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

I. Overview -- The School of Teaching and Learning values faculty who are engaging, collegial, productive, and scholarly in all aspects of their professional career. Our first priority is excellence in teaching. We are The School of Teaching and Learning and our teaching should exemplify our knowledge of pedagogy and our commitment to excellence in 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.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the School of Teaching and Learning. 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 with the WCU Faculty Handbook (section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the faculty member should also have available the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier, a separate document disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

I. Domains of Evaluation

Teaching (Faculty Handbook 4.04 & 4.05) Faculty members at Western Carolina University are scholarly teachers who provide evidence that their teaching is effective. Effective teaching will be documented through the use of student and peer evaluations as well as a self-report. Students will evaluate teachers on the professional aspects of teaching and on their response to instruction. Peers evaluate the pedagogical content knowledge as well as the professional aspects of teaching. Faculty members will provide a self-evaluation on the link between their instruction and disciplinary currency.
The faculty at Western Carolina University is committed to the idea that effective teaching maximizes student learning. As such we define teaching excellence as the facilitation of engaged and ambitious learning. Even among diverse instructional settings, we recognize that effective teaching incorporates some common aspects that can be evaluated. In accordance with UNC Policy Manual Chapter 400.3.1.1[G], WCU’s policies for the evaluation of teaching include ongoing student and peer evaluations of teaching. WCU’s evaluation of teaching centers on three areas: pedagogical content knowledge, the professional administration of the class (including supervision of students), and student response to instruction. See Office of the Provost website for further resources and research on the evaluation of teaching.

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 usable 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.

II. **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.

III. **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. The PRTM will be small working teams of faculty with similar expertise, who will be selected by each program at the initial program meeting each year. The committee must include at least 3 full-time faculty members from the program with at least one tenured faculty member on the committee. (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 and faculty being reviewed. (4.05.B2B)

d) **Student assessment of instruction.** All sections of all courses taught by all faculty will include SAIIs using a form of the Senate-approved 20-item university-wide SAI instrument. For primary summative evaluation, course averages will be used. However, if fewer than 5 evaluations are submitted and/or the number of respondents represents less than 50% of the total course enrollment, the faculty member may choose not to report the course SAI average. While there may be questions regarding the reliability and validity of low enrolled courses and low return rates, fulltime faculty assigned 1 FTE must include a minimum of 2 courses each semester, regardless of enrollment numbers and return rate. (4.05B2A)

**General comments**—The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data. The three forms of evidence that contribute most to evaluation of teaching effectiveness are self-, peer, and student evaluations of teaching. Other sources of evidence are considered supplemental.

Professional Development—The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution and also includes professional development activities used for the enhancement of teaching. Professional development activities designed to strengthen teaching expertise are positively valued and should be included in the self-evaluation of teaching with particular emphasis on how the professional development activity impacted the candidate’s growth in teaching.

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

Faculty differ with regard to specialty area within the discipline, the types of scholarship emphasized, investment in service and engagement, and the balance created between research and practice. The School of Teaching and Learning should build on its strengths and honor differentiated practices. STL’s collegial review document (CRD) should reflect differentiated strengths while showing that teaching, scholarship, and service are connected. While this process is complex, often abstract and difficult to quantify, it is important to provide faculty members with guidelines to help develop productive and
gratifying careers. The guidelines are intended to be practical and flexible enough to promote individual differences within all faculty members.

1. WCU recognizes the 4 types of scholarly activity described by Boyer as scholarly work. See http://www.wcu.edu/26990.asp for detailed information on the Boyer Model.
   a. **Scholarship of Discovery** - Original research that advances knowledge. Scholarship of Discovery also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
   b. **Scholarship of Integration** - Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
   c. **Scholarship of Application** - Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
   d. **Scholarship of Teaching and Learning** - Systematic study of teaching and learning processes. (See Appendix D for other information regarding Boyer Model).

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review**—Scholarship evidence is divided into works that show scholarly activity important to AFE documentation and external peer reviewed works acceptable for Tenure and Promotion. An activity that qualifies as scholarship, regardless of the type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) external peer review; (2) methodological rigor; (3) substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and (4) disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community. These four 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., journals, conference proposals, edited work, grants), but it can also include a broader community of external scholars through alternate peer view. For example, it can include both blind and open reviews of items presented for publication or presentation, and it can include invited key presentation addresses to national or international conferences, textbook chapters, and themed issues.

**Evaluating Scholarship**

Scholarship in the School of Teaching and Learning, regardless of the Boyer category, will be based on the concept of a "unit" of work. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following guidelines should be useful to the candidate and to the Collegial Review 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. The units are also categorized as major and minor works. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and does not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be achieved. For faculty, scholarly and creative work that does not fall within any of the categories described in the CRD document, the faulty member will meet with the department head and collaborate to determine the "unit" value of the work. The faculty member will present to the department head the quality and the contribution to the discipline that the work entails and the way in which the work will be/has been externally peer reviewed and disseminated.
widely to peers. The department head and the faculty member must mutually agree on the unit value.

Categories for Units:

Major Works (Category A)

One Unit:

Scholarship of Discovery and Synthesis
- Authorship of a peer-reviewed journal article in a practitioner or research journal (Does not have to be sole authorship or first author. However, for promotion and tenure, the faculty member should have at least one peer-reviewed publication where they are the lead author)
- A chapter in an edited book
- Published conference proceedings which include a peer-reviewed, full-length paper
- Authorship of subsequent editions of a scholarly book
- Invited publications in a peer-reviewed journal
- Peer-reviewed yearbook chapter
- Serving as an editor or associate editor/co-editor of a peer-reviewed journal including but not limited to themed issues.
- Co-PI for a successful external grant exceeding $50,000
- PI for a continuation grant

Scholarship of Application and Teaching: Projects subject to external peer review
- A patent related to the field
- A substantial technical report for a program review/evaluation project that has been alternatively reviewed (e.g., for accreditation, DPI, NCATE) if subjected to formal external peer review as previously described under alternative peer review and disseminated.
- Additional alternative faculty projects that have been externally reviewed using the alternative peer review process and disseminated.

Two Units:
- Authorship of an article in a research journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline. It is up to the faculty member to document the high status of the journal. For example, faculty may state the journal impact factor, acceptance rates, and/or circulation rates. Without this documentation it will be considered as a one unit publication. The publication does not have to be sole authorship, but should be first author to receive 2 units, otherwise it will be categorized as 1 unit.
- Serving as primary editor of an edited book or widely recognized journal, including themed issues. It is up to the faculty member to document the high status of the journal. The publication does not have to be sole editor but should be primary editor to receive 2 units, otherwise it will be categorized as 1 unit.
Successful external grant exceeding $50,000. To receive two units, the faculty member must serve as primary investigator. Faculty members serving in the role of co-PI receive 1 unit of credit.

Minor Works (Category B)

One Unit:
- An invited address at an International or National conference
- Successful external grant less than $50,000. Faculty member must serve as primary investigator.
- Presentation at a national or international conference
- A scholarly book review

One-Half Unit:
- Presentation at a regional/state professional conference
- A successful internal research grant proposal
- An unsuccessful external grant proposal exceeding $50,000
- An invited address at a state or regional conference
- A published article in a non-peer review journal/or other professional outlet
- Annual reports and evaluations for external grants lasting more than a year.
- Serving as Co-PI on a successful external grant less than $50,000.

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, demonstrate how the selected scholarship has had an impact on the field as well as how the piece has been disseminated, 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 (4.04C3 and 4.05D)
Western Carolina University creates engaged learning opportunities that incorporate teaching, research and service through residential, distance education and international experiences. The university focuses its academic programs, educational outreach, research
and creative activities, and cultural activities to improve individual lives and enhance economic and community development in the region, state and nation. Therefore, service is an important and valued component in the School of Teaching and Learning.

1. Types of Service- The definition of service is the acceptance and fulfillment of professional responsibilities outside of teaching and scholarship in the following three areas: a) institutional service; b) community engagement; c) special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership. Examples are provided to help faculty establish annual goals and meet their AFE and TPR requirements. They are neither mandates nor restrictions on service work.

Faculty members demonstrate a commitment to the service of students and colleagues and a willingness to help others. The faculty member shares responsibility by working with various groups as an active participant. He/she appreciates and respects differences in expertise, ideas, and background of others. It is expected that faculty members will devote approximately 20% of time/effort to service as a general guideline acknowledging that some faculty will differentiate time and effort based on years in service, individual strengths, and needs of the unit. While service should play a smaller role in new and untenured faculty members’ professional efforts, as their teaching and scholarly accomplishments become established, university and professional service should increase. Untenured faculty should not be involved in too many external or internal activities that may jeopardize their reappointments.

a. Institutional Service – Involves performance of professional responsibilities at the program, department, college, university and system levels and is documented with a total cumulative record of assigned responsibilities and other service activities at each level, dated in chronological sequence from most recent to earliest. Program service includes advising roles and activities. Effective advising involves being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, assistance with academic and career planning. Include both the number of assigned advisees and examples of advising roles and activities as well as number of advisees seen in cumulative record.
### Institutional Service Examples

- Faculty Governance
- Membership / chairing of committees & task forces
- Administrative duties
  - Department Head, Assistant Department Head, Program Coordination
- Faculty Mentoring
- Professional seminars for faculty/staff/others
- Contributions to accreditation to include committees and report generation
- Liaison to other departments, colleges, universities, systems
- Assistance to faculty/students based on disciplinary expertise

### Student recruitment
- Open House, WCU on Tour
- Mentoring students on theses, research or projects
- Student organization / association advising
- Entry advisement (teacher interviews, student strategic plans)
- Advisement
- Other service as defined in the approved annual goals

### b. Community Engagement – Engagement in outreach by sharing of professional expertise with professional, civic, economic or educational organizations at the local, regional, state, national and international levels relevant to one’s professional role.

### Community Engagement Examples

- Speeches, workshops, and invited presentations for schools / communities
- Newspaper editorials, interviews
- School/community/government boards, committees, or offices

### sponsored services
- Consulting or teaching in the broader global community
- Other service as defined in the approved annual goals

### c. Special Expertise, Unusual Time Commitments, or Exceptional Leadership – Professional service through the participation in off-campus organizations related to one’s discipline.

### Special Expertise, Unusual Time Commitments, or Exceptional Leadership Examples

- Service in professional organizations
  - Holding office
  - Organizing conference
  - Reviewing proposals
- Administrative roles in interest groups
- Conference or society committees
  - Other roles in organization
- Accreditation service
- Conference attendance with students

- Taking students to community service projects
- Professional society memberships and offices
- Textbook review
- Guest lectures
- Other service as defined in the approved annual goals
2. Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence
The faculty member’s list of service activities will be evaluated with regard to time and
supportive commitment, level of expertise involved, available quantitative / qualitative data
and other indicators of quality of service. Candidates can provide evidence of participation in
service through documentation including a description of the service duration, level of
involvement, agendas, benefits, and letters of recognition. Documentation or artifacts should
be included in the appropriate dossier appendix.

3. General Comments
AFE files should contain evidence related to the faculty member’s activities in service since
the previous year’s AFE. All full time tenured, tenure-track and fixed term faculty who have
service as an expectation must prepare an AFE document that includes service.
List and provide supporting documents showing services provided to the program,
department, college, university, external community and profession at large, organized by the
three types of service. Within Institutional Service, specify one’s advising activities,
including number of undergraduate and graduate assigned and actual advisees. Faculty can
decide to report service using a quantifiable approach or a more holistic approach.

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. The AFE document will
include a chart that examines faculty member’s goals regarding teaching,
scholarship, and service along with a self assessment of how the faculty member
accomplished those goals. All AFEs must include a section on teaching that
includes a self evaluation statement regarding pedagogical content and
disciplinary currency, SAI data and return rates, direct observation of teaching,
and peer review of teaching materials analysis. AFEs will also include a brief self
evaluation of scholarship and a table outlining the number of major and minor
units earned over the academic year. Finally, faculty will also need to provide a
brief self evaluation of service, and a table indicating service at the program,
school, college, university, community and professional levels. Deadlines for
completion of the review process are determined by the Deans and Provost.
2. Composition of review committees – In the School of Teaching and Learning,
AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by the Assistant Department Heads and the
Department Head, rather than by a faculty committee.
3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
a) Documentation will be submitted electronically as an attachment to an email. Faculty may turn in a supplemental binder of materials if the need should arise. In the section describing faculty goals the faculty member will submit self evaluation statements, regarding Teaching, Service, and Scholarship. These paragraphs should be used to highlight activities that are documented formally in the AFE 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. Basically, the faculty member is making his or her “case” for the year.

b) The primary documentation will be a report submitted to the Department Head as an email attachment. 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 include all data necessary to evaluate annual performance. Data must be complete and accurate.

c) The Department Head along with the Assistant Department Heads 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 Department Head will submit a draft of the letter to the faculty member in which the faculty member can respond. If the faculty member approves and accepts the letter they can sign and return to the Department Head. Upon request the faculty member may meet 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 instructors - 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 instructors 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.
   iii. Self Evaluation Statement on Pedagogical Content Knowledge, with attention to instructional currency.

b) Part-time faculty should have peer review of materials (by STL Peer Review of Teaching Materials (PRTM) committee) during the first semester of the academic year in which they teach.

c) The Department Head along with the Assistant Department Heads 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 part-time 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 STL Collegial Review 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 Advisory 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 TPR Advisory 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 six tenured members of the School, excluding the Department Head and any members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty in the department, the Provost, in consultation with the Head of the School of Teaching and Learning 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 also include the self-evaluative statement regarding Pedagogical Content Knowledge, scholarship and service. The faculty member must send an email along with an attachment that must include self
evaluative statements, current and up-to-date curriculum vita, and copies of four most recent AFE statements prepared by the Department Head.

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)

Teaching – To meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should: submit their self-assessment in a satisfactory manner. A satisfactory rating indicates the self-assessment is well written and clearly addresses the candidate’s personal teaching philosophy, includes how teaching strategies and methods were used to reach course objectives and clearly addresses the three areas of teaching where applied to the courses taught. The peer reviews of the candidate’s teaching should reflect overall satisfactory comments on the candidate’s application of the areas of teaching, as well as an overall rating of “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” or “needs improvement.” The course materials review should reflect ratings that indicate the candidate’s satisfactory application of the three areas of teaching. In regard to SAI data faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or higher on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI in order to meet teaching expectations.

Scholarship – The general expectation for a normal academic year is 1 unit. Faculty should demonstrate ongoing progress towards tenure and promotion by reporting the status of all submitted works and should thoroughly describe their role in multi-authored scholarly works. Each faculty member should accumulate scholarship units annually in order to reach or exceed the 6 units required for tenure and promotion, including at least four units from the Major Works category A.

Service – In order to meet expectations in the AFE, all full time, tenured, tenure track, and fixed term faculty who have service as part of their expectation must engage in service activities and provide evidence of satisfactory performance in two areas of involvement:

• Institutional service including, student advisement
• Community engagement
• Special expertise and exceptional leadership
Meets Expectations: Satisfactory involvement in at least two levels of three areas: Institutional, Community, Special. Satisfactory is defined as consistent, professional, and productive engagement.

Exceeds Expectations: Exemplary involvement in at least one level and satisfactory involvement in the other two levels. Exemplary is defined as service that is recognized by documented public acknowledgement of the service including, but not limited to, awards, news media recognition, or letter of commendation.

General comments –

a. For most tenure track faculty, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 30%, and service 20%. 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 unless specified in their contract. It is possible in some cases that individual adjunct 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. Grant proposals and awards – Grant proposals and awards are recognized as scholarly products that count toward expectations related to each personnel action described in Section B-2. Pursuit of grants is the prerogative of the faculty member and should be reflected in his or her annual goals.

c. Professional development - Professional development activities designed to strengthen methodological expertise are positively valued and may be described in self-evaluative statements for AFE, Collegial Review, and PTR purposes. However, participation in professional development in this area does not count as evidence of a scholarly product according to school expectations unless the results of the professional development activity result in publication, or have been externally reviewed.

B. Reappointment: (4.06)

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 and annual AFE reports, with greatest weight attached to most recent data. Their self-assessment regarding each of the 3 areas of teaching should be satisfactory; they should also earn satisfactory ratings on the SAI. Faculty members should earn an average score of 3.0 or higher on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on 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.
Scholarship – For reappointment, the School expects that each faculty member accumulate scholarship units steadily over time in order to reach or exceed the 6 units required for tenure and promotion, including at least four units from the Major Works category. Faculty should demonstrate ongoing progress towards tenure and promotion by reporting the status of all submitted works and should thoroughly describe their role in multi-authored scholarly works.

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.

Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in service for approximately 20% of the overall time at all three levels (institutional, community, and special expertise) though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period.

Meets Expectations: Satisfactory involvement in at least two levels of three areas: Institutional, Community, Special. Satisfactory is defined as consistent, professional, and productive engagement.

Exceeds Expectations: Exemplary involvement in at least one level and satisfactory involvement in the other two levels. Exemplary is defined as service that is recognized by documented public acknowledgement of the service including, but not limited to, awards, news media recognition, or letter of commendation.

General comments – In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 30%, and service 20%. 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. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

Overall, candidates must demonstrate superior teaching, scholarship and service.

1. Teaching –

Overall candidates must demonstrate teaching that is effective and scholarly. To meet these expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to the consensus of the Collegial Review Committee; satisfactory self-evaluation statement on each of the 3 factors of effective teaching; and satisfactory ratings (3.0 or greater) on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the sections taught. Additionally, they should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching from at least four of the scheduled peer observations 3 years prior to going up for tenure. Candidates for early tenure must demonstrate exemplary performance.
2. **Scholarship**

   For tenure and promotion, the School expects that each faculty member from the time of initial appointment generate at least six (6) units as described above with at least four (4) of the units generated from the Major Works category. As each faculty member moves towards tenure and promotion, it is important to understand the process of the research cycle and sustain a clear pattern of scholarly production. If the faculty member has previous years accepted as counting toward tenure and promotion during the initial hiring stage, then those years should also be counted toward tenure and promotion, and it is up to the faculty member to indicate this. 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**

   **Service indicators:**
   
   1. Engagement in service activities at all levels (i.e., Department, School, College, University, Community Engagement) for approximately 20% of their total workload, with an increasing degree of external engagement to the region.
   
   2. Evidence of exemplary performance in one of the service types and at least satisfactory performance in a second.
      - Institutional service including student advisement
      - Community engagement
      - Special expertise and exceptional leadership

   **Meets Expectations:** Exemplary performance in at least one level and satisfactory involvement in the other two levels. Satisfactory is defined as consistent, professional, and productive engagement. Exemplary is defined as service that is recognized by documented public acknowledgement of the service including, but not limited to, awards, news media recognition, or letter of commendation.

4. **General comments**

   In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 30%, and service 20%. The cumulative record should include a pattern of positive AFE Statements. Candidates normally apply for tenure and promotion as they begin their sixth year. Faculty with exemplary performance in teaching, scholarship and service and the endorsement of their Department Head and Dean may apply for early consideration of tenure and promotion. Faculty who fail in their application for early tenure and promotion may reapply during the standard probationary period.

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

   Overall, candidates must demonstrate superior teaching, scholarship and service.
Teaching -- To meet expectations of superior teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory overall ratings on teaching materials according to consensus of the review committee, and should receive exceeds expectations on 75% of AFE’s since tenure in the area of teaching; and exceed departmental expectations on ratings (departmental expectations are 3.0 or greater) on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught. Additionally, they should receive a high overall rating on direct observation of teaching, if used, from at least one of the observers.

Scholarship --
For promotion to Professor, the School expects that each faculty member from the time of their appointment to Associate Professor generate at least seven (7) units as described above with at least five (5) of the units generated from the Major Works category. Significant presence of first authorship from some combination of the four levels of the Boyer model (e.g., journal articles, published conference proceedings, books, book chapters, other examples of Boyer Scholarship) should be evident. Additionally, invited blind letters of review from colleagues at other institutions should be submitted to the Department Head or Dean of the College. The faculty member going up for full professor must provide a list of five potential external reviewers by the beginning of fall semester. The Department Head will select three 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 dossier, a copy of the departmental CRD to provide context, and the departmental evaluation protocol to guide the review. Each external reviewer will review the dossier and submit a review of faculty performance letter. 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.

Service --
Service Indicators-
1. Engagement in service activities at all levels (i.e., Department, School, College, University, Community Engagement) for approximately 20% of their total workload, with significant leadership at the university level including chairing a university committee and holding a major leadership position in a state or national professional association.
2. Evidence of exemplary performance in one of the service types and at least satisfactory performance in a second.
   i. Institutional service including student advisement
   ii. Community engagement
   iii. Special expertise and exceptional leadership

Satisfactory is defined as consistent, professional, and productive engagement.
General comments - In general, teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 30%, and service 20%. Special duties may alter this balance. The record should reflect evidence of superior teaching, scholarship, and service.

E. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching –
   To meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should, for up to three years prior to the review, receive satisfactory self-assessment on each of the 3 areas of teaching; and satisfactory ratings (3.0 or greater) on each of the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught. Additionally, they should receive a satisfactory overall rating on direct observation of teaching and peer review of teaching materials, if used, from at least one of the observers. Of particular importance on Post-Tenure Review is currency in teaching. Candidates are strongly encouraged to utilize the optional 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.

2. Scholarship –
   For post-tenure review, the School expects that each faculty member generate at least five (5) units (i.e., one [1] unit per year) as described above with at least four (4) of the units generated from the Major Works category. The purpose of post tenure review is to ensure the productivity of tenured professors and to provide suggestions and guidance as needed.

3. Service –
   For successful post tenure review, candidates should have met departmental expectations for service each year since their last post tenure review.

   Service Indicators-
   1. Engagement in service activities at all levels, Program, School, College, University, Community, and Profession for approximately 20% of their total workload, including some degree of external engagement.
   2. Evidence of exemplary performance in one of the service types and at least satisfactory performance in a second.
      i. Institutional service including student advisement
      ii. Community engagement
      iii. Special expertise and exceptional leadership
   3. Exemplary ranking requires evidence of sustained excellence in performance in at least three of the service types listed above.

   Satisfactory is defined as consistent, professional, and productive engagement.

4. General Comments – Teaching counts approximately 50%, scholarship 30%, and service 20%. 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. A significant shift in the divisions of responsibility must be approved and documented by the department head and the dean of the College.
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