I. Overview – The Department of Mathematics and Computer Science establish the following policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty evaluation for the purposes of 1) informing faculty members how their work is being evaluated, 2) encouraging faculty members to bring their work to a high level of professional quality, 3) promoting continuing professional development of faculty members; 4) providing a consistent, professional basis for assessments when decisions regarding the status of the faculty member are being made. The document is guided first and foremost by The Code of the UNC system and secondly by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. 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).

II. Domains of Evaluation
Although the domains of evaluation speak directly to teaching, scholarship, and service, the department recognizes the importance of integration and values holistic activities that exhibit components of teaching, scholarship, and service which cannot be separated easily. It is at the discretion of the faculty member to determine the most appropriate domain(s) to document the components of the integrative activities. Peer review of materials will be conducted as indicated in Section III of this document.
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
   1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:
      a. Pedagogical Content Knowledge – This area includes content expertise and instructional design skills. Content expertise includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education. Instructional design refers to the design of course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
         i. Evidence may include but is not limited to:
            • Professional preparation and experience
            • Competence in course content
            • Currency in scholarship
            • Currency in pedagogical design
• Course development
• Organization of course and syllabus
• Appropriate course workload
• Preparation for class

ii. Documentation may include but is not limited to:
(required documentation is denoted by a *)
• Self evaluation*
• Peer review of course materials*
• Sample course materials

b. Professional Aspects of Teaching - This area includes instructional delivery skills, course management skills, and evaluation of students. Instructional delivery skills refer to communicating information clearly, creating environments conducive to learning, and using an appropriate variety of teaching methods. Course management skills refer to giving timely feedback to students, making efficient use of class time, and handling classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately. Evaluation of students refers to designing assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensuring fairness in student evaluation and grading, and providing constructive feedback on student work.

i. Evidence may include but is not limited to:
• Classroom presentation
• Organization of class time
• Efficient use of class time
• Grading and general fairness
• Timely feedback given to students

ii. Documentation may include but is not limited to:
(required documentation is denoted by a *)
• Self evaluation*
• Peer observation
• Peer review of course materials*
• Sample course materials
• University student assessment of instruction (SAI) and Departmental student evaluations.*

c. Student Response to Instruction -- This area includes facilitation of student learning and faculty/student relationships. Facilitation of student learning refers to maintaining high academic standards, preparing students for professional work and development, facilitating student achievement, and providing audiences for student work. Faculty/student relationships refers to displaying a positive
attitude toward students, showing concern for students by being approachable and available, presenting an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, supporting student learning, and respecting diversity.

i. Evidence may include but is not limited to:
   - Demonstrating interest in student learning
   - Encouragement of classroom participation
   - Availability to students and effective student guidance
   - Maintenance of rapport with students
   - Fostering student interest in subject

ii. Documentation may include but is not limited to:
    (required documentation is denoted by a *)
   - Self evaluation*
   - Peer observation
   - Peer review of course materials*
   - Sample course materials
   - University student assessment of instruction (SAI) and Departmental student evaluations.*

2. Possible sources of evidence for evaluation of teaching (4.05.B.2)
   - Self evaluation
   - Sample teaching materials
   - Peer review of course materials
   - Peer observation of classroom teaching
   - Student assessment of instruction (SAI) and Departmental Student Evaluations

3. General comments – 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.
### Overview: Evaluation of Teaching – 3 Areas with Evidence and Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Measures</th>
<th>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Professional Aspects of Teaching</th>
<th>Student Response to Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence (may include but is not limited to)</td>
<td>• Professional preparation and experience</td>
<td>• Classroom presentation</td>
<td>• Demonstrating interest in student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Competence in course content</td>
<td>• Organization of class time</td>
<td>• Encouragement of classroom participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Currency in scholarship</td>
<td>• Efficient use of class time</td>
<td>• Availability to students and effective student guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Currency in pedagogical design</td>
<td>• Grading and general fairness</td>
<td>• Maintenance of rapport with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course development</td>
<td>• Timely feedback given to students</td>
<td>• Fostering student interest in subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts (may include but is not limited to)</td>
<td>• Self evaluation*</td>
<td>• Self evaluation*</td>
<td>• Self evaluation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Required documentation is denoted with a *)</td>
<td>• Peer review of course materials</td>
<td>• Peer observation</td>
<td>• Peer observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample course materials</td>
<td>• Peer review of course materials</td>
<td>• Peer review of course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample course materials</td>
<td>• Sample course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• University SAI and Departmental student evaluations.*</td>
<td>• University SAI and Departmental student evaluations.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C) 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.

**Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge.
**Scholarship of integration** – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
**Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
**Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

Sources of evidence for evaluation of scholarship—The department values a variety of types of scholarship, and
scholarship must be externally peer reviewed by a recognized organization and be disseminated. Forms of evidence of scholarship can include but are not restricted to the following:

**Modified from: Boyer’s Model of Scholarship by Marta Nibert, Educational Consultant for Occupational Therapy** (http://www.pcrest.com/PC/FGB/BoyerModel.pdf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scholarship</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Measures of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Discovery           | Build new knowledge through traditional research. | • Publishing in peer-reviewed forums  
|                     |         | • Presenting in professional forums  
|                     |         | • Designing original projects and investigations, including work in progress |
| Integration         | Interpret the use of knowledge within or across disciplines | • Publishing in peer-reviewed forums  
|                     |         | • Presenting in professional forums  
|                     |         | • Preparing a comprehensive literature review  
|                     |         | • Writing a textbook  
|                     |         | • Creating a substantive body of original content material, educational tools, and/or applications  
|                     |         | • Directing undergraduate and graduate student research that results in professional presentations or publications  
|                     |         | • Presenting in non-professional forums  
|                     |         | • Writing grant applications to fund original projects and investigations; successful grant proposals are valued most highly. |
| Application         | Aid society or discipline in addressing problems. | • Publishing in peer-reviewed forums  
|                     |         | • Presenting in professional forums  
|                     |         | • Serving as an external consultant  
|                     |         | • Editing, peer reviewing, and other scholarly contributions to professional organizations  
|                     |         | • Designing and/or delivering an extended seminar or workshop  
|                     |         | • Implementing original projects and investigations, including work in progress  
|                     |         | • Writing grant applications to fund society or disciplinary initiatives; successful grant proposals are valued most highly. |
| Teaching and Learning | Enhance knowledge of | • Publishing in peer-reviewed forums  
|                      |         | • Presenting in professional forums |
| discipline, teaching models, and teaching practices. | • Advancing learning theory through classroom research
• Developing and testing instructional materials that results in professional presentations or publications
• Designing and implementing a research-based program-level assessment system that results in professional presentations or publications
• Directing undergraduate and graduate student research that results in professional presentations or publications
• Writing grant applications to fund curriculum research and development; successful grant proposals are valued most highly. |

General comments – 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. Examples include:
- Participating in short courses, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings
- Participating in activities to maintain currency in the discipline

B. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)
1. Service is any activity that provides support, based on an individual’s expertise and/or interests, to the program areas, department, college, university, profession, or community. Forms of service include but are not restricted to the following:
   • Institutional service
   • Community engagement
   • Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership
   • Advising

2. Sources of evidence for evaluation of service –
Forms of evidence of service can include but are not restricted to the following:
   a) Institutional service –
      • Serving on departmental, college, and university committees
      • Instructing for Western off campus
      • Working with student organizations inside or outside of the
discipline
- Working with students in disciplinary or interdisciplinary extracurricular activities
- Mentoring new faculty members
- Mentoring pre-service and graduate student teachers
- Conducting peer observations
- Arranging colloquium talks
- Arranging panel discussions
- Serving as a Liaison with other programs/departments/colleges

b) Community engagement –
- Public school assistance
- Consulting
- Other regional service activities
- Membership in professional organizations

c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership –
- Service to professional organizations
- Service to departmental, college, or university committees with unusually extensive time commitments (e.g. TPR, AFE, PTR, accreditation, faculty recruitment, faculty governance, program review)
- Leadership roles in university affairs or professional organizations

d) Advising – The department values academic advising. Quality advising requires familiarity with curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, and assistance with academic and career planning.

Curriculum advising serves groups such as:
- Undergraduate majors,
- Undergraduate minors,
- Undergraduate second academic concentrations,
- Licensure-only students, and
- Graduate students

Also included in academic advising are the managerial duties associated with student activities such as:
- Thesis/dissertation advising and
- Coordination of and arrangements for students to attend and/or present work at professional meetings.
3. General comments – Professional development activities in the area of service are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events
   A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)
      Overview – In evaluating the performance of faculty members in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science of Western Carolina University, the area of contribution considered most important is teaching, followed by scholarship and service, and then special talents and skills.
      Composition of review committee – AFE Committee: The Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of four members and an alternate elected from the department’s tenured faculty or persons participating in the University of North Carolina System Phased Retirement program from the department. The members and alternate will be elected annually in the spring semester preceding the academic year in which they are to serve. They will be elected by the department’s faculty who are subject to evaluation by the AFE committee after members of the Advisory Committee on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure have been elected. Immediately after this election, the members of the newly formed AFE committee will elect a secretary. The secretary will be responsible for arranging committee meetings, and submitting AFE reports to the Department Head.
      Preparation of documentation and procedures
         All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:
         The Departmental Annual Faculty Data Form
         The Instructor’s Self-Report and Assessment that addresses each of the three areas of teaching (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above). The report should include items such as a statement of a teaching philosophy and a description of goals, methods, and strategies used. This report should be limited to 2 pages maximum.
         The Course Materials Packet that includes:
         • copies of course syllabi (with details of grading and attendance policies) and
         • major assessments (e.g. examinations, projects, papers) for all classes (exclusive of individualized instruction) taught during the evaluation period. Daily handouts, worksheets, and quizzes are not routinely included with this material.
         The Departmental Classroom Observation Form(s) (if
observations are required).

- Mandatory classroom observation of non-tenured faculty—Each tenure-track faculty member will be observed at least once each semester by a member of the departmental tenured faculty. Fixed-term faculty will be observed at least once each semester by a member of the department. The observer will be selected by the Department Head after the Department Head consults with the non-tenured faculty member. Copies of the completed Observation Forms will be given to the Department Head, the faculty member and to the AFE Committee for use in the annual evaluation.

- Mandatory classroom observation of a non-tenured Department Head - Each member of the AFE Committee shall observe the classroom teaching of a non-tenured Department Head at least once each semester. Copies of the completed Observation Forms will be given to the Department Head, the Dean, and the AFE Committee for use in the annual review.

- Optional classroom observations of faculty—Any faculty member may request to be observed by members of the AFE Committee and by at most one additional faculty member. Such a request must be submitted to the Department Head in the first two weeks of the term in which the observation is to be made. In such cases the faculty member will be observed by each AFE Committee member, and possibly by one other faculty member. Copies of the completed Observation Forms will be given to the Department Head, faculty member and to the AFE committee for use in the annual evaluation.

Student Assessment of Instruction—Course evaluations are required of all course sections taught in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science and will be attached to the AFE documents by the Department Head.

The Departmental Student Evaluation Forms will be used during the two weeks of a
semester before the final exam period begins. The forms are to be filled out in class in the absence of the instructor; a student volunteer will immediately deliver them in an envelope to the department secretary where they will be filed. After semester grades have been turned in, a legible copy of the instructor's evaluations will be returned to the instructor.

The University Student Evaluations will be available for all courses and results will be available to instructors after semester grades have been turned in.

The AFE Committee will consider the submitted materials and write a review that addresses teaching, scholarship, and service for each faculty member. This review will be provided to the Department Head and the faculty member. In the area of teaching, the AFE Committee will

- Summarize the Departmental Student Evaluation Forms for each faculty member
- Consider each faculty member’s
  - Teaching Portion of the Annual AFE Data Form
  - Submitted Course Materials Packet;
  - Summarized Departmental Student Evaluation Forms and University Student Evaluations
  - Instructors Self-Report
  - Departmental Classroom Observations Forms (when applicable)
- Discuss the extent to which the faculty member meets the teaching criteria in Section IV.A.1. If more than half of the AFE committee members designate the faculty member’s teaching as “exceeds expectations,” then the final designation will be “exceeds expectations.” In a similar manner, if more than half of the AFE committee members designate the faculty member’s teaching as “unsatisfactory,” then the final designation will be “unsatisfactory.” Otherwise, the final designation will be “meets expectations”.
- Provide feedback in the written review addressing the three areas of teaching.

In the area of scholarship and creative works, for tenured and tenure-track faculty the AFE
Committee will
- Consider each faculty member’s Scholarship Portion of the Annual AFE Data Form and
- Discuss the extent to which the faculty member meets the scholarship criteria in Section IV.A.2. If more than half of the AFE committee members designate the faculty member’s scholarly activity as “exceeds expectations,” then the final designation will be “exceeds expectations”. In a similar manner, if more than half of the AFE committee members designate the faculty member’s scholarly activity as “unsatisfactory,” then the final designation will be “unsatisfactory”. Otherwise, the final designation will be “meets expectations”.
- Provide feedback in the written review addressing the faculty member’s scholarship and creative works.

For faculty with expectations in the area of service, the AFE Committee will
- Consider each faculty member’s Service Portion of the Annual AFE Data Form
- Discuss the extent to which the faculty member meets the service criteria in Section IV.A.3. If more than half of the AFE committee members designate the faculty member’s service as “exceeds expectations,” then the final designation will be “exceeds expectations”. In a similar manner, if more than half of the AFE committee members designate the faculty member’s service as “unsatisfactory,” then the final designation will be “unsatisfactory”. Otherwise, the final designation will be “meets expectations”.
- Provide feedback in the written review addressing the faculty member’s service.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)
1. Overview - In evaluating the performance of faculty members in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science of Western Carolina University, the area of contribution considered most important is teaching, followed by scholarship and service, and then special talents and skills; each faculty member will be evaluated on all criteria.
2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) -- TPR Committee

In the event that the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science has seven or more tenured faculty members, the tenure and promotion advisory committee shall consist of the department head and six tenured faculty members elected by the department’s tenured and tenure track faculty. When the department has six or fewer tenured faculty members, the committee shall be composed of the department’s head and tenured faculty provided the resultant committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members, exclusive of the head.

Whenever the department finds it impossible to form a committee containing at least three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultations with the department and the dean, will, by selecting sufficient tenured faculty from similar departments, form a committee of three tenured faculty for the department.

Committee memberships shall be determined by elections that shall be conducted during the spring term of each year. When there are more than six tenured faculty members, two members will be elected to two-year terms and two members will be elected to one-year terms each year with two continuing members from the previous year. Vacancies will be filled by election. Each committee member who is a candidate for promotion will be replaced by an elected alternate tenured faculty member. The alternate member(s) will participate in all promotion deliberations and promotion appeals for the same promotion action sought by the candidate, but will have no other committee duties. The department head shall be the chair of the committee and shall not vote.

When the department head is the person being considered by the committee, the department head shall excuse himself/herself, and the committee shall elect a pro-term chair (voting) from its membership. The pro-term chair shall submit the committee’s recommendations directly to the appropriate dean. The department head (or any other member of the committee being considered) shall absent himself/herself during the deliberations concerning the department head.

3. Preparation of documentation and procedures—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 when decisions are made at the various review levels. The department student course evaluation forms for the last five years or since initial appointment, whichever is shorter, are to be included in a separate two inch binder.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)
   1. Overview - In evaluating the performance of faculty members in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science of Western Carolina University, the area of contribution considered most important is teaching, followed by scholarship and service, and then special talents and skills; each faculty member will be evaluated on all criteria.

   2. Composition of review committee --
      PTR Committee:
      Each departmental PTR review committee will consist of three tenured faculty members. The department will elect at large two tenured faculty to serve on the PTR committees (each to serve staggered two-year terms), and the individual being reviewed will select one additional tenured faculty to complete his or her individual review committee. A tenured faculty who is up for review the following year may not be newly elected to a PTR committee, and a sitting committee member must step down (a one-year replacement being voted on by the department) during the year in which he or she is reviewed. However, a faculty member under review shall be eligible to serve as one of the “selected” members of another individual’s PTR committee. The department head will not be eligible to serve on any PTR committees.

      “Staggered two-year terms” above means: During the initial election of faculty to the PTR Committees, one individual will be elected to a two-year term and another to a one-year term. Thereafter, those elected will serve two-year terms. During the spring semester the department will vote for the elected members of the PTR committee whose terms begin during the following academic year. The PTR elections will take place after the TPR and AFE elections.

   3. Preparation of documentation and procedures
      a. Performance to be reviewed is limited to the five years preceding review or to the period subsequent to the prior review event, whichever is less. Items to be considered include:
         • The four (4) most recent Annual Faculty Evaluations (including supporting materials such as Annual Review
Data Forms) will be obtained from department files.
• The faculty member being reviewed will provide a current Curriculum Vita and may include other supporting materials.

b. Considerable justification must be given if the tone of the PTR differs from that of the four (4) most recent AFE’s.

c. During the academic year under which the review shall take place, the reviewee shall designate his/her “selected” member of the committee no later than October 15.

d. Each PTR Committee shall complete its review and submit its evaluation to the Department Head no later than March 15 of that same academic year. Each PTR committee shall present its written evaluation to the department head; individual reports may be included. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and an initial draft of his/her evaluation. The department head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head shall then append his/her final evaluation. After examining the complete evaluation, the faculty member then has the option of attaching a written response. In the event that the reviewee is the Department Head, the Dean will serve in the Department Head’s role.

e. Each PTR committee evaluation shall carry the designation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory with respect to the majority opinion. The department head’s final evaluation shall carry the designation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

f. In the case of an unsatisfactory review, the department head will, in consultation with the faculty member, the reviewee’s PTR committee, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, develop a three-year improvement plan within one month of the review. The plan shall include (1) specific areas for improvement; (2) resources available for that improvement; and (3) administrative support provided. The plan will also include consequences for failure to make adequate progress by the third year.

g. The department head will monitor the progress of that plan and provide oral and written assessments of that progress to the faculty member semi-annually.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
   A. Annual Faculty Evaluation

1. Teaching – In order to “meet expectations” in the area of teaching the faculty member must:

   • Submit required documents in a timely fashion
   • Demonstrate competence in each of the three areas of teaching
   • Have student evaluation feedback that is primarily non-negative in nature
   • Provide course materials that meet the course description and objectives in a suitably rigorous fashion.
   • Exhibit evidence of maintaining currency in one’s teaching, or furthering one’s professional development in teaching.

   When faculty members demonstrate exceptional quality of teaching, they will be rated as “exceeds expectations”.

   If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).

2. Scholarship – In order to “meet expectations” in the area of scholarship the faculty member must:

   • Submit required documents in a timely fashion.
   • Demonstrate at least one piece of externally reviewed scholarship OR a collection of evidence of continuing scholarship from any category of the Boyer Model in Section II.B.2.
   • Exhibit evidence of maintaining currency in one’s discipline, sustained problem solving, or furthering one’s professional development.
   • The Department Head will consider progress over multiyear period toward promotion/tenure.

   When faculty members demonstrate exceptional scholarship, they will be rated as “exceeds expectations”.

   If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).
If a faculty member’s position does not include scholarship expectations the rating will be “not applicable”.

3. Service – In order to “meet expectations” in the area of service

- All faculty must submit required documents in a timely fashion.
- All tenured and tenure-track faculty, after their first year of service, are expected to advise students in the Mathematics and Computer Science majors.
- Phased retirees are to continue advising, but will not be given new advisees.
- All advisors are expected to maintain up-to-date check sheets and four year plans on their advisees.
- In addition, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate a variety of forms of service at a level appropriate to their academic rank and/or contractual obligations.

When faculty members demonstrate exceptional quantity or quality of service, they will be rated as “exceeds expectations”.

If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).

If a faculty member’s position does not include service expectations the rating will be “not applicable”.

4. General comments – For the purposes of moving from one level of collegial review to the next, the ratings will be “meets expectations” or “unsatisfactory”. However, the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science ratings are: “unsatisfactory”, “meets expectations”, and “exceeds expectations”.

B. Reappointment (4.06) In order to be recommended for reappointment without conditions the faculty member must:

Teaching –
- meet or exceed expectations in teaching in each year’s AFE review
- demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained growth in teaching
- demonstrate adequate progress towards meeting teaching requirements for tenure

Scholarship –
- meet or exceed expectations in scholarship in each year’s AFE review
• demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained scholarship
• demonstrate adequate progress towards meeting scholarship requirements for tenure

Service –
• meet or exceed expectations in service in each year’s AFE review
• demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained service
• demonstrate adequate progress towards meeting service requirements for tenure

General comments – If the faculty member fails to meet expectations in any of these areas in an AFE review, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of actions taken to address the area(s) identified as “unsatisfactory” by the AFE committee. The TPR committee will review the results of those actions to determine if reappointment with conditions is warranted.

First year reappointment is based largely on academic degrees, professional preparation and experience, promise for sustained future professional achievement, and institutional needs and resources.

Procedures for Feedback:
The TPR Committee will provide feedback to the Department Head and the faculty member addressing the faculty member’s progress toward tenure.

C. Tenure (4.07) In order to be recommended for tenure the faculty member must:

1. Teaching –
   demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained growth in teaching throughout a significant portion of the probationary period
   demonstrate effective teaching and promise for continued growth

2. Scholarship –
   • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained scholarship throughout a significant portion of the probationary period
   • demonstrate evidence of authoring or co-authoring peer reviewed scholarly publications that are national or international in scope.
   Examples of these scholarly publications include but are not limited to the following:
   • Journal articles
   • Book chapters in edited, peer-reviewed volumes

---

1 A candidate may submit evidence that a publication is peer reviewed and national or international in scope.
• Research monographs
• Peer-reviewed, full articles in conference proceedings\(^2\)
• demonstrate promise for continued scholarship

3. Service –
• demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained service throughout a significant portion of the probationary period
• demonstrate promise for continued service

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07) In order to be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor the faculty member must:

1. Teaching –
• possess at least five years of teaching experience at the college level at the rank of assistant professor
• demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained growth in teaching throughout a significant portion of the probationary period
• demonstrate effective teaching and promise for continued growth

2. Scholarship –
• demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained scholarship throughout a significant portion of the probationary period
• demonstrate evidence of authoring or co-authoring peer reviewed scholarly publications that are national or international in scope\(^3\).

Examples of these scholarly publications include but are not limited to the following:
• Journal articles
• Book chapters in edited, peer-reviewed volumes
• Research monographs
• Peer-reviewed, full articles in conference proceedings
• demonstrate achievement in scholarship and promise for scholarly work of distinguished quality

3. Service –
• demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained service throughout a significant portion of the probationary period
• demonstrate achievement in and promise for continued service

E. Promotion to Professor (4.07). In order to be recommended for promotion to

\(^2\) In mathematics education and computer science the accepted disciplinary norms place a strong value on peer-review conference proceedings as evidence of active scholarship. See Appendices A and B.

\(^3\) A candidate may submit evidence that a publication is peer reviewed and national or international in scope.
Professor the faculty member must:

1. Teaching –
   • possess at least ten years of teaching experience at the college level, at least five at the rank of associate professor
   • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained growth in teaching throughout a significant portion of the career
   • demonstrate excellence and promise for continued achievement of distinguished quality in teaching

2. Scholarship –
   • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained scholarship throughout a significant portion of the career, including the most recent five years
   • demonstrate regional, national, or international recognition of scholarly achievement by an appropriate community of peers
   • demonstrate excellence and promise for continued achievement of distinguished quality in scholarship

3. Service –
   • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained service throughout a significant portion of the career, including the most recent five years
   • demonstrate recognition of achievement in service by appropriate peers
   • demonstrate excellence and promise for continued achievement of distinguished quality in service
   • demonstrate leadership in university affairs

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08) In order to receive a satisfactory post-tenure review the faculty member must:
   1. Teaching –
      • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained growth in teaching since the last review event
      • demonstrate effective teaching and promise for continued growth

   2. Scholarship –
      • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained scholarship since the last review event
      • demonstrate promise for continued scholarship

   3. Service –
      • demonstrate evidence of continued and sustained service since the last review event
• demonstrate promise for continued service
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