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

I. Overview – The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Accounting, Finance, and Economics. 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, the Office of the Provost, and in some cases, by the College of Business. 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 the WCU Faculty Handbook (§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 7 dimensions:
      a. Content expertise – Faculty member displays adequate knowledge of their subject. Content expertise shall include the “body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education” (Arreola, 1995).
      b. Instructional delivery skills – Faculty member communicates information clearly, creates environments conducive to learning, and uses an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
      c. Instructional design skills – Faculty member designs course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to student learning.
      d. Course management skills – Faculty members give timely feedback to students, makes efficient use of class time, and handles classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations effectively (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.).
      e. Evaluation of students – Faculty member designs assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensures fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provides constructive feedback on student work.
f. Faculty/student relationships – Faculty member displays a positive attitude toward students, shows concern for students by being approachable and available, presents an appropriate level of intellectual challenge along with sufficient support for student learning, and has respect for diversity.

g. Facilitation of student learning – Faculty member maintains high academic standards, prepares students for professional work and development, facilitates student achievement, and provides audiences for student work.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence

a. Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the 7 dimensions of effective teaching, (4.05 A) Each faculty member must provide a report addressing and evaluating him/herself on each of the seven dimensions of teaching. In addition, the report should include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Statement of teaching philosophy. This statement should be reviewed and updated at least every two (2) years.

(2) A description of goals, methods and strategies used in instruction

(3) Professional development activities which would include attendance at professional conferences, participation in pedagogical workshops, as well as participating in other organized activities designed to improve teaching and learning.

b. Peer review of teaching materials — including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05 B 2 b) A committee of three faculty members from the department will conduct a review of teaching materials from one of the instructor’s courses. The committee will a selected by mutual agreement of the department head and the instructor whose course is being evaluated. One representative course will be chosen for evaluation each year. The course chosen to be evaluated by the instructor should rotate each year until all courses have been evaluated at which point the rotation should start again. At a minimum, this review will include the following materials (additional materials may be requested by the committee):

(1) Syllabi for the selected course

(2) All materials used in assessing student’s course performance, e.g. final examination, midterm exams and quizzes

(3) Ancillary materials, including the textbook, for the selected course.

The review will evaluate the material based on a standard rubric (a copy of which is included in the Appendix).

Copies of the review will be provided to both the instructor and the department head.

c. Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol (UNC Policy Manual §400.3.1.1(G)) At least once annually, all tenue-track faculty members will be observed and evaluated in a classroom
setting. The observation will be scheduled at the convenience of both the instructor and evaluator. The instructor may select his/her evaluator, subject to the final approval of the department head. The evaluator will provide a written report of the observation, addressing each of the applicable dimensions of teachings.

Copies of the report will be provided to both the instructor and department head.

d. **Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument – required of all sections of all courses (4.05 B 2 A).** Course assessments, using a university approved instrument, are required for all sections of all courses taught by part- and full-time fixed term faculty, untenured faculty and tenured faculty, except for co-ops, internships and independent study courses. In addition to the above exceptions, student assessments will not be used for evaluation purposes in:
   (1) courses with less than five registered students, or
   (2) courses for which the response rate is less than 25%.

3. **General comments –**
   a. **Period of evaluation** - When evaluating the teaching domain, the period being evaluated shall be the most recent academic year. Summer teaching assignments are not incorporated into the Annual Faculty Evaluation although summer teaching performance may be an input factor into future summer teaching assignments.

B. **Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05 C)**
   1. The department 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.
      a. **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as software programs and the like.
      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. Discipline specific proprietary work may fit into this category in which case appropriate discussion should be had with the department head, early in the process, to determine how the work will be classified.
      d. **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

The goal of the Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics Department is to demonstrate regular productivity in one or more types of scholarship as evidenced by the examples given below:
a. Discovery expectations: A book, book chapter, refereed journal article, or the equivalent* reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge.

b. Integration expectations: A book, book chapter, refereed journal article, or the equivalent* that crosses subject matter or disciplinary areas.

c. Application expectations: A book, book chapter, refereed journal article, or equivalent* that applies the knowledge and skill of one’s discipline to a practical problem.

d. Teaching and learning expectations: A book, book chapter, refereed journal article or the equivalent* that has pedagogical value.

* In evaluating all scholarship efforts including books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, or the equivalents, important factors include: (1) outside peer review; (2) methodological rigor; and (3) dissemination to a professional or academic audience. External validation of self-published scholarship artifacts will be especially important.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review – The evaluation of scholarship in the Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics Department will be based on the concept of a “unit” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. The unit is intended to reflect such criteria as “degree of difficulty,” “potential impact,” and “value to the mission of the department and college.” Published outcomes are more highly valued than unpublished outcomes, top tier journals more highly valued that 2nd-tier journals, and national conferences more highly than regional conferences. A unit of work cannot be comprehensively defined, but the following guidelines and examples will be useful to the candidate and review committees:

a. Three or more units - -

b. Two units -
   (1) Publications in a top-tier journal (i.e. Cabel or equivalent listing; acceptance rate less than or equal to 40%)

c. One unit -
   (1) Address at a national conference
   (2) Academic presentation at a national conference
   (3) Publication in a second-tier journal (acceptance rate greater than 40% and less than or equal to 80%)
   (4) Substantial external grant funded, amount of grant exceeds $5,000.
(5) Proceedings publication (acceptance rate less than 40%, e.g. American Accounting Association Regional or National conference)

d. **One-half unit** -
   (1) Academic presentation at a regional or state level conference
   (2) Proceedings (very high acceptance rates, e.g. Decision Sciences, Allied Academies)
   (3) Funded external grant where funding is less than $5,000.

3. **General comments** –
   a. **Grant proposals and awards** - Considered as noted above. While grant proposals may be an indicator of scholarly activity, they are not evaluated as scholarship until funded.
   b. **Professional development** – Memberships in academic or professional organizations, attendance at regional and national meetings, attendance at relevant workshops, reading relevant current articles in academic and professional journals and related activities in a faculty members’ discipline are considered part of ongoing professional development.
   c. **Criteria for comparable scholarly activity** - In evaluating all scholarly activity, including books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, proceedings, or the equivalents, important factors include:
      (1) outside peer review
      (2) methodological rigor
      (3) dissemination to a professional or academic audience.
   d. **Period of evaluation** - When evaluating the scholarly activity performance domain, the period of evaluation will include the most recent five (5) years.

C. **Service (4.04 C 3 & 4.05D)**
   1. **Types of service**
      a. **Institutional service** – Committee and task force service to all levels including department, college, and university; faculty governance; search committees; off-campus instruction including international instruction and services; independent studies and coop/internship supervision; Honors student contracts; credit-by-exam activities; recruiting; teaching university transitional or career development courses; and mentoring.
      b. **Community engagement** – Providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level. Includes continuing education and other non-credit instruction, lectures, presentations, workshops, grant writing and other such activities. Includes student service-learning involvements.
      c. **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** - Includes service in professional organizations, journal editing, book reviewing/editing, work on accreditation documents, administrative duties such as department head, a major role in faculty governance, advisory board activities, etc.
d. Advising – Being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to students advisees, assistance with academic and career planning, orientation programs, student recruitment programs, retention activities, student placement activities, assistance with study skills and referrals from appropriate counselors, advising student organizations, etc.

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

3. General comments –
   a. Faculty advising of students - Faculty are expected to be active and competent advisors to students. Advising is part of the normal professional load for faculty and adequate time should be set aside for quality advising. Advising may include selection of courses to assure adequate progress toward degree completion as well as career and professional advising.

   Faculty in disciplines with majors are expected to carry a fair share of students advising responsibility. Guidelines for a normal advising load are delineated in the Faculty Handbook. If the number of student advisees exceeds the Faculty Handbook guidelines, special consideration may be given when considering service load.

   Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at the departmental and college/university level. Tenured faculty should be active at the university level.

   Faculty members are encouraged to perform outreach to the community and to participate in organizations related to their discipline. Outreach should have a beneficial impact attributable to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge to real world problems, issues or concerns addressed by the outreach contribution.

   b. Professional development - Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department; they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix.

   c. Period of evaluation - When evaluating the service performance domain, service activities in the most recent 12 month period may be submitted for consideration.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events
A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

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 Provost and Dean.

2. Composition of review committee - In the Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics Department, Annual Faculty Evaluation files are reviewed, evaluated and report written by the Department Head, rather than by a faculty committee.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:
   (1) Teaching
      (a) A self-evaluative statement briefly addressing the seven dimensions of teaching, a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review.
      (b) Copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.
      (c) Copies of direct observation of classroom instruction reports
      (d) Student Assessment of Instruction as specified above - SAI summary information will be gathered by the department head directly from the SAI administration system.
      (e) Course load and enrollment - This information will be gathered either from Banner or from the faculty resource database, i.e. Digital Measures

   (2) Scholarship and Creative Activity - Information to be gathered from the Faculty Resource Database, i.e. Digital Measures.

   (3) Service - Information to be gathered from the faculty resources database, i.e. Digital Measures

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document - Faculty are expected to have their data current on the faculty resource database, i.e. Digital Measures, by the appointed time announced by the department head. Requested information not included in the database should be submitted to the department head by the appointed time. Material not submitted by the appointed time runs the risk of not being considered in the Annual Faculty Evaluation written by the department head.

c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track/phased retiree instructors (4.05 F) - A separate document exists describing the evaluation procedures for part-time and other fixed term instructors (see Appendix B).
B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)

1. **Overview** - The Provost’s Office generates a list of faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion. This list is verified with documents maintained in the Dean’s Office and the departmental office.

2. **Composition of review committee (4.07 D 1)** - The departmental Collegial Review Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and composed of up to six tenured members elected by the department’s full-time members. If the department should have six or fewer tenured faculty members, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, provided the resultant committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members, exclusive of the head.

A good faith effort will be made to have representation from all departmental disciplines on the committee. The committee elects a secretary to record the actions of the committee and to sign appropriate documentation.

Refer to §4.07 D 1 for further clarification on Review Committee composition and processes when the department head is being considered for action.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the Deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for document submission deadlines and decisions at the various review levels. The candidate will need (1) the departmental Collegial Review Document, (2) the Guidelines for Preparation of the Dossier, and (3) the timetable for the review process.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. **Overview** - These guidelines are based on §4.08 of the Faculty Handbook. 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 tenure faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of any of the following review events: award of tenure or promotion at Western Carolina University, prior post-tenure review, or return to faculty status following administrative services. Further clarification may be found in §4.08 C.

2. **Composition of review committee** - The Post-Tenure Review Committee for the Accounting, Finance, and Economics Department will consist of the elected Collegial Review Committee members, excluding the department head. A good faith effort will be made to have representation from all departmental disciplines on the committee. Should the department find it impossible to form a committee containing at least three tenured faculty, the matter will be referred to the Provost.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   
   a. **Documentation** - The faculty member being reviewed will provide the four most recent annual faculty evaluations and a current curriculum vitae (CV) ($4.08$ E).
   
   b. **Procedures** - Peer reviewers will present their written evaluations to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head shall then append his/her evaluation relative to the mission of the University, College, and program. The faculty member shall then have the option of attaching a written response. When the department head is reviewed, the dean shall perform the roles ordinarily performed by the department head ($4.08$ E).
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for performance expectations in Accounting, Finance, and Economics Department -

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching -
   a. Self evaluation of teaching
   b. Peer Review of Teaching Materials
      (1) EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS - The three faculty reviewers must find that a faculty member’s syllabi, examinations, and at least two other examples of classroom materials are exemplary.
      (2) MEETS EXPECTATIONS - The three faculty reviewers must find that a faculty member’s syllabi, examinations and at least one example of classroom materials is satisfactory.
      (3) UNSATISFACTORY - The three faculty reviewers determine that syllabi and/or examinations are unsatisfactory or nonexistent.
   c. Direct observation of instruction - The written report by the faculty observer shall indicate whether the class session observed EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS, MET EXPECTATIONS or was UNSATISFACTORY as part of their report. This conclusion shall be supported by adequate narrative description.
   d. Student Assessment of Instruction
      (1) EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS - A faculty member must score an average of 3.25 or higher (on a 4 point scale) on the combined student ratings.
      (2) MEETS EXPECTATIONS - A faculty member must score an average of 2.75 - 3.24 (on a 4 point scale) on the combined student ratings.
      (3) UNSATISFACTORY - A faculty member’s score an average below 2.75 (on a 4.0 scale) on the combined student ratings.
   e. Overall evaluation - The department head is responsible for assigning the overall rating of teaching effectiveness based on the review of each of the methods described above. The various evaluation methods will be used to form the evaluation rating as delineated in the matrix included as Appendix C. The department head will, as part of the annual faculty evaluation process, summarize the results of the evaluation methods and dimensions in matrix form with a rating of “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, or “Unsatisfactory” in each dimension where applicable to the evaluation method (as described earlier). A final overall rating will then be assigned based on the following:
      (1) EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS - The faculty member must exceed expectations in a majority of the seven dimensions and meet expectations in all of the other dimensions.
      (2) MEETS EXPECTATIONS - The faculty member must meet expectations in all the seven dimensions.
(3) UNSATISFACTORY - The faculty member is unsatisfactory in at least one of the seven dimensions.
In the case of an unsatisfactory rating, the instructor and the department head will create a plan to address and improve the identified area(s) of weakness.

2. Scholarship –  
   a. EXCEED EXPECTATIONS - A faculty member will generate more than five units of scholarship work in the most recent five year period (a rolling five-year period), including a minimum of four units from categories “a” and “b” above. Faculty are expected to demonstrate scholarly activity on a continuing basis.
   b. MEETS EXPECTATIONS - A faculty member will generate five units of scholarship work in the most recent five year period (a rolling five-year period), including a minimum of four units from categories “a” or “b” above. Faculty are expected to demonstrate scholarly activity on a continuing basis.
   c. UNSATISFACTORY - A faculty member generates fewer than five units of scholarship work in the most recent five year period (a rolling five-year period) and/or fails to have four units in categories “a” or “b” above and/or fails to demonstrate continuing scholarly activity. Specific areas will be noted and specific actions outlined to address the shortfalls.

3. Service –  
   a. EXCEED EXPECTATIONS - A faculty member must be active in three of the four service/engagement areas and exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. Untenured tenure-track faculty are encouraged to limit their service component to 10% of their workload, or about ½ day per week. For a tenured faculty member, service/engagement typically represents 10-20% of the workload. A faculty member may request a weighting of 30% on service when he/she can demonstrate an exceptional commitment to service/engagement.
   b. MEETS EXPECTATIONS - A faculty member must be involved in at least two of the four areas of service/engagement (advising, institutional, community, expertise/leadership) and performing at a satisfactory level.
   c. UNSATISFACTORY - A faculty member is not actively involved in at least two of the four areas of service/engagement or not performing at a satisfactory level in the areas of involvement.

4. General comments –  
   a. When a faculty member does not have a complete five year rolling period for evaluating scholarship, the evaluation will be based on threshold levels of scholarship that can reasonably be expected to lead to favorable tenure decisions. The minimum threshold levels for “meets expectations” are delineated in the table below:
(1) First year - The equivalent of two (2) units, perhaps from dissertation, nearing submission to journal
(2) Second year - The equivalent of four (4) units submitted/under review
(3) Third year - The equivalent of two (2) units published and the equivalent of four (4) units under review
(4) Fourth year - The equivalent of four (4) units published an the equivalent of four (4) units under review
(5) Fifth year - Rolling five year review window now in place.

B. Reappointment (4.06)
1. Teaching - Faculty members are expected to perform at a level meeting or exceeding expectations described in IV.A.1 above.
2. Scholarship - Faculty members are expected to generate units of scholarship work meeting or exceeding expectations described in IV.A.2.
3. Service - Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at the departmental and college level and to be active and competent advisor to students. Some degree of involvement in outreach and/or external engagement activities is encouraged. Untenured tenure-track faculty are encouraged to limit their service component to 10% of their workload or about ½ day per week.
4. General comments - When considering the reappointment decision, generally the faculty member would be expected to perform at a level that meets or exceeds expectations. In situations where faculty fail to meet expectations in a particular area, reappointment decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis considering the reasoned, seasoned and experienced judgment of the Collegial Review Committee and department head.

C. Tenure (4.07)
1. Teaching - Faculty members are expected to perform at a level that “meets expectations” or “exceeds expectations” as defined in IV.A.1.
2. Scholarship - Faculty members are expected to generate a minimum of 9 units of scholarly work defined in IV.A.2 including a minimum of 6 units from categories “a” or “b”. This will result in a minimum of 3 scholarly pieces and most likely 4 pieces before the tenure decision.
3. Service - Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at the departmental and college levels and to be active and competent advisors to students. Some involvement in outreach and/or external engagement activities is expected. An overall “meets expectations” level of performance is expected.
4. General comments - When considering the tenure decision, the cumulative record of work to date will be considered. Generally, faculty are expected to meet standards set forth above. Where the standards have not been met, the Collegial Review Committee and department head will give reasoned, seasoned and experienced judgment to the candidate’s specific situation. Superior performance in one area may ameliorate performance that “meets expectations” in other areas.
D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
1. **Teaching** - Faculty members are expected to demonstrate “high levels” of performance in teaching. High level of performance can be demonstrated by performance at a level where at least one-fourth of the annual evaluations are at the “exceeds expectations” level as defined in IV.A.1.

2. **Scholarship** - Faculty members are expected to generate units of scholarly work which meet or exceed expectations as defined in IV.A.2.

3. **Service** - Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at the departmental or college levels and to be active and competent advisors to students. Involvement in outreach and/or external engagement activities is expected.

4. **General comments** - When considering the promotion to associate professor decision, the cumulative record of work to date will be considered. Faculty will be expected to demonstrate “high levels” of achievement and performance in teaching, service and scholarship. Faculty are expected to perform at a level where they “meet expectations” or “exceed expectations.” In situations where a performance level that at least “meets expectations” has not been sustained, the Collegial Review Committee and department head will give reasoned, seasoned and experienced judgment to circumstances surrounding the shortcoming.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)
1. **Teaching** - Faculty members are expected to provide evidence of “superior levels” of performance in teaching. Superior levels of performance is demonstrated when the faculty member has exceeded expectations as defined in IV.A.1 in a majority of the years under consideration.

2. **Scholarship** - Faculty members are expected to provide evidence of “superior levels” of performance in scholarship. Faculty members are expected to generate units of scholarly work which will meet or exceed expectations as defined in IV.A.2. Superior levels of performance would be demonstrated when the faculty member has exceeded expectations in a majority of the years under consideration.

3. **Service** - Faculty members are expected to provide evidence of “superior levels” of performance in service. Superior levels of performance are demonstrated when a faculty member has (i) been regularly involved in at least two of the four areas of service/engagement and exhibited exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas OR (ii) shown regular involvement in three of the four areas. Involvement in outreach and/or external engagement activities is expected.

4. **General comments** - When considering promotion to full professor, the cumulative record of work to date will be considered. Generally speaking, faculty will be expected to perform at levels described above. In situations where a performance level that at least meets expectations has not been sustained, the Collegial Review Committee and department head will give reasoned, seasoned and experienced judgment to circumstances surrounding the shortcoming.
F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching - Faculty members are expected to perform at a level that at least meets expectations as defined in IV.A.1.

2. Scholarship - Faculty members are expected to generate units of scholarly work which meets expectations as defined in IV.A.2.

3. Service - Over the preceding review period, a faculty member must have been regularly involved in at least two of the four areas of service/engagement and exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of those areas or show regular involvement in three of the four areas. Involvement in outreach and/or external engagement activities is expected.

4. General comments - The time period for post-tenure review is set by university policy and currently is at least once every five year period since the last personnel action. The Collegial Review Committee and department head will use careful reasoned, seasoned and experienced judgment in cases where the above standards have not been met. University policy deals with procedures if the evaluation yields an unsatisfactory outcome.

Approved by:

[Signatures and dates]

Department Head

[Signature]

Date: 9.30.08

Dean

[Signature]

Date: 9.30.08

Provost

[Signature]

Date: 10.2.08
APPENDIX A

Department of Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics
Rubric for Peer Evaluation of Teaching Materials

Note to Evaluators: In a holistic way, teaching materials are reviewed in light of the 2 - 3 page overview provided by the candidate. A packet that “Meets Expectations” demonstrates clear reasoning with regard to the ways in which the teaching materials show evidence of the candidate’s ability to create and deliver courses that could facilitate learning (e.g., candidates may choose to show connections between objectives, activities, and assessment.) A packet judged to be “ Unsatisfactory” may lack a 2 - 3 page overview of materials and/or contain materials that are considered grossly unclear, incoherent, etc. “ Unsatisfactory” equates to gross negligence of teaching responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor name</th>
<th>Course evaluated</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of teaching</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: The four dimensions included were selected by the faculty as the most relevant of the seven dimensions to be evaluated by peer review of materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
<td>Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matter. 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design Skills</td>
<td>Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Students</td>
<td>Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of Student Learning</td>
<td>Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Department of Accountancy, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics

Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and Procedures for Part-time and Fixed-Term Faculty Members, Lecturers, and Phased-Retirees

Annually, the department head of the Department of Accountancy, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics provides a written evaluation to all faculty using the guidelines and procedures outlined in the Departmental Collegial Review Document (hereinafter, DCR Document). The DCR Document is updated annually by the faculty of the Department of Accountancy, Finance, Information Systems, and Economics and approved by the Dean and the Provost. The processes and instruments that provide the input for this evaluation include (1) Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI), (2) peer evaluations, (3) faculty activity reports, (4) departmental documents, including course syllabi, (5) discussions with the faculty member, and (6) other information that provides evidence appurtenant to the annual evaluation.

All part-time faculty members and lecturers and, unless otherwise stipulated in the employment contract, fixed-term faculty members are evaluated solely on the basis of teaching effectiveness. Phased-retirees and fixed-term faculty members, whose contracts so specify, may have service responsibility. These faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of both their teaching effectiveness and their agreed-upon service contributions.

Teaching Effectiveness. In accordance with university guidelines and §II A of the CRD Document, teaching has seven components: content expertise, instructional delivery skills, course management skills, evaluation of students, faculty-student relationships, and facilitation of student learning. The Department recognizes that teaching is of primary importance and that commitment to and proficiency in teaching is evidenced by any or all of the following items:

- Input on the Student Opinion Survey
- Annual Department Head evaluation
- Direct observation by peers and review of syllabi, exams and other materials as appropriate
- Student accessibility and rapport with students
- Evidence of innovative practices and the use of research in instruction
- Evidence of quality and standards as developed through consultation with colleagues to meet the objectives set forth in the course syllabus
- Initiative in developing or experimenting with media and materials
- Additional evidence of effective teaching.

The rating scale used to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of part-time and fixed-term faculty members, lecturers and phased-retirees is the same as that used to evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Levels of performance include EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS, MEETS EXPECTATIONS, and UNSATISFACTORY. Norms for each rating level are provided in the CRD Document.

Service. Phased-retirees and, where agreed to in the employment contract, fixed-term faculty members are expected to contribute to institutional affairs through service. Because of the
limited duration and/or nature of their employment, opportunities to serve on departmental, college and university committees are somewhat limited. Accordingly, the contributions of these employees may manifest in activities such as orientation programs, recruitment, retention activities, limited-term or limited-purpose task forces, continuing education, work with the SBTDC or IEF, non-credit instruction and workshops, service to professional organization, community service where relevant to the faculty member's academic expertise, and other.

Levels of performance are EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS, MEETS EXPECTATIONS, and UNSATISFACTORY. Norms for each level of performance are contained in the CRD Document.
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## APPENDIX C
Methods of Evaluation used to evaluate Teaching Dimension Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of evaluation</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>Seven Dimensions of Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of teaching materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation of teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>