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Department Collegial Review Document
Effective Fall Semester, 2012

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

I. Overview

The faculty is the heart of any educational program. The faculty must be of sufficient number; and must have the competencies to cover all of the curricular areas of the program. There must be sufficient faculty to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student advising and counseling, university service activities, professional development, and interactions with industrial and professional practitioners, as well as employers of students. The program faculty must have appropriate qualifications and must have sufficient authority to ensure the proper guidance of the program and to develop and implement processes for the evaluation, assessment, and continuing improvement of the program’s educational objectives and outcomes. The overall competence of the faculty may be judged by such factors as education, diversity of backgrounds, professional work experience, teaching experience, ability to communicate, enthusiasm for developing more effective programs, student recruitment and advising, level of scholarship, participation in professional societies, and/or professional licensure/certifications. Professional experience includes appropriate teaching at the college level in engineering, technology, and/or industrial experience in engineering, engineering technology, and other closely related fields. These factors include prior professional activities and preparation as well as current performance as a faculty member.

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

The departmental collegial review process involves assessment of the performance of a faculty member. Chapter 100 of the UNC Policy Manual (101.3.1) notes that “Within the University, important faculty personnel decisions are based on evaluations of performance rendered by a candidate’s immediate colleagues and supervisors, who are in the best position to make such judgments. These assessments are not the product of mechanically applied checklists, criteria or formulas; there is no simple litmus test for outstanding teaching, research or service. Rather, these decisions must reflect careful exercises of discretion, in which the faculty colleagues draw
on their own academic knowledge, experience and perceptions to evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance. Unavoidably and appropriately, such exercises to some extent are subjective and imprecise. Thus, the academic review process seeks to obtain the collective good faith judgment of the candidate's colleagues and responsible university administrators, as the basis for decisions about advancement and reward within the academic community. Provided that these conclusions are based on considerations that are relevant to the candidate's performance and the candidate's promise to contribute to the good of the institution, they are entitled to great deference and weight.” Therefore, the general guidelines set forth in this document represent the minimum requirements for faculty in consideration of tenure, promotion and reappointment in the Department of Engineering and Technology.

Beyond the traditional domains of teaching, scholarship, and service, overarching behavioral expectations include professionalism, ethicality, and collegiality. Collegiality is not a distinct category to be assessed independently, but it is an integral part of our work with students, staff, colleagues, administrators, and external constituents. Collegiality should be viewed as a professional, not personal, criterion relating to performance. That is, collegiality refers to behavior, not personality, and does not imply congeniality or conformity of opinion. Collegiality entails shared responsibility and effective cooperation to achieve common goals. Collegiality also involves appreciation of and respect for differences in expertise, ideas, and background. Non-collegial behavior interferes with the ability of colleagues to achieve the mission and goals of the department, college, or university. Persistent or severe non-collegial behavior may be grounds for negative decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review.
II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
Teaching is a complex and multi-dimensional activity that is difficult to define and evaluate. Although it is virtually impossible to identify all aspects of teaching, it is possible to identify some of the major elements of effective teaching and to evaluate these elements through the collection of relevant data.

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. Shulman1 has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.
   b) Professional Administration of the Class – 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 the course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence
   a) Self-evaluation addressing effective teaching. (4.05B2c). The report should include items such as a statement of teaching philosophy, pedagogical content knowledge, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used, and selected teaching materials for the courses taught during the period of the review. The self-evaluation report must include a section on pedagogical content knowledge.

b) Peer review of teaching materials --including syllabi, examinations, study
guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2b) See Addendum A for
departmental form. Every faculty member under review will provide
appropriate/necessary information to complete items 1, 3, 5 and 7 in Addendum
A. These forms will be returned to the faculty member's department
head/program directors for compiling and evaluation. Once data has been
collected, the department Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee
(comprised of at least two colleagues elected from tenured faculty members in the
department and exclusive of the department head) will review the data
specificaly addressing self-evaluation of teaching and any other considerations
that may be pertinent to the discipline. The Department Head may conduct a
separate observation.
This same course material is to be used as part of the ongoing accreditation
review, and only one notebook per course is necessary. The normal timeline for
these reviews is:
1) October—accreditation review and course binder review
2) February—First year faculty course binder review

c) Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol (4.05B2b).
See Addendum A for departmental form. All faculty will be observed at least
once per academic year. Direct observation of instruction will be conducted by
the Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee (comprised of at least two
colleagues and exclusive of the department head). The Department Head may
conduct a separate observation.

d) Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI
instrument--required of all sections of all courses taught by tenure-track and
tenured faculty. (4.05B2a) Each faculty member will be evaluated for each class
section taught (this does not include independent studies, co-ops, or internships).
SAIs will be conducted using forms and procedures that have been departmentally
approved and include one of the university-wide assessment forms approved by
the Faculty Senate.

e) Formal student evaluations conducted by the department head during individual
and group discussions with departmental students;
f) Formal exit interviews by the department head with graduating seniors.
g) Other sources of data could include alumni, department heads, or deans (1).

3. General comments —
The quality and effectiveness of teaching will be measured in the same manner
whether a faculty member has a full teaching load or a reduced teaching load and will
begin in the first semester of employment. The evaluation of teaching involves
multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution, but we attach the

1 Arreola, Raoul A., Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Handbook
for College Faculty and Administrators on Designing and Operating a Comprehensive
greatest weight to the peer review of substantive teaching materials and quantitative SAI.

a) **Professional Development** - Professional development activities in the area of teaching are positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

**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.

   a) **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.

   b) **Scholarship of integration** – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.

   c) **Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.

   d) **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

Engineering and Engineering Technology are professions that apply the physical sciences, math, and engineering science to the products and processes that sustain our design and manufacturing base. In a university setting, Engineering and Engineering Technology faculty members are expected to be competent and current in their discipline, both in practice and theory, and to be lifelong learners as well as excellent teachers and researchers. Consequently, the four facets of the Boyer model of scholarship are all important for the professional development of E&T faculty and students.

The Department of Engineering and Technology faculty value all 4 types of Boyer scholarship equally. The faculty are encouraged to produce scholarship through external engagement. The Department faculty defines engagement based on the premise that faculty play a major role in the stewardship of place and the economic transformation of our region. Each engagement activity should either sustain jobs, create new economic opportunities, or improve the quality of life for people in the region.

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review** —

   a) **Scholarly Engagement**

   The Scholarship of Application, or scholarly engagement, goes beyond the provision of service to those within or outside the University. To be considered scholarship, there must be an intellectually compelling and significant (consequential) application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers. To facilitate the development and evaluation of these activities, the Dean of the Kimmel School convenes the
Kimmel School Engagement Committee, which has both pre-screening and post-review evaluation responsibilities over Scholarship of Application programs. See Addendum C for guidelines. Scholarly engagement will be considered of equal merit, value and rigor to that of traditional publications; however, papers or technical reports (e.g. the outcome evaluation of an engagement project) may be evaluated differentially from traditional publications based upon factors such as scope, societal impact, and sophistication of intended audience, etc.

b) Traditional Publications
1) Publications should be peer reviewed or refereed, and only count once accepted for publication.
2) Publications based on all four Boyer types have equal merit.
3) Examples (equally weighted)
   i. Textbook contributions such as chapters, sections or complete volume
   ii. Appropriate professional journal articles that are refereed or peer reviewed
   iii. Paper published with presentation at regional, state, national or international professional societies (e.g. ASEE, IEEE, ASME)
   iv. Invited presentation at a professional meeting
   v. Monthly/quarterly reports for funded grants

c) Grants, Creative Works, and other projects
1) Writing proposals, securing grants / donations / scholarships / contracts.
2) Other scholarly activities such as reviewing publications, including conference proceedings, journal editor or textbook editing, book reviews, abstracts, etc.
3) Patents
4) Supervision of student research projects/senior design projects which result in a poster session and/or presentation (e.g. NCUR)

d) Methods of evaluation – Scholarship, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be judged on a case-by-case basis. The following provides general guidelines to the department’s Collegial Review Committee:

   a) The judged quality of the journal in which an article appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.
   b) Collaboration and joint authorship are highly encouraged and do not devalue the quality.
   c) Presentations at regional, national or international conferences are valued more highly than presentations at state or local conferences.
   d) At conferences, invited addresses are valued more highly than poster presentations or symposia participation.
   e) When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.
   f) Applying for a grant, and being unsuccessful, is valued more highly than not applying for any grants.

Using these general guidelines, the department’s Collegial Review Committee will determine the value and level of scholarly contribution for each faculty
member being reviewed. Although what constitutes the value and level of contribution cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the Collegial Review Committee. As a general guideline, Category A is valued higher than Category B and Category B is valued higher than Category C.

**Category A:**
- First authorship of an article in a journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (e.g. IEEE Transactions, ASME, ASEE journals)
- Authorship of the first edition of a textbook or a scholarly treatise
- Editorship of an edited book
- Granted patent with strategic or application value
- A successful external grant proposal that is transformational in supporting departmental goals

**Category B:**
- First authorship of an article in a scholarly journal within the discipline or second authorship in a journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (e.g. IEEE Transactions, ASME, ASEE journals)
- First or second authorship in conference proceedings (e.g. ASEE, ASME, IEEE)
- An invited address at a conference
- An invited journal paper
- An engagement activity having met all criteria required by the Kimmel School Engagement Committee to be approved as "scholarship"
- A chapter in an edited book
- A patent application
- A successful external grant proposal incrementally supporting departmental goals
- Submission of an unsuccessful but otherwise high-quality and significant external grant proposal as a Principal Investigator (PI) supporting departmental goals

**Category C:**
- A scholarly book review
- Presentation at a professional conference (no proceedings)
- Other than first or second authorship in conference proceedings (e.g. ASEE, ASME, IEEE)
- A successful internal research grant proposal supporting departmental goals
- Poster at a professional conference
- NCUR sponsorship

3. **General comments** –
   a) These guidelines and examples are not exhaustive, nor do they focus on "borderline" cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of
scholarship in this department. It will be the faculty members’ duty to provide rationale and justification documenting the value and level of scholarly contribution. Additionally, it will be up to the candidate to defend any other activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary nature, presenting their work in sufficient detail that the departmental Collegial Review Committee itself can serve the peer review function. A fifth-year candidate for tenure may request an administrative review as established by the University’s TPR guidelines.

b) 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, student recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring at all levels, including department, college/school, and university.
      1) Engineering Technology undergraduate/graduate program in Asheville
      2) Engineering Technology distance learning programs (ICC, CVCC, WPCC, and NCCET)
      3) Graduate MST program (e.g. advising as a major professor, teaching off campus, serving on thesis/project committees).
   b) Community engagement – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, national, or international level.
      1) Educational Consulting/Professional Development & Training Seminars
   c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership - includes service in professional organizations, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as department head, program director, or major role in faculty governance, etc.
      1) Participation in professional organizations which involves leadership roles
      2) Accreditation self-study as primary author
   d) Advising – being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, assistance with academic and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation committee service as well as advising student professional organizations.)
      1) Student Organizations – providing leadership and advisement.
      2) Accurate, consistent, and timely academic guidance provided to assigned advisees.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence – The faculty member’s listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regard to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees, advisor evaluations by students, etc.), and other indicators of quality of service, including documentation or artifacts included in the appropriate dossier appendix.
3. General comments –

a) Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college/school, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. For a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, service/engagement is typically considered to represent 20% of the workload, or about one day per week.

b) Service is highly valued by the department. As a faculty members career progresses, the level and amount of service is expected to increase.

c) Professional development - Professional development activities in the area of service are positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. For example, most faculty need to remain current on the evolving Liberal Studies requirements and the impact on advising.
III. Specific Procedures for Review Events
   A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
      1. Overview –
         Supplemental to the annual appointment/reappointment, promotion and tenure
         process, the department head shall complete an evaluation of all faculty members
         each spring semester.

         Each faculty member in the department shall be evaluated by the department head on
         the same criteria and by the same process. The AFE documents are placed in the
         faculty member's departmental personnel file with a copy given to the faculty
         member.

         The purposes of the AFE are:
         a. To assist faculty members to know how their work is being evaluated,
         b. To assist faculty members to bring their work to a high level of professional
            quality,
         c. To promote the continuing professional development of faculty members and
         d. To provide a professional basis for assessments when decisions regarding the
            status of the faculty member are being made and used for merit pay
            consideration.

      2. Composition of review committees – The AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by
         the Department Head. The Collegial Review Document (CRD) Committee, elected
         annually, comprises two tenured faculty and two tenure-track, non-tenured faculty,
         with the Department Head as non-voting chair. This committee is responsible for
         reviewing and recommending changes to the departmental CRD as needed. The
         departmental Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee is also elected annually.

      3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
         a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:
            1) Teaching
               a) a self-evaluation addressing pedagogical content knowledge, effective
                  teaching (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), a statement of teaching
                  philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and
                  selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of
                  review
               b) copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.
               c) direct observation of classroom teaching
               d) Student Assessment of Instruction - A copy of the results of these
                  evaluations must be included.
               e) List of course sections taught for the current academic year, including the
                  preceding summer, with enrollment.
            2) Scholarship and Creative Activity –
               a) List scholarly activity completed during the academic year (previous 12
                  months from time of submission of file). Clearly distinguish between
                  outcomes and work in progress. Take care not to duplicate entries from
previous years. If an item appeared previously with a different status (e.g.,
article submitted), clearly indicate that it was listed previously, and how.
b) Include in Appendix G any copy of abstracts and/or publications as it
appears in journal or proceeding to document your scholarly activity.
3) Service - List service to the department, college, university, and external
community during the immediately previous 12 months. Address advising
activities, including number of undergraduate and graduate advisees, work
with student organizations, and so forth. Document as appropriate in
Appendix H.
4) Professional Development Activities. List workshops, training institutes, and
related activities, and describe/document as appropriate. Artifacts may
optionally be included in Appendix I. Include the previous year’s Faculty
Development Plan/Goals and address accomplishments and achievements.
5) Other pertinent information. Add any other information pertinent to their
overall contribution to the university
6) Procedures - The Department Head shall prepare a written AFE Statement,
addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching,
scholarship, and service; in the context of departmental expectations (see
Addendum B). The faculty member meets with the Department Head to
review the results of his/her evaluation and to discuss the Faculty
Development Plan/Goals for the coming year. As a minimal requirement, the
faculty member shall sign the summary to indicate receipt of it, but should be
provided the added opportunity of replying to indicate acceptance of it or of
providing a rebuttal to be attached to the department head’s summary.

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document - All full-time
faculty members prepare an AFE file that includes (1) their AFE document and
(2) a set of appendices with supporting documentation and artifacts. This should
be submitted in a 1-inch 3-ring binder, and the AFE document should also be
submitted electronically to the Department Head. Include your name on the
outside of the binder and on a cover sheet, with AFE and year. In general, this file
follows the structure of the CRD dossier but is limited to a single year rather than
a cumulative record. Use the Guidelines For Preparation Of Dossiers For
Reappointments, Tenure, And Promotion generated in the Office of the Provost.
The AFE document prepared by the faculty member should begin with a Self-
evaluative statement--one page maximum. Use this opportunity to describe the
highlights of your year, focusing on teaching, scholarship, and service. Use the
same appendix structure stipulated for the TPR Dossier, but to a more limited
degree, as follows
i. Appendix A. (not used)
ii. Appendix B. Current vita.
iii. Appendix C. (not used)
iv. Appendix D. Peer review of teaching. Include the written feedback from
the departmental peer review of teaching materials. If direct observation of
teaching was conducted, you may optionally include the ratings and
comments of observers. These peer ratings should be for the current
academic year.
v. **Appendix E.** SAI data. Because spring data will not be available in time for the AFE file, include SAI data for the previous calendar year, including any summer courses. Prepare a concise tabular summary of the average scores on the 5 factors for each course taught. Follow this with a 1-page presentation of quantitative data for each course. DO NOT include narrative responses to open-ended questions in this section. If you choose to include such qualitative data to support self-evaluative statements, include it in Appendix I, taking care to avoid excessive bulk.

vi. **Appendix F.** Samples of teaching materials from the current year, including syllabi, tests, exams, projects, assignments, and so forth. Avoid excessive bulk.

vii. **Appendix G.** Samples of scholarly products, including reprints, letters of acceptance, brief manuscripts or abstracts, or technical reports. Take care not to include the same products in multiple years.

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

ix. **Appendix I.** Optional. Any other documentation you wish to provide.

c. **Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05 F)** -

1) All part-time instructors and non tenure-track instructors will be evaluated with regard to teaching effectiveness using data from the following sources:

- **Peer review of teaching materials,** using the departmental protocol, annually. See Addendum A. This includes submission of syllabus, appropriate graded tests, quizzes, assignments, lab activities, etc. for peer review.

- **Peer observation of instruction** using the departmental protocol. (4.05F2b) See Addendum A for the departmental form. All faculty will be observed at least once per academic year.

- **Student Assessment of Instruction,** using the university instrument, for each course section taught.

- **Self-evaluation addressing effective teaching (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above).**

2) Par.-time faculty should have peer review of materials (by the departmental Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee) 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. At the end of the semester, they will prepare a dossier containing the material described in III.A3.c.1

3) Ful.-time, non-tenure track faculty will undergo an annual review, in sequence with the tenure track faculty, presenting a dossier containing the material described in III.A3.c.1. The peer review of materials (by the departmental Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee) is also done annually, in sequence with the tenure track faculty.

4) The Department Head or designee shall write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during the preparation of other AFEs in the spring.
5) The Department Head shall place in the faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer review of teaching materials, and all available SAI reports. The evaluation summary is also given in writing to the instructor.

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.
   2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) –
      a) The departmental Collegial Review Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and shall be constituted in a manner consistent with all the provisions of the Faculty Handbook. The Committee shall operate in accordance with the procedures listed in the Faculty Handbook. A quorum is defined as two-thirds of the number of members.
      b) The School Collegial Review Committee shall be chaired by the dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of faculty members of the school as specified in the Faculty Handbook.
      c) The University Collegial Review Committee shall consist of the Provost as chair (non-voting); the Dean of the Graduate School, and faculty members of the University as specified in the Faculty Handbook.
   3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.
      a) All faculty eligible for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, will be notified in person, by E-mail, and/or memo, by the department head, of the procedures and deadlines that the faculty member must follow to be considered for the particular action. The candidate will need (1) the departmental CRD, (2) the Guidelines for Preparation of the Dossier, and (3) the timetable for the review process.
      b) An appeal of a negative decision (request for reconsideration) may be initiated at the conclusion of the consideration process as provided in Section 4.09F and 4.10.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)
   1. Overview –
      Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty. The purpose of this review is to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence among tenured faculty. This is achieved by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance; offering suggestions to enhance performance; providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty members whose performance is found less than satisfactory; and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions for those whose performance remains deficient. 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 department Collegial Review Committee shall conduct the reviews in a manner consistent with all the provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** -
   a) All faculty eligible for post-tenure review will be notified in person, by E-mail, and/or memo, by the department head, of the procedures and deadlines that the faculty member must follow to be considered for the particular action. The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.
   b) The documentation prepared by the faculty member should generally follow the structure and format of the TPR Dossier. Use a 1-inch 3-ring binder, with name and PTR on the cover.
      i. Prepare a brief (2-3 page) Self-evaluative statement highlight teaching, research, and service achievements over the past 5 years, since the most recent promotion or Post-Tenure Review.
      ii. The dossier should cover the preceding five years or the period subsequent to the prior review event, whichever is less.
      iii. Finally, prepare a single set of appendices following the labeling and structure described in the Guidelines. In this case, include the 4 most recent AFE Statements written by the department head, plus any rebuttals, in Appendix C. SAIs should be provided for at least the past 3 years (but no more than five), as should ratings of the peer review of teaching materials committee.
   c) The committee shall present its written evaluation to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head shall add their review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forwards this material to the Dean.
   d) See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.

D. Preparation and Implementation

1. **Preparation and Approval of the Collegial Review Document (CRD)**
   a) The departmental CRD shall be prepared or reviewed and revised each spring semester by the CRD Committee for the next academic year, if needed.
   b) On the timetable announced by the dean, the department CRD shall be submitted to the dean for review. The dean shall endorse the document or recommend revisions. The dean shall forward the approved document to the Provost for review, only when the dean is satisfied as to the quality and completeness of the document. The Provost will approve the document or recommend revisions and return it to the dean and department head. When revisions are needed, the department head will resubmit the revised document for approval through channels as before.
2. Implementation
   a) This document becomes effective beginning the academic year immediately following its preparation or revision upon endorsement by the dean and approval by the Provost.
   b) This document shall guide the Department’s consideration of candidates during the year within the framework of the timetable announced by the Provost and subsequent years until revisions are approved by the Dean and Provost.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the Department of Engineering and Technology
In its consideration for each candidate, the department Collegial Review Committee shall assess and be guided by the individual's promise of sustained future professional achievement based upon the cumulative record in teaching, scholarship, and service. Recommendations for appointment/reappointment and promotion to a rank shall be consistent with the provisions of the Faculty Handbook. A recommendation for the conferral of permanent appointment or acceptable post-tenure review must be based on a thorough assessment of the candidate's cumulative record and promise for sustained achievement.

All recommendations on appointment/reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review shall be consistent with the needs, direction, strength, and resources of the department.

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
   1. Teaching –
      a. Meets expectations: The faculty member should
         i. Receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee, and
         ii. Receive a satisfactory evaluation of their self-evaluation addressing effective teaching (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), and
         iii. Earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 66% of the course sections taught, and
         iv. Receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching, from at least one observer, and
         v. Teach a full load of classes, or a pre-approved reduced load, as agreed on in the annual work plan, and
         vi. Participate in professional development activities.
      b. Exceeds expectations: The faculty member should
         i. Receive excellent overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee, and
         ii. Receive a satisfactory evaluation of their self-evaluation addressing effective teaching (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), and
         iii. Earn an average score of 3.4 or greater on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 66% of the course sections taught, and
         iv. Receive an excellent overall rating on direct observation of teaching, from at least one observer, and
         v. Teach a full load of classes, or a pre-approved reduced load, as agreed on in the annual work plan, and
         vi. Regularly participate in professional development activities.
      c. Does not meet expectations – A faculty member
         i. Receives unsatisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee, or
         ii. Earns an average score of less than 3.0 on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 66% of the course sections taught, or
iii. Receives an unsatisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching, from at least one observer, and
iv. Fails to participate in professional development activities.

2. Scholarship – The faculty member’s scholarship will be judged against the criteria and guidelines presented in section II.B.1-3 of this document. Whereby, the faculty member:
   a. Meets expectations - Receive satisfactory overall ratings on scholarly materials according to the consensus of the review committee. The faculty member has produced, on average, over a rolling three-year period, three quality peer reviewed artifacts. Scholarship is not uniform from year-to-year. In some years, a faculty member may produce several quality artifacts; in other years there may be none. Consequently, the evaluative process should consider one’s scholarship agenda and the progress made toward achieving the goals of that agenda. A first-year faculty member is, at a minimum, expected to have submitted for peer review at least one artifact. A second-year faculty member is expected to have received an acceptance of one peer-reviewed artifact, and made one additional submission of a quality artifact for peer review. Third- through fifth-year faculty members are expected to have produced an average of one peer reviewed artifact annually.
   b. Exceeds expectations – Receive excellent overall ratings on scholarly materials according to the consensus of the review committee, and the faculty member has exceeded the standards for “meeting expectations” in terms of quality and quantity.
   c. Does not Meet Expectations – Receive an unsatisfactory overall ratings on scholarly materials according to the consensus of the review committee, and the faculty member fails to meet the standards in terms of quality and quantity.

3. Service –
   a. Meets expectations - The faculty member:
      i. Assumes a fair share of departmental responsibilities, and
      ii. Actively serves on School and University committees, and
      iii. Demonstrates some engagement activity with regional organizations or businesses, and
      iv. Meets departmental, college, and university responsibilities, and
      v. Meets posted office hours and appointments, and
      vi. Provides competent academic advising.
   b. Exceeds expectations - The faculty member not only meets expectations but also:
      i. Shows a greater level of participation at the college or university level, such as being a member of a major committee (could be an ad hoc committee), chair of a committee, or serves on several committees, or
      ii. Demonstrates sustained engagement activity with regional organizations or businesses, or
      iii. Assumes more than the “normal” department-level duties, such as initiates and follows through with new departmental initiatives, or
      iv. Is often available for student development outside class.
   c. Does not Meet Expectations - The faculty member fails to meet the departmental expectations in the area of scholarly activity.

4. General comments –
The relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service is to be determined for each individual during the annual faculty evaluation based upon the projected schedules of the faculty for the upcoming year. Any changes in criteria emphasis will be indicated to the faculty member by the department head to permit the faculty time to adjust to the new criteria. Part-time and fixed-term faculty are in most cases evaluated entirely on teaching. The expectations for scholarship and service described above are to be gradually achieved as the candidate progresses through the probationary period.

B. Reappointment (4.06)
1. Teaching – A faculty member must consistently “meet expectations” in this category.
2. Scholarship – A faculty member must consistently “meet expectations” in this category and be making adequate progress towards tenure for Junior Faculty
3. Service - A faculty member must consistently “meet expectations” in this category.
4. General comments –
The overarching evaluation for reappointment is to ensure that the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion.

For TAC of ABET accredited programs, i.e., engineering technology, and electrical and computer engineering technology, faculty credentials will be in accordance with Criterion 6. Faculty, as specified in the Criteria for Accrediting Programs in Engineering Technology, published by the Technology Accreditation Commission (TAC) of ABET.

For EAC of ABET accredited programs, faculty credentials will be in accordance with Criterion 6. Faculty, as specified in the Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs, published by ABET.

For all degree programs, the doctoral degree is strongly preferred. Under certain conditions, a master's degree accompanied by related professional experience may be acceptable. A minimum of three years of industry based professional work experience is required.

C. Tenure (4.07)
1. Teaching - A faculty member must meet or exceed expectations in this category for at least the three years prior to this review.
2. Scholarship - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.
3. Service – A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.
4. General comments –
The maximum number of years of continuous full-time probationary service shall be seven years in accordance with Faculty Handbook. An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action.
D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
Each candidate for promotion must provide evidence of high levels of achievement and contributions to the institution in teaching, service, and scholarship.

1. **Teaching** - A faculty member must meet or exceed expectations in this category for at least the three years prior to this review.
2. **Scholarship** - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.
3. **Service** - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.
4. **General comments** - An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action. Tenured or tenure-track faculty must spend a minimum time in rank of five years. Exceptions may be made in cases where faculty have demonstrated extraordinary competence and have made significant contributions to the University.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)
Each candidate for promotion must provide evidence of superior teaching, service, and scholarship.

1. **Teaching** - A faculty member must meet or exceed expectations in this category for at least the three years in the review period (up to five years). At least one of the five most recent annual ratings must exceed expectations.
2. **Scholarship** - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category for each of the years in the review period (up to five years). At least one of the five most recent annual ratings must exceed expectations.
3. **Service** - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category for each of the years in the review period (up to five years). At least one of the five most recent annual ratings must exceed expectations.
4. **General comments** - An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action. Tenured or tenure-track faculty must spend a minimum time in rank of five years. Exceptions may be made in cases where faculty have demonstrated extraordinary competence and have made significant contributions to the University.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. **Teaching** - A faculty member must meet or exceed expectations in this category for at least the three years prior to this review.
2. **Scholarship** - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.
3. **Service** - A faculty member must consistently meet or exceed expectations in this category.
4. **General comments** - An overall summary assessment of performance in all categories of responsibilities is the basis for recommending positive action.
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Addendum A

Department of Engineering and Technology
Review of Teaching Materials and/or Teaching Observation Report

Instructor being evaluated: ___________________ Date of Evaluation: __________ Time: ______

Reviewer: ___________________ Course Reviewed: ___________________ Location: ______

Please place a check mark beside the data reviewed for this evaluation:

_____ Classroom/Laboratory Observation  _____ Course Syllabi

_____ Assignment Sheets/Handouts  _____ Quizzes, Tests, Examinations

_____ Student Work  _____ Media Materials for In-Class Use

Other materials such as programs, web materials, etc. (list): __________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Based on analysis of the data provided from the sources indicated above, rate each of the following items on the following scale?

3 = Excellent
2 = Satisfactory
1 = Weak in certain areas of this dimension
0 = Does not meet minimal expectations of this dimension

The questions under each heading below are provided to assist in defining each teaching dimension. Please rate materials according to the overall dimension. All ratings must be accompanied by a written statement. In some cases, Not Appropriate (N/A) might be applicable for a given question or section.

1. Content Expertise:

Does the instructor demonstrate appropriate knowledge of the course content and was the syllabus and textbook provided the day of announced observation?

Comments: __________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Rating: 0 ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3
2. Instructional Delivery Skills:
   - Observed attributes can include Presentation of Materials, Engagement of Students, and Accessibility.

   Comments: ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   Rating: 0 __1__2__3

3. Instructional Design Skills
   a. Syllabi
      - Are course objectives stated clearly on all syllabi? Is the content sequenced and paced appropriately? Are learning activities clearly related to course goals, plans and objectives? Do course assignments, readings, and materials support course objectives?

   Comments: ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   Rating: 0 __1__2__3

   b. Quality of Instructional Materials:
      - Are text and other materials appropriate for the course? Are the instructional materials current and up-to-date? Are instructions appropriate to the level of the students?

   Comments: ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   Rating: 0 __1__2__3
4. Course Management Skills:

- Can include Preparation of Materials/Grade Reporting, Current/Up-to-date Materials/Content/Delivery, and Demonstrates Classroom Leadership.

Comments: __________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Rating: 0 ___1___2___3

5. Evaluation of Students:

- Are assessment procedures consistent with course goals and objectives? Are grading standards clearly articulated. Is there evidence of appropriate feedback on graded course materials?

Comments: __________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Rating: 0 ___1___2___3

6. Faculty/Student Relationships:

Classroom Observation

- Can include Instructor Behavior as Approachable, Demonstrates/Shows Respect, listens to questions, and participates in student extracurricular activities like club meetings and field trips.

Comments: __________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Rating: 0 ___1___2___3
7. **Student Outcomes:**

Do course materials suggest that the students are able to meet the objectives of the course? Is there evidence of high and appropriate academic standards? Are methods used that encourage interaction between instructor and students and among students? Is there evidence of improvement in the quality of student work over the period of this course?

Comments:________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Rating: 0 __1__2 __3

**Overall Summary Statement:**

**Reviewer:** __________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Date: __________________

**Department Head or Designee:**

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Date: __________________
Addendum B
2012-2013
Annual Faculty Evaluation

The purpose of Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) is to provide faculty members with an annual assessment, which includes written feedback concerning the extent to which they have met the department and college criteria, and university standards for teaching, service, and scholarly/creative contributions. The AFE is based on an annual record of performance and is used in making reappointment and TPR decisions.

Please complete the following table. Provide specific and relevant criteria for meeting expectations in your school/department concerning teaching, scholarly/engagement activities and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Faculty Evaluation</th>
<th>Criteria for meeting expectations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>i. Receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program:</td>
<td>ii. Receive a satisfactory evaluation of their self-evaluation, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Kimmel School</td>
<td>iii. Earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on each of the 5 &quot;factor scores&quot; of the SAI on at least 66% of the course sections taught, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year:</td>
<td>iv. Receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching, from at least one observer, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Teach a full load of classes as agreed on in the annual work plan, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Participate in professional development activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Expectations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Expectations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teach the equivalent of 6 courses per year unless otherwise approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have classroom/laboratory observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate in professional development activities designed to improve teaching and/or stay abreast of the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal Professional Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality &amp; Effectiveness of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• List of courses taught by semester, number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student assessment of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• List of professional development activities and identification of the aspect of job being addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what degree were goals meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scholarly/Engagement Activities

**Scholarly/engagement expectations (be specific about preferred format):**
- publication in peer reviewed/refereed regional or national journal (in the discipline or the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning)
- refereed national/regional presentation
- Other creative works
- Personal Professional Goals

**Criteria for meeting expectations:**
The faculty member has produced, on average, one scholarly work per year.
- Evidence of sustained development and growth
- Other notable professional development

**Evidence needed:**
- letter of grant award
- copy of article(s)
- copy of program(s) listing presentation(s)
- To what degree were goals meet

### Service Expectations:
- Sustained engaged activity with regional organization or business throughout the year
- Personal Professional Goals

### Citizenship to the Institution:
- service on departmental, college/school, and university committees/task forces
- Advise students
- other duties as assigned

**Evidence needed:**
- letter/e-mail from agency(s) or CRPR Director describing service(s) rendered
- list of citizenship activities
- Number of undergraduate/graduate advisees
- To what degree were goals meet

**Criteria for meeting expectations:**
i. Assumes a fair share of departmental responsibilities, and
ii. Actively serves on School and University committees, and
iii. Demonstrates some engagement activity with regional organizations or businesses, and
iv. Meets departmental, college, and university responsibilities, and
v. Meets posted office hours and appointments, and
vi. Provides competent academic advising.

In order to be recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion in this department the faculty member must:
*Secure a positive vote from Collegial Review Committee and support from Department Head. The full criteria are in the Departmental Collegial Review Document, Section IV.*

**Signatures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Addendum C
2012-2013

Kimmel School Engagement Committee

The Kimmel School encourages faculty to incorporate the Scholarship of Application into their professional activities, emphasizing our role as Stewards of Place and our responsibility to engage in activities that impact the economic transformation of our region, state, and nation. Engagement activities should sustain jobs, create new economic opportunities, or improve the quality of life for the people in the region.

All faculty are also expected to provide meaningful community engagement as service. The Scholarship of Application, or scholarly engagement, goes beyond the provision of service to those within or outside the University. To be considered scholarship, there must be an intellectually compelling and significant (consequential) application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and critically evaluated by peers.

To facilitate the development and evaluation of these activities, the Dean of the Kimmel School convenes the Kimmel School Engagement Committee as required. The Committee is organized and managed at the direction of the Dean through the Center for Rapid Product Realization.

Members of the Kimmel School Engagement Committee are appointed by and serve at the discretion of the Dean. This Committee may have and normally will have both internal and external members. The Dean serves as Chair, and the Director of the Center for Rapid Product Realization serves as an ex-officio member of the Committee. A minimum of two members of the Kimmel School Tenure and Promotion Committee also serve on the Committee.

The Kimmel School Engagement Committee has both pre-screening and post-review evaluation responsibilities over Scholarship of Application programs. Specifically, the Committee is responsible for:

- Pre-screening of engagement activities to ensure that they match the mission of the department and the resources available;
- Assistance in developing roadmaps for success in the planning, implementation and documentation of Scholarship of Application programs;
- Post-activity evaluation to ensure completion and impact; and,
- Validation as scholarship of application.

Forms of engagement may include significant funded support, projects resulting in noteworthy economic impact, and/or quality of life improvements.

Forms of dissemination (other than traditional journal publications) may include technical reports, policy statements, guidebooks, economic impact statements, and/or pamphlets. Due to the proprietary nature of some engagement projects, peer review and
dissemination may be restricted to the Committee and the client’s organization only (although in practice this may limit the Committee’s ability to evaluate the impact of the scholar’s work).

Additionally, results of scholarly engagement may be documented through report(s) from stakeholders and/or clients documenting the magnitude of delivery and/or impact resulting from the engagement activities and application of disciplinary expertise. Peers are those who have the academic, industrial, and/or entrepreneurial expertise and knowledge to form an unbiased evaluation of the magnitude and impact of scholarly engagement activities. Examples of peers associated with client(s) and stakeholder(s) may include, but are not limited to the following: engineering and/or technical personnel; chief executive or financial officers; and proprietors. Examples of peers not associated with the client(s) and/or the stakeholder(s) may include, but are not limited to other professional with related and adequate academic, industrial, and/or entrepreneurial experience and expertise and directors of regional economic and development centers. The Committee may consider formal reports, or letter of support from client(s) or stakeholder(s) documenting impact, jobs saved, new product launches, etc. in its assessments.