.”
   b) Receive a minimum average score of 3.2 on a 4.0 scale on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75 percent of the courses taught.
   c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-
credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship—Eight units subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees and have demonstrated competence as a student advisor and serve as a model/mentor for junior faculty.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching – To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to post-tenure review, have an overall “satisfactory” rating based on the previous AFE committee reports.

2. Scholarship—One unit minimum for each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review noting that some faculty may be assigned a differential load.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees and have demonstrated competence as a student advisor and serve as a model/mentor to junior faculty.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.
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