I. Overview
The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation in the Forensic Science Program. The document is guided by The Code of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University.

The Forensic science (FS) program is interdisciplinary; the degree program represents a deliberate blending of courses and faculty expertise across disciplines within the College of Arts and Sciences (Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry & Physics, Criminal Justice), and a program in the College of Health and Human Sciences (Environmental Health). The FS program is guided by a Program Director and an Advisory Committee consisting of faculty from the disciplines listed above. We recognize that faculty vary in their teaching, scholarly and service activities, and that there is not a single model that defines success. This AFE/TPR document for faculty with an FS appointment reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the appointments held by FS faculty.

For purposes of Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) and Tenure Promotion and Reappointment (TPR) for FS faculty:

- The supporting Department Head (DH) for a FS faculty member is the DH of the disciplinary home of that faculty member (e.g., a faculty member specializing in genetics would be assigned to teach in Biology while a faculty member with expertise in analytical chemistry would be assigned to Chemistry & Physics).

  The AFE and TPR committees for FS faculty will consist of the same individuals and will be hereafter referred to as the FS Collegial Review Committee (CRC).

- Evaluation of FS faculty will reflect the teaching, scholarship and service contributions to the FS Program with support from Departments in which the FS faculty being evaluated have teaching responsibilities.

- Where FS faculty hold interdisciplinary appointments, separate AFE/TPR evaluations by Departments outside of FS will not be done, because the interests of these Departments will be represented by their DHs and by individuals from these Departments on the FS CRC.

- The CRC for FS faculty will consist of tenured individuals as follows: 1 faculty member appointed by the DH of the Biology Department, 1 faculty member appointed by the DH from the Chemistry & Physics Department, and 1 appointee from a support program for FS (e.g., Anthropology or Criminal Justice) designated by the Dean of Arts & Sciences.
The DHs of Chemistry & Physics and Biology will also serve on the CRC as will the Director of the FS Program.

- The FS Program Director will prepare the AFE and TPR review of faculty members assigned primarily to the FS Program. The DH statements for AFE and TPR will be prepared by the DH of the supporting department(s) for each faculty member in the FS program which the faculty member serves. The DHs from all appropriate departments served by the FS faculty member will sign the prepared statement with an option to include an addendum to the statement that reflects additional information regarding the FS faculty members’ contribution to their respective Department.

- The Advisory Committee for the Forensic Science Program will consist of a similar makeup at the CRC (DH and one faculty each from Biology and Chemistry & Physics, two appointees from the Dean of Arts & Sciences), however, appointees designated by the DHs and Dean may be different faculty members than for the CRC.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:
   a) Pedagogical Content Knowledge -- Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.

   b) Professional Aspects of Teaching -- Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise, teaching is also a profession that requires 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.

   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 also 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
   a) Self-evaluation. Narrative statement addressing pedagogical content knowledge, particularly with regard to currency. What are you doing to help students understand the most important material in your field? How have you changed your teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and advancements for the courses you teach? Faculty members are not expected to incorporate major changes every year, but maintaining currency should be evident over time. (4.05B2C)
b) **Peer review of teaching materials.** The departmental collegial review committee will evaluate, for all instructional faculty, teaching materials, including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. *(4.05B2B)*

c) **Direct observation of instruction.** All faculty within the FS Program will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually. Members of the department’s collegial review committee will observe each faculty member in a class and also meet with them to discuss and evaluate their teaching materials (see section on AFE). *(4.05.B2B)*

d) **Student assessment of instruction.** All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAIAs using a form of the Senate-approved 20-item university-wide SAI instrument. *(4.05B2A)*

The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution, but we attach the greatest weight to the peer review of teaching and quantitative SAIAs. 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.

3. **General comments**

   Faculty members should have the ability to create an atmosphere for learning, and stimulate learning by students. This ability can best be assessed through the University criteria outlined above. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting the University expectations, the cumulative record of faculty should reflect that they also meet the supporting Department’s and FS Program’s load by contributing to several of the following:

   * teaching large section courses;
   * courses for non-major students;
   * teaching service and core courses: 100-300 level;
   * teaching 300-600 elective level courses;
   * teaching courses involving individual instruction (independent research at the undergraduate and graduate level).

a) **Professional Development**

   Documentation of quality teaching can be enhanced by participation in pedagogy-related conferences, workshops, and courses.

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

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four 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. Consistent with university policy, there must be dissemination and external review of scholarly work for it to be used in faculty evaluations.
a) **Scholarship of discovery** — Original research that advances knowledge. For example: publication in a peer reviewed journal or presentation of novel data at a scientific conference.

b) **Scholarship of integration** — Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time. For example: publishing a textbook for the discipline or publishing a review article.

c) **Scholarship of application** — Application of disciplinary expertise. For example: obtaining a patent for an invention 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. For example: publish in a peer reviewed journal related to the scholarship of teaching or presentation of novel insights/data at a teaching conference.

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

Scholarship productivity of FS faculty must be dominated by discovery. Scholarship productivity of tenured faculty may reflect any mixture of the four types described above. Evidence of productivity is indicated by the following:

* participation in research;
* number, and quality of publications;
* recognition by professional organizations such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions, election to office involving activities related to the advancement of the sciences, requests for critical reviews of research proposals, and requests to referee articles by other scientists;
* evidence of participation in student research such as the production of reports, student oral or poster presentations, theses, or published articles;
* evaluation of work by peers outside the department and the University. All scholarship must be peer reviewed. We define peer review as the evaluation of the scholarly work by people external to Western Carolina University with knowledge and expertise in the discipline in order to determine the quality of the work; and where the results of that assessment are made known to the faculty member and others, as appropriate for the work being evaluated. Scholarly work also must be disseminated to a broad audience so that knowledge is advanced. In cases where scholarly work does not fit the traditional academic peer review model it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document in writing how their scholarship fits into the model.
* presentation of papers or posters at professional meetings;
* evidence of keeping abreast of the developments in the discipline.

3. **General comments** — Scholarship is expected of all faculty in the Forensic Science Program, though the type, amount, and role of scholarship may vary between faculty members due to expertise, interests, needs of the Department and University, and stage of career.
a) **Grant proposals and awards** – The cumulative record of tenured and tenure-track faculty should show evidence of active attempts to obtain funding if required to maintain their research/teaching programs.  

b) **Professional development** in scholarship is enhanced by a faculty member’s participation in activities such as grant writing workshops, short courses that demonstrate use of new technology within their discipline, working with and/or using equipment (that WCU does not have) of colleagues at other institutions or agencies. Participation in a mentoring program as the person being mentored is also considered professional development.

C. **Service (4.04.C.3 & 4.05.D)**

1. **Types of service**

   a) **Institutional service** is general expertise service done as an act of good citizenship such as serving on committees, recruiting students, mentoring new faculty members and advising administrators. This service might include: participation in committee work at the departmental, college and university level; participation in open house activities, orientation and other forms of student recruitment; helping new faculty members succeed in their new positions by providing advice regarding teaching, research and service; advising administrators regarding the needs of the program, department, college and university (this can include advice regarding changes in curriculum, programs, student enrollments, grant requests, challenges associated with resources for advising, teaching and research, personnel issues etc.); helping each other by presenting guest lectures in other faculty’s classes, if a faculty is unable to hold class.

   b) **Community engagement** includes activities that require scientific expertise such as participation in local school activities, presentations to local community groups, aid to local organizations, mentoring elementary, middle and high school students, participation in science fair judging, professional volunteer work and interactions with media.

   c) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership includes:**

      * Service related to: hosting special speakers; operation and management of core facilities such as the DNA sequencing facility; invited presentations at the local, state, national or international level; grant proposal review, manuscript review and editor positions for books, chapters and journals; professional societies, as an officer, committee member or program organizer.

      * Service on committees that require an extraordinary amount of time, such as faculty senate, oversight committees.

      * Service related to exceptional leadership that provides an improved instructional quality, administration, or research capabilities.
d) Advising students includes being informed about curriculum and related processes, being available to advisees, and assisting academic and career planning. These activities include familiarity of:

- the specific concentrations available to students pursuing the B.S. in Forensic Science;
- the four semester plan regarding upper level elective course offerings;
- where to direct students to find research options for students completing the research component of their degree;
- how science and math courses completed by FS students fit into the liberal studies requirements;
- the requirements for liberal studies, junior/senior courses and total hours toward graduation;
- the surcharge policy;
- the requirement of availability to meet with advisees during advising time and during the drop/add period of the semester;
- the responsibility for timely responsiveness to email and telephone inquiries regarding advising;
- where to direct students to find out about career opportunities for students completing a B.S. in Forensic Science.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence – Administrative professional judgment can appropriately be applied in this area of evaluation. The workload of Committee Chairpersons will be taken into account. Other evidence such as letters of appreciation can be taken into account.

3. General comments – Forensic Science faculty members should serve the University and the public in ways appropriate to their discipline and an educational institution of our type.

   a) Professional development in the area of service can be enhanced by participation in activities that improve leadership, advising, or engagement skills (e.g., workshops, conferences, training sessions, formal courses).

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview

   The statements in Section I of this document applies to the AFE review process. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service expectations described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of the fiscal-calendar-year reflected in each AFE portfolio. In addition:

   * Tenured faculty within the departments supporting the Forensic Science Program will serve on the Collegial Review Committee (CRC; aka the TPR or AFE committee) on a rotating basis, with a length of service of three years. The Department Heads of Chemistry & Physics and Biology will be members of the CRC and will each make an appointment of a faculty member to the committee. The Dean of Arts & Sciences will appoint one faculty member
and they or their appointee, will also serve on the FS CRC. The FS Program Director will be a non-voting member of the CRC.

* The CRC will review materials submitted by each faculty member and will make written comments regarding teaching, scholarship, and service. A single written statement prepared by the committee and signed by the Chair of the Committee will be part of the overall review documentation. The FS Program Director will use both the information provided in the faculty member's AFE document plus the CRC's statement in preparing his/her letter. The FS faculty member will be provided these two statements from the FS Program Director.

* The faculty member has one week to respond to the written review statement. The FS Program Director will consult with each member of the faculty to review his/her evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance, if necessary. The faculty member must sign the reports to indicate receipt, but has the right to add a written statement of acceptance, clarification, or rebuttal to be included with the FS Program Director's report. The FS Program Director shall, following the meeting with the individual and receipt of any additional written statement from the faculty member, reconsider his/her report and either amend, or forward it as previously written.

* A summary of the year's faculty performance results and any written statements by the faculty member shall be prepared and submitted to the Dean by the end of the spring semester by the FS Program Director.

2. Composition of review committee
The composition of the AFE committee is identical for the CRC committee. In the event that the AFE of a member of this committee is being reviewed, that member will excuse him/herself from the process.

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 (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) direct observation(s) of classroom teaching (required for non-tenured faculty)
         c) Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)
         d) copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials (required for all non-tenured faculty)
            i. Required documents will include: Syllabi from two different courses taught over the covered year (faculty members who have taught only one course will submit a syllabus from that course) and examples of methods for assessing student learning from two different courses taught over the covered year (faculty members who have
taught only one course will submit materials from that course). Optional materials may include: Other materials that address teaching the candidate wishes to submit, including, but not limited to, reading and assignment lists, study questions, handouts, slides, computer programs, or student products.

ii. Procedure: Each untenured faculty member’s teaching materials will be reviewed by a member of the CRC who will also observe the faculty member teach. Criteria that may be assessed include the following, which will be discussed by the CRC committee member and faculty member. The CRC member will include this assessment and results of the discussion of the teaching materials in their report to the CRC.

- Scholarly content: Course topics, texts and materials are up to date and appropriate for the course level.
- Organization: provides evidence that class sessions, assignments, and assessments are sequenced in alignment with the course goals.
- Opportunities to apply course concepts: There is evidence that students are required to apply concepts.
- Uses a variety of assessment procedures when feasible: Grades and other feedback are based on multiple methods.
- Assessments are tied to course goals: there is evidence that assessment procedures reflect stated goals.
- Accessibility to students: the syllabus or other materials indicate how students can interact with the instructor.

2) Scholarship and Creative Activity
The summary of scholarship, which applies to all tenured/tenure-track faculty and fixed term faculty with research expectations. Faculty will include the items listed in the AFE Template provided by the disciplinary support Department Head.

3) Service
The summary of service will include the items listed in the AFE Template provided by the Department Head.

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document
The AFE Portfolio is due to the CRC by the last Friday in February each year. The portfolio will include information for items III.A.3.a.1-3, along with a filled in template, and course syllabi and exams from the previous two semesters assembled in a 1.5” 3-ring binder. Faculty may include other instructional-related materials in addition to syllabi and exams if they so choose. A blank template will be provided each year to the faculty member and will include a table to document teaching load and activities for the following:
- List of courses taught
- Total number of credit and contact hours
• Total number of students taught
• Number of different lecture and laboratory preparations
• List of courses or laboratories that were new or involved significant new preparations or new textbook
• List of independent studies supervised and brief statement of faculty role
• Teaching award considerations (nominated, finalist, awarded)
• Participation in pedagogy-related courses or workshops
• Brief documentation of use or development of new, creative, or innovative techniques, content or materials
• List of student professional presentations supervised.

c. Evaluation of Instructors, Lecturers, and Part-time faculty
   Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated based on data from the following sources:
   1. Direct observation of teaching by tenured peers.

   2. Peer review of teaching materials, using the supporting Department’s AFE format for teaching each spring (as above).

   3. Student Assessment of Instruction, using the supporting Department’s approved instrument, for each course taught.

   4. Self assessment, performed by each faculty member in a brief statement.

   5. Service: Instructors, but not Lecturers or Part-time Faculty, are expected to contribute service to the program including student advising, committee service, Open House, and/or scholarship, etc. The service duties expected of an instructor will be explicitly stated in the contract issued when the faculty member is hired.

   * The FS Program Director will write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during AFE preparation in the spring.
   * The FS Program Director shall place in the faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer teaching observation report, peer review of teaching materials, and a summary of all available SAI reports.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)
   1. Overview – The philosophy statement in Section I of this document applies to the reappointment, tenure and promotion review process. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative record.
Faculty are expected to show improvement or continued excellence in teaching during their six years leading up to tenure application as reflected in peer evaluations and student evaluations.

Faculty are expected to increase their service as their progress through their tenure track period. Faculty initially serve only on department and program committees and have few advisees, by the third and fourth year faculty are expected to also serve on college and/or university wide committees and to carry an increased advising load.

Faculty are expected to begin their scholarship with grant application submissions and gathering of preliminary data. Subsequently faculty are expected to work with an increasing number of students and have obtained necessary funding to support their work. Lastly, faculty are expected to have their work accepted for publication in externally reviewed journals by the last years leading up to their tenure application.

2. **Composition of review committee (4.07.D.1)** - The Forensic Science CRC for TPR will have the same membership as the AFE committee (see section III.A.1).

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** - The statement in Section I of this document applies to post-tenure review. The Domains of Evaluation for teaching, scholarship and service described in Section II of this document serve as the basis for evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative record.

2. **Composition of review committee** – The post-tenure review committee will consist of the CRC.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – The post-tenure review documents will consist of a faculty member’s CV, copies of all AFE reports from the CRC during the review period, and copies of the Department Head’s AFE reports during the review period.

Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the Forensic Science Program
A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with his or her rank as described below.

2. Scholarship – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with his or her rank as described below.

3. Service – Faculty must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section II of this document that are consistent with his or her rank as described below.

4. General comments – Part-time/non tenure-track instructors must satisfy the criteria outlined in Section III.A.3.c. of this document.

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching - To achieve the teaching mission and aspiration of WCU and the strategic goals of the Forensic Science Program, the faculty in Biology and Chemistry & Physics have expectations of how and what we teach. We expect that in addition to satisfactorily meeting Department definitions of load and teaching effectiveness, the cumulative record of faculty should reflect that they regularly update their courses, maintain good student course evaluations, and contribute to one or more of the following:
   * Teaching large section courses for non-major students
   * Teaching service and core courses: 100-300 level
   * Teaching 300-600 elective level courses
   * Teaching courses involving individual instruction (independent study and undergraduate and graduate research courses).

2. Scholarship – Faculty must show evidence they are developing a research program dominated by the scholarship of discovery. This evidence may include peer-reviewed publications; oral and poster presentations; grants applied for; grants funded; research in progress; involvement with students; unpublished research and manuscripts; lectures based on discovery research presented at non-professional meetings; other indications of keeping current in the field; review of grants and manuscripts. The most critical of these components are involvement of students in research, peer reviewed publications, active pursuit of funding necessary to support their work (either internally or externally) and invited presentations.

Although scholarship of untenured tenure-track faculty must be dominated by discovery, productivity related to the other three types of scholarship described in section II. B. 1. of this document is also valued and will count toward meeting scholarship expectations in the Forensic Science Program. Evidence of scholarship will be those activities listed in the above paragraph.

3. Service - Faculty must show meaningful participation in program and departmental activities, especially where the faculty member can make
substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising). In addition faculty are expected to contribute to college and/or university wide service activities (e.g. governance, awards, student recruitment). It is expected that Faculty increase their service as they progress through their tenure track period. Initially Faculty serve only on department and program committees and have few advisees, by the third and fourth year faculty are expected to also serve on college and/or university wide committees and to carry an increased advising load.

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member must have demonstrated a consistent and solid record of teaching over several years. The faculty member must have demonstrated proficiency in a range of teaching preparations, which include teaching at different levels (introductory/liberal studies courses to upper level and graduate courses in the major) and class types (traditional lecture courses, independent studies, field investigation courses, etc.). Peer evaluations must be consistently positive for the last three years prior to tenure application and student evaluations for all class sections should indicate a majority of students believe the instructor is an effective teacher.

2. Scholarship - In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of 1) an on-going, established research program, 2) that has been productive, and 3) shows promise of continued productivity. Such a record is typically evidenced by publications in peer-reviewed journals, involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research activities, and the ability to obtain external funds, if necessary, to carry out scholarly activities. The scholarship of discovery is expected to dominate, but the scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are also valued. All forms of scholarship should be both disseminated and subject to external peer review (see section II. B. 2.). Most faculty will use their first few years to establish their research laboratory and/or field sites, gather data, and to obtain the necessary funding for their research, later years are expected to be more productive in terms of publications.

Our departments expect faculty to actively engage students in learning using a teacher-scholar model. This requires that faculty are active, productive scholars and that their scholarly activity provides students with opportunities to enrich their educational experience. It is not feasible to establish a standard publication expectation for tenure because 1) the Forensic Science Program encompasses a wide-range of disciplines within the broad fields of biology, chemistry, and physics with research approaches ranging from computer-
Based to lab-based to field-based; 2) the highly variable, and sometimes
lengthy time it may take from project initiation to publication; some research
programs require extensive data for publication; and 3) the expectation of
student involvement in research, which requires significant time and may
decrease scholarly productivity.

The typical successful case for tenure will include a minimum of two
publications accepted in peer-reviewed journals. However, the number of
peer-reviewed publications is not the sole source of evidence that will be
considered in granting tenure. It is the responsibility of the faculty member
being considered for tenure to demonstrate that their scholarship is 1) on-
going, 2) productive, and 3) has promise for continued productivity.

3. Service – In addition to the criteria described for reappointment, a faculty
member will have engaged in service beyond the department and program
prior to promotion to associate professor. This type of service includes
discipline-based service to the community or society or service to the
profession. Faculty must show meaningful participation in program and
departmental activities, especially where the faculty member can make
substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising). In addition faculty are
expected to contribute to college and/or university wide service activities
(e.g., governance, awards, student recruitment).

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for
criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
1. Teaching – Criteria for meeting expectations are the same as for tenure

2. Scholarship – Criteria for meeting expectations are the same as for tenure

3. Service – Criteria for meeting expectations are the same as for tenure

4. General comments – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for
criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)
1. Teaching - Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory
established in earning tenure, and should demonstrate leadership as a teacher.
Faculty should show excellence in the classroom in terms of teaching skills
and/or student learning. Evidence of leadership could include publications
related to pedagogy, mentoring of young faculty, or participation (as a leader)
in teaching workshops or seminars. Evidence of superior classroom
performance can be reflected in peer evaluation, student evaluations and
student learning assessment data, if available.
2. **Scholarship** - It is expected that a faculty member’s research program will include scholarship of discovery, but productivity in scholarship of integration, application, and of teaching and learning are also highly valued. Faculty should show continued progress on the trajectory established in earning tenure as evidenced by activities required for tenure but also should show evidence of their scholarship having a broader and long-lasting impact on their discipline, education, and community. Faculty are expected to have established a national/international reputation reflected in presentations at national/international meetings as well as publications in prestigious national and international journals. In addition faculty are expected to have obtained external funding if necessary to support their research. Evidence of broader and long-lasting impact also includes being recognized by professional organizations such as invitations to speak or participate in panel discussions; performing critical reviews of research programs and proposals; and refereeing articles for peer-reviewed journals.

3. **Service** – Faculty should show broadening contributions to service. This service should reflect clear evidence of a high level of performance, which should include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities internal and external to the university.

4. **General comments** – Faculty should refer to Section II of this document for criteria describing domains of teaching, scholarship and service evaluation.

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

1. **Teaching**
   Faculty must satisfy the criteria for tenure, and must be engaged in other activities that are consistent with his or her rank as described above.

2. **Scholarship**
   Faculty must demonstrate productivity in any of the four areas of scholarship by having at least two peer reviewed publications over a five year period, continuing to involve students in research, demonstrating the ability to obtain funds necessary to carry out research, and having a research program that promises continued productivity in the future. Faculty will not be penalized for diminished scholarship because of significant increase in important service contributions (see comments below).

3. **Service**
   Faculty should show broadening contributions to service. This service should reflect clear evidence of a high level of performance beyond that expected for tenure, which would include the evolution of the faculty member from a participant to a leader in service activities (see comments below).
4. General comments

The service, teaching, and scholarship expectations of tenured faculty may vary over time. Situations where any of the three areas deviate significantly from the norm must receive prior approval from the Department Head and Dean. For example, tenured faculty who have been at WCU for lengthy careers are primary sources of institutional knowledge regarding history and operations. This knowledge enables faculty to contribute in a unique way to service. In addition, faculty may have significant professional service contributions beyond the University. These service activities are extremely valuable and should not be overlooked.

G. Assigning Rank to an Instructor Position (APR 12.I.4.C)

The disciplinary support departments may offer fixed term instructor positions at the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor of Instruction depending upon the qualifications of the candidate. Ranks of Assistant through Full Professor for fixed term instructor positions (including endowed professors) generally will require equivalent qualifications to tenure track positions. However, because instructors have a higher teaching load and are not necessarily required (nor typically supported) to conduct research, weighting of their scholarship can be adjusted for their overall record of performance and may include all forms of Boyer scholarship. The Forensic Science CRC must vote on assigning rank for all instructors who request such consideration and approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Provost are also required.