I. Overview—As the field of communication is diverse in its nature, the Department of Communication requires a faculty with diverse expertise and experience. The department needs to balance teaching, scholarship and service. Quality teaching is the number one priority for all faculty; however, individual faculty members will differ in terms of the types of scholarship pursued, investment in service, and balance between research and practice.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Communication. With the exception of stipulated departmental criteria listed below, the Department of Communication will follow Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook and any approved supplements or addenda to the Handbook, which prevail on any matter not covered herein.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 7 dimensions:
   a. Content expertise – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters. 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.
   b. Instructional delivery skills – Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
   c. Instructional design skills – Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
   d. Course management skills – Effective teachers give timely feedback to students, make efficient use of class time, and handle classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately.
   e. Evaluation of students – Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
   f. Faculty/student relationships – Effective teachers display a positive attitude toward students, show concern for students by being...
approachable and available, present an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, sufficient support for student learning, and respect diversity.

g. Facilitation of student learning – Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence
   a. Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the 7 dimensions of effective teaching (4.05A). The instructor’s self-report and assessment should address each of the seven dimensions of teaching identified above. A packet that includes items including a statement of a teaching philosophy should accompany the report; a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for the courses taught during the period of review.
   b. Peer review of teaching materials --including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2b) The Departmental Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment committee (TPR) will review the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) for teaching quality and effectiveness when giving consideration for tenure, promotion, and reappointment and will assess the following
      - Annual student evaluations for each course
      - Annual Report of Faculty Activities
      - Review of course materials, such as syllabi, tests, handouts, reading lists, and audio-visuals.
   c. Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol (4.3.1.1). All departmental faculty will have direct observations in their classes at least once a year. The procedure for conducting these observations is as follows:
      - Each faculty member will choose a colleague to serve as an observer of their teaching
      - The faculty member and the faculty observer will agree on the criteria/scope of the observation.
      - After the observation, the faculty member and the observer will discuss the experience.
      - The observer will fill out a departmental-approved evaluation form, which will be forwarded to the Department Head to be included in the faculty member’s file.
      - Note: Other options are available for direct classroom observations: (1) observers not employed at WCU approved by the Department Head, (2) Faculty Center observers, and (3) non-departmental teaching awards committee. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside
consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

- Outside observers or the Faculty Center observers will fill out the departmental-approved form. If a teaching awards committee observes the faculty member, the faculty member should request from that committee any evaluation of the observation be sent to the Department Head.

d) Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument. (4.05A) All sections of courses will be evaluated using a form of the Senate-approved 20 item university-wide SAI instrument.

3. General Comments—The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, peer review of substantive teaching material and quantitative SAI. Recognition of quality work performed on-campus and off-campus, including guest lectureships, the judging of activities, and work with students in experiential activities will also be considered appropriate to teaching. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. Faculty members will be rated on a 5-point scale with the following ratings: 5=exemplary; 4=superior; 3=satisfactory; 2=needs improvement; 1=unsatisfactory.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 4 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. The Department of Communication recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than other, and all Boyer categories are valued equally. Scholarship must include external peer review by experts in the discipline.

a. Scholarship of discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works. The Department of Communication will consider as research and creative works all work accomplished for the production of television programs, radio programs, motion picture production, and professionally related consulting, as well as traditional journalistic, historical (where new discoveries or knowledge claims are made) and empirical research leading to publication. Publication is defined as all presentations to the public, including books, brochures, journals, conference papers, exhibitions, performances (live, recorded or mediated communication
such as podcasts, streamed audio/visual, or new media defined by leading authorities in the discipline, expert interviewee for television or radio, magazine and newspaper stories, op-ed pieces, editorial work, design or directing for public performance (television, radio), published software (commercial or publicly distributable), etc.

b. Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time. Examples include textbooks, literature reviews, or documentary pieces presented to the public in such forms as described for discovery.

c. Scholarship of application – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers. Publications in this area may be written or oral reports where the presentation of such is made “in the field” to professional, civic, or academic organizations. Professional consulting including, television, radio, or other broadcasts (either as expert interviewee or production consultant), public relations, marketing, training and development or other communication-related endeavors for academic, governmental, and professional organizations will be considered as scholarship of application.

d. Scholarship of teaching and learning – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes. The department recognizes that faculty research and scholarship in teaching, learning, and educational technology is of great importance to this department, the College of Arts and Science, WCU, and the State of North Carolina; therefore, the department will consider faculty activities in these areas in its tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions.

2. Methods of evaluation – Scholarship and creative works in the Department of Communication, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of a “unit” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. Scholarship must include external peer review by experts in the discipline. The department’s TPR Advisory Committee will judge whether a unit has been achieved on a case-by-case basis, but the following provides general guidelines:

a. Published pieces (as defined in Section II B1a above) are valued more highly than unpublished pieces.

b. The quality of the journal in which an article appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.

c. The department values multi-disciplinary research but candidates should show competence in the field of Communication.

d. The department values collaboration and co-authorship as well as single-authorship.

e. Presentation at national or international conferences is valued as well as presentations at prestigious regional or local conferences.
f. At conferences where symposiums are selected by a competitive or juried method, organizing a symposium and participating in it is valued more highly than just participating in a symposium.

g. Professional speaking engagements other than at Western Carolina University (e.g., at other academic institutions, government agencies, etc.) where the speaker’s research, creative, or professional works are highlighted.

h. Professional consulting, including public relations, marketing, training & development, or other communication-related endeavors for academic, governmental, and professional organizations are highly valued. Note: it is important that non-traditional refereed scholarship be documented in a manner that will clearly indicate the impact of the scholarship.

i. Publishing the first edition of a book is valued more highly than publishing subsequent editions of that book except when subsequent editions require significant revision.

j. With published books, scholarly treatises that involve some degree of original research are valued more highly than the production of textbooks (i.e. the scholarship of discovery over the scholarship of integration).

k. Technical reports or “white papers” will be evaluated according to the impact of the scholarship (e.g., international, national, regional, state, or local) and according to the type of scholarship (discovery, application, integration, etc.)

l. When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.

m. Applying for a grant, and being unsuccessful, is valued more highly than not applying for any grants.

n. Scholarship must identify Western Carolina University as the author’s institution.

o. The department expects faculty to have a well formulated program of scholarship and refereed creative works indicating future projects and activities.

Using these general guidelines, the department’s TPR Advisory Committee will determine “unit” totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the TPR committee. Some items are of such high value that they will be awarded two or more units, most items will earn one unit, and some items will earn a half unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be earned.

Category A - four units:
  o Authorship of a first edition book with a university press or equivalent (i.e. no “self-publications”)
Category B - three units:
- Authorship of the first edition of a textbook
- Original research or creative works that reach an international or national audience involving WCU students and that brings national recognition to the department

Category C - two units:
- Authorship of an article in a refereed journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (Journal of Communication, Journal of Broadcast and Electronic Media, Human Communication, Theory, etc.)
- Editorship of an edited book with a university press or equivalent
- Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a national network audience.
- Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a national network audience.
- Receiving a national award for the production of a radio or television product, original research, or book from organizations that are widely recognized as having high status within a discipline (International Communication Association, National Communication Association, Broadcast Education Association, Intercollegiate Broadcast Service, etc.)

Category D - one unit:
- Authorship in a refereed journal other than those named in category C
- A chapter in a scholarly edited book
- Authorship of a refereed academic conference paper
- A successful external grant proposal (excluding travel grants) of $1,000 or more.
- Presentation at a prestigious refereed professional conference at the state, regional, national, or international level.
- An article in a prestigious magazine or other publication
- Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a regional multi-state audience.
- Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a regional multi-state audience.
- Receiving a national award for the production of a radio or television product, original research, or book from an organization other than those in category C
- Professional consulting or creative works that includes WCU students, reaches a national audience, and brings recognition to the Department

Category E - one-half unit:
- Authorship in a refereed state-level journal or equivalent (e.g., Florida Journal of Communication)
- A scholarly book review
Presentation at a professional conference at the state, regional, national, or international level (other than Cat. D above).

Professional speaking engagements as defined in 2.g above

Professional consulting as defined in 2.h. above

A successful internal grant proposal (excludes travel grants)

An opinion-editorial piece for a newspaper

An article in a magazine or other general readership publication

An encyclopedia entry in a scholarly publication

A technical report for a program evaluation project or government agency (e.g., Citizen Satisfaction Survey)

Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a local audience.

Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a local audience.

3. General comments – These guidelines and examples are not intended to serve as an exhaustive inventory, nor do they focus on “borderline” cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in the Department of Communication. 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, presenting their work in sufficient detail and with evidence of external peer review. The candidate may request a prior review of the proposed project in order to get feedback from the TPR Advisory Committee. The TPR Advisory Committee may solicit outside reviewers if necessary. In these cases of prior review, the TPR Advisory Committee will provide written feedback to the faculty member for inclusion in their dossier or other evaluation materials, and a copy will also be provided to the Department Head for placement in the faculty member’s departmental file. Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

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 an academic, professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level. The department will recognize extension instruction workshops given in the community, any fieldwork, guest speaking, judging for contests or similar activities in the specific areas of communication.
d. Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership/membership, activities and leadership roles in professional organizations from the state, regional, or national level such as service as an officer, participation in conference planning, service as journal editor or reviewer, academic conference paper reviewer, service on accreditation teams, serving as an officer in area-specific academic or professional organizations (e.g., the National Communication Association’s Organizational Communication Interest Group), etc. Recognition of quality work performed in on-campus and off-campus service such as department head or a major role in faculty governance will also be considered as appropriate.

e. Advising— advisement of students, advisement of or work with co-curricular and extracurricular student groups, and the supervision of individual projects in the various communication areas.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—The faculty members listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regards to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees) and other indicators of quality of service.

3. General comments—Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one area 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 15% of the workload. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department; they should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

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 evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. The Deans and Provost determine deadlines for completion of the review process.

2. Composition of review committee – The Departmental AFE Committee will consist of the department head and three faculty members (at least two tenured or tenure-track faculty) nominated by the department head from the full-time permanent faculty at the beginning of the academic year and approved by vote of all faculty. The positions are to be rotated (among all areas in the department) among the faculty each year as practical. The Department Head will serve as a non-voting chair. This committee will also be responsible for reviewing the department Collegial
Review Document and recommending changes as needed. These changes will be submitted to the departmental faculty at one of the first meetings of the academic year. The faculty will discuss and vote on the proposed changes. If adopted, the changes will be written into the following year's evaluation procedures.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
a. The evaluation weighting percentages applied to teaching, scholarship, and service are typical guidelines recognizing that some faculty may be assigned differential loads.

All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes 1) the Annual Report of Faculty Activities and (2) a set of appendices with supporting documentation and artifacts. The Annual Report addresses the following aspects:

1) Teaching (60% of Evaluation)
   - Teaching loads
   - Teaching versatility—range of preparation and level of courses
   - Teaching effectiveness—brief summary of student assessment of instruction, and other indices used to measure effectiveness.
   - Other information: include objective information to illustrate teaching commitment and effectiveness (e.g., graduate students supervised, service learning projects, engagement activities, directing student research)
   - The seven dimensions of teaching: based on information in a. through d., briefly address each dimension, as outlined in the departmental Collegial Review Document.

2) Scholarship and Refereed Creative Work (25% of Evaluation)—Faculty will list the total cumulative record in chronological sequence for the year from most recent to the most dated with regard to scholarship and creative works, as defined by above. Items with projected publish dates may also be included if publication is projected to occur within the year. Items should be clearly designated as referred, non-referred, or non-traditional referred.
   NOTE: Public recognition is also considered. Public recognition is defined as any activity, which brings positive recognition to the department and the university. Consideration will be given to the balance
between quantity and quality. Also, differing needs, career opportunities, and professional obligations may change the formula for limited periods of time during a faculty member’s career. Such changes will take the form of a letter of agreement between the individual faculty and the Department Head in the individual’s AFE file stating the time period covered as well as the purpose and terms of the adjustment.

3). Service (15% of Evaluation)—Consideration will be given to the balance between quantity and quality as well as to willingness to contribute. Faculty will list the cumulative record of their service/engagement activities in chronological sequence from most recent to most dated with each category:

- Service to the University—departmental, college and institution;
- Service to external constituencies—engagement activities, delivering workshops, professional consulting, teaching professional continuing education courses, service to professional disciplines, etc.; and
- Service to students—advisee load, work with student organizations, etc.
- Note: Expectations for service is based on years of experience (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College or University level committees)

b. Specific Guidelines for Preparation of the AFE Document—See Section III.A.3.a above.

c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05F) Part time (including adjunct) and Lecturer positions shall be evaluated in a similar procedure as tenure-track faculty. Part time (including adjunct) and Lecturer positions shall be evaluated based 100 percent on their teaching. Fixed term Instructors will be evaluated in the same procedure as the tenure/tenure-track faculty. Eighty percent of an Instructor evaluation will be based on teaching and the remaining 20 percent on either scholarship or service. All faculty will complete the elements of the Annual Report of Faculty that is applicable to them (scholarly activity and service may not be required). For those teaching the Liberal Studies course CMHC 201, the Director of that program does classroom observation and
confirmation of the observation will be placed in the faculty member’s file.

d. General Comments: Procedures for the AFE Committee
The AFE committee will elect a secretary among its membership. The committee will meet and evaluate each faculty member in accordance with university procedures and the provisions of this document. The committee will confer and discuss all of the submitted materials and enter a rating and rationale to be placed on the Faculty Evaluation Scale. (See appendix). The committee will act in an advisory capacity to the Department Head. During committee deliberations, the Department Head will be a non-voting member. When the Department Head is the person being considered, he/she will excuse him/herself. The AFE Committee Secretary will submit the committee’s recommendations directly to the appropriate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Based on the committee deliberation and ratings, the Department Head will prepare a written AFE Statement for each faculty, addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty members meet with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement and may prepare a rebuttal statement if they wish. The AFE Statement is then submitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)

1. Overview – The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment. The Dean’s office will review and consult with the Provost’s office on any changes.

2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) - The Departmental TPR Advisory Committee will be chaired by the Department Head (non-voting) and will be comprised of three tenured faculty members elected annually by the department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with Department tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean of Arts & Sciences, selects tenured faculty from other closely-related departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.
C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Overview—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.

2. Composition of review committee—The departmental post-tenure review committee shall be comprise of the Department Head (non-voting) and all tenured members of the department, excluding any member scheduled for Post-tenure Review. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with Department tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean of Arts & Sciences, selects tenured faculty from other closely-related 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 member under review should provide the following information for the committee to review:
      1) A current curriculum vitae
      2) The four most recent AFE statements written by the Department Head, plus any rebuttals.
   c. The committee will discuss and determine a rating of exemplary, superior, satisfactory, needing improvement or unsatisfactory based on the previous four AFE Statements. The Department Head will provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head will add his/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.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in Department of Communication

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation

1. Teaching – Each full and part-time faculty member must be evaluated annually for teaching effectiveness. The departmental faculty evaluation committee (AFE committee) must reach consensus on each faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on the following criteria:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
   b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
   c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching evaluations at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship – Minimum one unit per year, as described in Section II B 2.

3. Service: Tenure and tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in each of the following levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair). Total commitment to all service areas should be approximately 15% of tenured and tenure track faculty workload. (Note: Expectations for service is based on years of experience (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College of University level committees). Part-time and fixed term faculty commitments to service are contingent on individual contract terms.

4. General Comments: In general, time and work efforts for tenured & tenure track faculty should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service. Unless the faculty contract stipulates differently, part-time and fixed term faculty are considered as 100% teaching. Exceptions to this full-time teaching commitment are dependent on individual contract. In these cases, the part-time or fixed term faculty member is expected to submit a copy of their contractual agreement with their AFE file.
B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching – Each full and part-time faculty member must be evaluated annually for teaching effectiveness. The departmental faculty evaluation committee (AFE committee) must reach consensus on each faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on the following criteria:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
   b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
   c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship – Minimum of one unit per year, as described in Section II B 2. As the candidate progresses through the probationary period, expectations increase with regard to scholarly activity. On a case-by-case basis, the candidate may need to exceed the yearly minimum to maintain sustainable progress towards tenure. Special note: Typically, for the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectations for the completion of scholarly activity during the first year, only the clear indication that plans have been initiated to establish a pattern of scholarly activity that will lead to tenure.

3. Service: The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service (departmental; college; university; external/regional service), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College of University level committees). There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. Total commitment to all service areas should be approximately 15% of faculty workload. Exposure to all levels of institutional service is desirable; however, exceptions approved by the Dept. Head and AFE committee are acceptable. Examples of approved service that might exempt a faculty member from traditional levels of varied institutional service includes: large outreach projects, funded research projects, faculty fellowships, etc. Tenure track faculty members should gradually accrue a share of advisees.
4. General Comments: In general, time and work efforts for tenured & tenure track faculty should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching –To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to tenure application, have an overall “excellent” rating based on AFE committee reports. The overall “excellent” rating is based on an AFE committee consensus decision on the faculty member’s following teaching materials:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be “excellent.”
   b) Receive an “excellent” score (averaging a minimum of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
   c) One “excellent” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship-- Six units, as described in Section II B 2. Faculty are expected to initiate scholarly work upon appointment, but these units may be completed during the latter four years of the probationary period. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. The faculty member should have experience in each level of service before receiving tenure. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of advisees by the year prior to submission for tenure.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
1. Teaching—To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to promotion for Associate Professor, have an overall “excellent” rating based on AFE committee reports. An overall “excellent” rating is based on AFE committee consensus of the following candidate teaching materials:

a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be “satisfactory.”
b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship—Six units, as described in Section II B 2. Faculty are expected to initiate scholarly work upon appointment, but these units may be completed during the four years preceding the requested promotion. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees by the year prior to submission for promotion.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching—To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should for three consecutive years prior to promotion to Full Professor, have an overall superior rating based on AFE committee reports. The overall superior rating is based on an AFE committee consensus decision of
faculty member submissions of the following teaching materials
a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based
on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
b) Receive a ‘superior’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5
“factor scores” of the SAI on at least 90 percent of the courses taught.
c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other
credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include:
departamental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departamental teaching
award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE
committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-
credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members;
quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the
past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty
member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and
Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship—Eight units subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor. A
minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following
traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university;
external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these
levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section
for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels
of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share
of departmental advisees and have demonstrated competence as a student advisor
and serve as a model/mentor for junior faculty.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in
teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching –To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the
faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to post-tenure review,
have an overall “satisfactory” rating based on the previous AFE committee
reports.

2. Scholarship—One or two unit minimum for each year since tenure or the last
post-tenure review noting that some faculty may be assigned a differential load.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the
following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college;
university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of
these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service”
section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees and have demonstrated competence as a student advisor and serve as a model/mentor to junior faculty.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.
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