Department of Psychology
Collegial Review Document
Effective Fall, 2012

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

I. Overview —The Department of Psychology seeks to attract and retain colleagues who are interesting, productive, and scholarly in everything they do. Our first priority is to be very good teachers, and to be scholarly in our teaching. The department needs to balance teaching, scholarship, and service, but individual faculty members do not all need to achieve exactly the same balance. Certainly we will differ with regard to specialty area within our disciplines, but we will also vary in terms of the types of scholarship we emphasize, investment in service and engagement, and balance between research and practice. This complex and rather abstract blend of expectations, which may well differ by individual, is hard to specify and harder to quantify. Nevertheless, we feel that it is important to provide faculty members with guidelines to help them develop productive and gratifying careers, guidelines specific enough to be practical, yet flexible enough to promote the individual differences that make our department a great place to live and work.

Beyond the traditional domains of teaching, scholarship, and service, overarching behavioral expectations include professionalism, ethicality, and collegiality. 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.¹

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Psychology. 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 college. 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

¹ 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. Non-collegial behavior interferes with the ability of colleagues to achieve the mission and goals of the department, college, or university.
with the WCJ 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.

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. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman (1987) has called this combination "pedagogical content knowledge" to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and 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 – and different disciplines often approach teaching differently – teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.

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

2. Methods of Evaluation

a) Self-evaluation. The candidate will prepare a 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. Faculty members
may reflect on any other aspects of their teaching effectiveness they deem relevant. (4.05B2C)

b) **Peer review of teaching materials.** The departmental Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee (PRTM) will evaluate a defined set of teaching materials for all instructional faculty, using the departmental rating form. (4.05B2B)

c) **Direct observation of instruction.** All tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually, using the departmental protocol. The Department Head will be one observer, and a second observer will be a full-time faculty member with at least three years of teaching experience, selected by the Department Head. (4.05 B2B)

d) **Student assessment of instruction.** All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAI's using a form of the Senate-approved 20-item university-wide SAI instrument. For primary summative evaluation, course averages are used for those courses with at least 5 respondents who represent at least 25% course enrollment, or for low-enrollment organized courses (4-10 students) in which fewer respondents represent at least 50% of enrollment. (4 05B2A)

3. **General comments** – 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 substantive teaching materials and quantitative SAI's. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued.

**B. Scholarship (4.05C)**

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuation of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples are described in this section. The Department of Psychology recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than another, and all Boyer categories are valued equally.

   a) **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge.

   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.

   An activity that qualifies as scholarship, regardless of type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) the activity is subjected to external peer review; (2) there is clear evidence of rigor; and (3) the outcomes are disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community. Activities that result in outcomes or implications with broader external utility (i.e., higher real-world impact) are particularly valued. These three criteria help to differentiate the scholarship of teaching and learning from teaching, and the scholarship of application from service/engagement. Peer review can include traditional forms (e.g., journal
reviewers, editors, committees awarding grants), but it can also include a broader community of scholars. For example, it can include both blind and open reviews of items presented for publication or presentation, and it can include “substantial” invited addresses to conferences, where the peers constitute members of a program committee.

2. Methods of evaluation – Scholarship in the Department of Psychology, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of a “Goodwin Unit” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. Although what constitutes a Goodwin Unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the TPR Advisory Committee. Some scholarly activities are of such high value that they will be recognized as achieving two units, most activities will equate to one unit, and some activities will equate to a half unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be achieved.

Category A (major works):

Two Goodwin Units -
- Substantial contribution to an article in journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (e.g., an APA journal, an APS journal, Science)
- Authorship of the first edition of a scholarly book
- Editorship of an edited book

One Goodwin Unit -
- Authorship of a peer-reviewed journal article
- A chapter in an edited book
- A patent
- Authorship of subsequent editions of a scholarly book
- A substantial technical report for a program evaluation project if subjected to formal external peer review as described below in general comments, and widely disseminated

Category B (minor works):

One Goodwin Unit -
- An invited address at a conference
- A substantial technical report for a program evaluation project with limited dissemination
- A successful external grant proposal

One-half Goodwin Unit -

---

2 Dr. Jim Goodwin was a member of our faculty from 2001 to 2011 and is now Professor Emeritus. An exemplary scholar in his own right, he helped to develop and refine the evaluation of scholarship used in this document.
o A scholarly book review
o Presentation at a professional conference
o A successful internal research grant proposal
o An unsuccessful substantial external grant proposal

3. General comments – These 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. We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present "interesting things" that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimate scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary nature, utilizing an alternative peer review process. The candidate may request a prior review of the proposed project in order to get feedback from the TPR Advisory Committee. If the candidate chooses to submit a project for credit in category A, he or she should so inform the Department Head and provide a list of five potential external reviewers by the beginning of fall semester. The Department Head will select two reviewers, at least one of which will be from the candidate's list. Reviewers should have demonstrated expertise in the relevant specialty area, hold the doctoral degree, and be employed in an accredited college or university. The Department Head will send to the reviewers the candidate's project, a copy of the departmental CRD to provide context, and the departmental evaluation protocol to guide the review. Each external reviewer will review the project and complete the protocol. The candidate will be provided copies of both review protocols to include in the dossier. Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are also positively valued.

C. Service (4.04.C.3 and 4.05.D)

1. Types of service:
   a) Institutional service – committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring, at all levels, including department, college/school, and university.
   b) Community engagement – providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level.
   c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership - includes service in professional organizations, contributions to accreditation documents, administrative duties such as Department Head, a major role in faculty governance, etc. Serving as a reviewer for journals, conferences, granting agencies, and so forth, would also be included, as would serving as a member of an editorial board.
   d) Advising – actively and accurately advising appropriate load of undergraduate and/or graduate students, if role-applicable; being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees and assistance with academic and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation committee service as well as advising student professional organizations.)
2. **Methods of evaluation** – 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** – Faculty members are expected to participate in service activity at each institutional level (department, college/school, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students to the extent that this is role-applicable. 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. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department.

III. **Specific Procedures for Review Events**

A. **Annual Faculty Evaluation**

1. **Overview** – All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. Deadlines for completion of the review process are determined by the Deans and Provost.

2. **Composition of review committees** – In the Department of Psychology, AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by the Department Head, rather than by a faculty committee. The DCRD Review 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 Peer Review of Teaching Materials Committee is a 3-member committee consisting of full-time faculty members, with 3-year staggered terms. One new member is elected annually.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   a) Documentation will primarily exist in the digital repository of faculty activities (Digital Measures), Banner, and CoursEval.
   b) The faculty member should submit an AFE Case Statement in fields created for this purpose in Digital Measures: Teaching, Service, and Scholarship. These paragraphs should be used to highlight activities that are documented formally in the digital repository report and to provide explanation for any aspects of the record as warranted. The Teaching statement should address the issue of Pedagogical Content Knowledge described above, particularly with regard to currency. Faculty members may optionally reflect on any other aspects of their teaching effectiveness they deem relevant. Entries in the Service and Scholarship fields are also optional. Basically, the faculty member is making his or her “case” for the year.
c) The primary documentation will be a report extracted by the Department Head from the digital repository (e.g., Digital Measures). The date range will be from April 1 of the previous year to March 31 of the current year. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to extract this report themselves prior to the official extraction to be sure data are complete and accurate.

d) 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. The faculty member meets with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement, and he or she may prepare a rebuttal statement if he or she wishes.

4. Evaluation of adjunct faculty - These procedures and guidelines are based upon the assumption that the adjunct faculty member is responsible only for teaching. Those with contractual agreements specifying other expectations will be evaluated using appropriate aspects and weightings of section IV.A below

a) All adjunct faculty will be evaluated with regard to teaching effectiveness, using data from the following sources:
   i. **Peer review of teaching materials**, using the departmental protocol, annually.
   ii. **Student Assessment of Instruction**, using the university instrument, for each section taught.

b) Adjunct 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.

c) The Department Head shall write an evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness during the preparation of other AFEs in the spring.

d) The Department Head shall place in the adjunct faculty member’s file the evaluation summary, the peer review of teaching materials, and all available SAI reports.

B. Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment

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

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

   b) The College Collegial Review Committee shall be chaired by the Dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of faculty members of the college as specified in the Faculty Handbook.
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** – as noted above, detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually by the Office of the Provost. The candidate will need (1) the departmental CRD, (2) the Guidelines for Preparation of the Dossier, and (3) the timetable for the review process.

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

1. **Overview** - Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship, and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event (other than AFE).

2. **Composition of review committee** - The departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee shall comprise five tenured members of the department, excluding the Department Head and any members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review, elected annually by the departmental full-time faculty. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty in the department, the Provost, in consultation with the Department Head and Dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   a) The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.
   b) The Faculty Handbook stipulates minimum documentation as being a current CV and the four most recent AFE Statements prepared by the Department Head. In our case, we use a modification of the departmental AFE process as primary documentation. The faculty member should ensure that his or her Digital Measures portfolio is current and accurate, including the AFE Case Statement (the self-evaluative statement regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge is required for PTR candidates; other components of the Case Statement are optional). The Department Head will extract a report from Digital Measures using the AFE Report format, spanning the previous 4 years. This report will include SAI data and PRTM data for the 4-year period under review and will serve in lieu of the CV. The Department Head will append the four most recent AFE Statements, providing the combined packet to the PTR Committee.
   c) The Committee shall meet to discuss each case and shall present its written evaluation to the Department Head, including a recommendation of “Satisfactory” or “Not Satisfactory.” 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 his or her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.
   d) See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.
IV. Expectations and Criteria – The criteria specific to each form of review and each type of promotion are described in detail below.

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation: (4.05)

1. Teaching – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee. Their self-assessment regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge should be satisfactory. They should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on the SAI, for the overall course average, for at least 75% of the sections taught. They should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching, if used, from at least one of the observers.

2. Scholarship – One Goodwin Unit, as described above.

3. Service – The tenure-track or tenured faculty member is expected to participate in institutional service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external community). They should exhibit exceptional performance in at least one category, which may be internal service or engagement with external constituencies. The time and energy commitment should approximate 20% of the total workload. Part-time and fixed-term faculty should meet expectations as indicated in the terms of their contract.

4. General comments – In general, for most faculty, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. Some roles, such as Department Head, require a different balance, and this may also be true in other special cases. Part-time and fixed-term faculty are in most cases evaluated entirely on teaching. It is possible in some cases that individual part-time or fixed-term faculty members have contracts stipulating expectations other than teaching, and they should be evaluated accordingly. Copies of their contractual agreement should be included in their evaluation file.

B. Reappointment: (4.06)

1. Teaching - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee, with greatest weight attached to most recent data. Their self-assessment regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge should be satisfactory. They should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on the SAI, for the overall course average, for at least 75% of the sections taught. They should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching for at least 75% of the included observations.

2. Scholarship – One Goodwin Unit, as described above. Special note: For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that plans are under way to initiate a productive pattern of scholarly activity. As the candidate progresses through the probationary period, expectations increase with regard to activities from section II.B.2 Category A. See criteria for tenure below.
3. **Service** - The faculty member is expected to participate in service at all levels (department, college/school, university, external), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period. During the initial year, there should be some departmental service and gradual building of an advisee load, if role-applicable. Advisee training is recommended. By the third year there should be at least some service activity at each internal level, with an emerging focus on at least one area of service/engagement.

4. **General comments** – In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. Teaching should be at an acceptable level of performance by the end of the 2nd year. Note gradually increased expectations for scholarship and service described above (and below, regarding tenure).

C. **Tenure (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the PRTM Committee. Their self-assessment regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge should be satisfactory. They should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on the SAI, for the overall course average, for at least 75% of the sections taught. They should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching for at least 75% of the included observations.

2. **Scholarship** – The record should document at least 4 Goodwin Units total. At least 3 units must be from section II.B.2 Category A, completed during the latter portion of the probationary period. The record must show promise of sustained scholarly productivity over time; at the time of tenure there should be evidence of ongoing scholarship in the form of paper presentations, data collection, submissions, work in progress, and so forth.

3. **Service** – By the time of tenure application, the faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor to the extent that this is role-appropriate.

4. **General comments** – In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. The cumulative record should include a pattern of positive AFE Statements. Candidates normally apply for tenure as they begin their sixth year. Faculty with exemplary performance and the endorsement of their Department Head and Dean may apply for early consideration of tenure. Faculty who fail in their application for early tenure may reapply during the standard probationary period.

D. **Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** - In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the review committee. Their self-assessment regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge should be satisfactory. They should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on the SAI, for the overall course average, for at least 75% of the sections taught.
2. **Scholarship** – Four Goodwin Units total. At least 3 units must be from section II.B.2 Category A, and these units should be completed during the four years preceding the requested promotion. The record must show promise of sustained scholarly productivity over time; at the time of promotion there should be evidence of ongoing scholarship in the form of paper presentations, data collection, submissions, work in progress, and so forth.

3. **Service** – The faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor, to the extent that this is role-appropriate.

4. **General comments** – In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. Special duties may alter this balance. The record should reflect evidence of high levels of achievement and contributions to the institution in teaching, scholarship, and service.

E. **Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for three years prior to the review, demonstrate evidence of excellence. Evidence may include SAI ratings, ratings on peer assessment of teaching materials, and self-assessments that reflect an ongoing commitment to quality in the three areas of teaching effectiveness. Candidates may also include evidence of teaching excellence beyond the sources required for promotion review, such as teaching awards.

2. **Scholarship** – The record should document at least 8 Goodwin Units subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor. At least 6 of these units must be from section II.B.2 Category A. The record must show promise of sustained scholarly productivity over time; at the time of promotion there should be evidence of ongoing scholarship in the form of paper presentations, data collection, submissions, work in progress, and so forth.

3. **Service** – The faculty member should have a record of sustained service at each institutional level and external engagement. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor, to the extent that this is role-appropriate.

4. **General comments** – In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. Special duties may alter this balance. The record should reflect evidence of superior teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

1. **Teaching** – The faculty member should, for three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall rating on teaching materials according to the consensus of the PRTM committee. They should earn an average score of 3.0 or greater on the SAI, for the overall course average, for at least 75% of the sections taught. Of particular importance on Post-Tenure Review is currency in teaching. Candidates are strongly encouraged to utilize the Case Statement regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge to emphasize their continued attention to this expectation. The
report of the PRTM Committee should also address the issue of currency. Faculty members may reflect on any other aspects of their teaching effectiveness they deem relevant.

2. **Scholarship** – One Goodwin Unit for each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review.

3. **Service** – The faculty member should have a record of service at each institutional level and some external engagement as well. They should be carrying a full share of advisees and have demonstrated competence as an advisor, to the extent that this is role-appropriate.

4. **General Comments** – Teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 35%, and service 15%. While these proportional weightings reflect the general value system of the department, it is understood that some flexibility may be appropriate for senior faculty members whose roles have evolved in individualized ways to make best use of their strengths as they continue to address the needs of the department, college, and university. Substantial change in weightings requires the approval of the Department Head.
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