I. Overview

Criteria, guidelines, and procedures are supplementary to the Faculty Handbook and the WCU Tenure Policies and Regulations as approved by the Board of Governors, the provisions of which shall prevail on any matter not covered in this document or on any point where this document is inconsistent with those provisions. All faculty members must have documented evidence of educational preparation, quality teaching, service and scholarship in their discipline.

Faculty performance is reviewed and evaluated each year by two formal processes. According to the schedule provided by the Office of the Provost, tenure-track faculty members are considered for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post tenure review during the fall and/or early winter months. For these actions, faculty members’ cumulative records are appraised by departmental, college, and, when appropriate, university committees. (It should be noted that post tenure review (PTR) occurs either every five years or five years after post tenure promotion actions – See Appendix C.) In the spring, Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFE) are conducted specific to performance over the most recent year of service. AFE evaluations apply to tenure-track and non tenure-track faculty.

The evaluation processes mentioned above are conducted through separate systems. Recommendations for appointment, tenure and rank are made by Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees, administrators at various levels, and finally, by the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Advisory post tenure review recommendations are made to the Department Head and Dean by the Collegial Review Committee (See section 4.07 of the faculty handbook). The AFE is conducted by the Department Head, discussed in meetings between faculty members and the Department Head, and used by the Department Head and Dean in decisions specific to merit raises.

Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) has a two-track system for faculty evaluation: the traditional tenure track for the educator/scholar, and a non-tenure track for the educator/practitioner. These tracks allow for the diversity of expertise needed within the Department. Both tracks provide vital contributions to the advancement of CSD as a discipline and a profession. The educator/scholar participates in all levels of faculty evaluation (i.e., AFE, TPR, PTR), while the educator/practitioner participates only in the AFE process.

See Appendices B and C for Procedural guidelines specific to AFE and PTR

A. Educator/Scholar Track -Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

1. Appointment Requirements
   a. Minimum of an earned Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders – ABD may be considered if the terminal degree can be obtained within time frame specified at employment;
   b. Evidence of or eligibility for the Certificate of Clinical Competence from the American-Speech-Language Hearing Association and state licensure from the NC Board of Examiners.
c. Eligible to be considered for tenure within the university;

d. Potential to meet criteria related to teaching, scholarship, and service. Consistent with Ernest Boyer’s (1990) model, types of scholarship appropriate for the educator/scholar track include the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching and learning. Guidelines for the dissemination and evaluation of scholarship are provided in later portions of this document.

2. Professional Preparation and Experience

   a. CSD faculty must be prepared in the areas for which they will assume teaching responsibilities. Preparation must include academic training and clinical preparation/experience consistent with teaching assignments. For appointment, reappointment, or promotion, the minimal departmental requirements are the same as those stated in the Faculty Handbook. For tenure, the maximum number of years of continuous full-time probationary service shall be six years except as provided by the Faculty Handbook. For ABD candidates who are first time faculty appointment candidates, a minimum of three years clinical/supervisory experience is required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Part-time and/or adjunct teaching experience is preferred for employment.

B. Educator/Practitioner Track -Criteria for Appointment

1. Appointment Requirements

   a. Minimum of an earned Masters Degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders.

   b. Eligible for appointments/promotions as outlined in University policies.

   c. Meet criteria related to teaching, scholarship, and service and practice in the delivery of speech-language pathology and audiology. Types of scholarship appropriate for the educator/practitioner track include the scholarship of integration, application, and teaching and learning. The scholarship of discovery may also be appropriate but is not required. Guidelines for the dissemination and evaluation of scholarship are provided in later portions of this document.

   d. Eligible for Certificate of Clinical Competence from the American Speech-Language Hearing Association and state license from the NC Board of Examiners.

2. Professional Preparation and Experience

   a. For appointment the minimal departmental requirements are the same as those stated in the Faculty Handbook. For candidates without doctoral degrees who are first time faculty appointment candidates, a minimum of three years clinical experience and at least one year of clinical teaching/supervision are required for appointment. Part time and/or adjunct teaching for at least one year may be considered in lieu of clinical teaching.

C. Adjunct faculty

1. Adjunct faculty are defined as those who hold a minimum of a master’s degree in CSD and are appointed for semester or one-year terms primarily as part-time clinical instructors. Adjunct faculty
must meet the appropriate requirements and professional preparation and experience criteria as noted above.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the 7 dimensions of teaching, content, expertise, instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, course management skills, evaluation of students, faculty/student relationships, and the facilitation of student learning. Performance should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion. Teaching will normally constitute 40% of AFE/TPR for Educator/Scholar Track faculty and 70% for Educator/Practitioner Track faculty. Instructional assignments for all faculty (except in unusual circumstances) will consist of traditional classroom assignments in addition to clinical teaching in the Speech and Hearing Center. It is likely that the greater percentage of teaching for the Educator/Practitioner will be in the area of clinical teaching/supervision. Evaluation of teaching will be based on the following key expectations and examples/behaviors provided under each dimension.

2. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require evidence of sustained growth in the expectation areas mentioned below. Reappointment in years 1 through 5 is based upon documented growth in 5 or more of the areas provided below as evidenced by a candidate’s cumulative record and support file. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is supported by the record attained during the reappointment process and AFE evaluations of “exceeds expectations” in teaching for the majority of years taught at WCU. Promotion to Professor is supported by a candidate’s cumulative record demonstrating excellence in 5 or more of the areas provided below and AFE evaluations of “exceeds expectations” for 3/4 of years taught at WCU. Positive post tenure review requires AFE evaluations of “meets or exceeds expectations” for 3/5 of years of the review cycle.

Expectations:

Preparation
- Makes significant contributions to course offerings/clinical preparation.
- Uses resources to improve teaching as suggested by peers and students.

Content Expertise
- Follows syllabus outline and assigned textbook (if applicable)
- Incorporates recent subject content/findings
- Contributes to content review
- Delivers invited/guest lectures outside department
- Obtains/maintains certification as appropriate

Instructional Delivery
- Engages students in learning
- Illustrates from own practice (protecting patient identity)
- Applies didactic to clinical
- Selects methods appropriate to content
- Uses technology in the classroom effectively
- Utilizes WebCT or other platforms effectively for course delivery (if appropriate)
- Uses FCTE/other resources to develop new strategies
• Participates in peer review and mentoring

**Instructional Design**
• Participates in syllabus revisions
• Proposes/develops new teaching resources/tools
• Proposes/develops new courses for traditional and/or distance delivery

**Course Management**
• Collaborates with faculty peers
• Makes effective use of teaching time
• Handles classroom/online/clinical dynamics effectively
• Incorporates student feedback into course revisions
• Collaborates on textbook/media selection
• Demonstrates best-practices in online courses

**Evaluation of Students**
• Gives constructive feedback in a timely manner
• Documents using approved evaluation tools
• Writes/modifies effective test items

**Faculty/Student Relations**
• Displays positive attitudes
• Keeps office hours or appointments
• Shows respect for students and for diversity
• Participates in academic advising
• Mentors student learning projects/research
• Supervises independent study/practicum

**Facilitation of Learning**
• Provides reliable resources
• Maintains high academic standards
• Adheres to scope of practice for self and students
•Synthesizes curriculum/conceptual threads as a whole in the facilitation of classroom/clinical learning, course and program development
• Develops, promotes, and/or assists with service learning opportunities

3. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence

a. Evaluation of teaching will include data from three sources: student assessment of instruction, colleagues' reviews of teaching (classroom observation and/or reviews of teaching materials), and instructor's self-report and evaluation.
   1. **Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)** - Course evaluations are required of all course sections (clinical and non-clinical) taught by non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty. All faculty are required to report SAs in AFE materials from all sections taught each academic year.
   2. **Colleagues' Reviews of Teaching Materials** - The Department Head will perform collegial review and evaluate teaching materials prepared by each instructor being evaluated. In January of each academic year the Department Head will review materials and make
recommendations and include findings in the AFE process. Materials reviewed may include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc. Instructors can request colleagues other that the Department Head to conduct the review described above. Requests will be submitted to and acted on by the Department Head. Reports of findings will be submitted to the Department Head. Direct Observation of Instruction (for all tenure-track faculty—UNC Policy 4.3.1.1—providing feedback addressing the seven dimensions of teaching) - All teaching faculty must be evaluated once each year by direct observation in the classroom. Observation of classroom teaching should be conducted by a peer familiar with the content or specialty being taught.

3. Instructor's Self-report and Evaluation Addressing the Seven Dimensions of Teaching - Each year during the AFE process, each faculty member will prepare a brief written report evaluating their performance in each of the seven dimensions. The examples/behaviors noted in the Teaching Criteria section of this document should be used as a guide. The report should also include items such as a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, strategies used, and selected teaching materials for the courses taught during the AFE review period.

b. Rating System for the Seven Dimensions of Teaching (rating system will be the same for Educator/Scholar and Educator/Practitioner tracks assuming Educator/Practitioner track faculty have classroom assignments): Meets Expectations (meets 70% or more of behaviors in each dimension including minimal expectations where applicable); Exceeds Expectations (meets 90% or more of behaviors in each dimension including minimal expectations where applicable); Does Not Meet Expectations - Unsatisfactory* (meets less than 70% of behaviors in each dimension including at least one minimum expectation). If a faculty member does not meet expectations the AFE rating will be "unsatisfactory" and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05 C)

1. All faculty members should include descriptions of professional development activities specific to teaching in the AFE materials to be reviewed by the Department Head. Scholarship is evaluated based on Ernest Boyer's (1990) model. Educator/Scholar faculty should demonstrate regular productivity in one or more types of scholarship through the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching and learning. Performance should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion. Scholarship will normally constitute 40% of AFE/TPR for Educator/Scholar Track faculty members. Scholarly outcomes are defined broadly as the use of disciplinary knowledge and skill and may include published or unpublished scholarly outcomes. Unpublished scholarly outcomes meet the definition of scholarship if they appear in a publicly observable form; in other words, it must be public, subject to critical review, and in a form allowing the use and exchange by other members of the discipline (Shulman & Hutchings, 1998). Unpublished scholarly outcomes can take the form of a paper, poster, an audio or videotape presentation, written report, or Web site (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002). Key expectations in scholarship and examples that meet criteria for scholarly behaviors are provided below. These should not be interpreted as all inclusive.

2. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require evidence of sustained growth in the scholarship areas mentioned below. Reappointment in years 1 through 5 is based upon documented growth in 2 or more of the areas provided below (Discovery is required as the candidate advances) as evidenced by a candidate’s cumulative record and support file. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is supported by the record attained during the reappointment process and AFE evaluations of “meets expectations/exceeds expectations” in scholarship for the majority of years taught at WCU. Promotion to Professor is supported by a candidate’s cumulative record demonstrating excellence in
2 or more of the areas provided below and AFE evaluations of “exceeds expectations” in scholarship for 3/4 of years taught at WCU. Positive post tenure review requires AFE evaluations of “meets expectations/exceeds expectations” for 3 years of the review cycle. Note that activities provided below must be peer reviewed. This can occur using Peer Review.

Expectations:

Scholarship of Discovery
- Scholarly Activity
- Writes research grant and/or manages successful research grant
- Serves as PI or Co-PI for research study
- Engages in graduate research activity
- Unpublished Scholarly Activity (See B1)
- A paper or poster presented, describing a new theory developed by the author
- A paper or poster presented, reporting the findings of research to gain new knowledge
- A report on research findings to a granting agency
- Publications
  - A book chapter, book, or refereed journal article describing a new theory developed by the author
  - A book chapter, book, or refereed journal article reporting new knowledge gained through research

Scholarship of Integration
- Scholarly Activity
- Serves as a peer-reviewer for a journal in the discipline or area of practice
- Serves as a peer-reviewer for a book in the discipline or area of practice
- Serves as a peer-reviewer for grant applications in the discipline
- Unpublished Scholarly Activity (See B1)
- Provides talk on a current disciplinary topic to a local radio or television station, service organization, business organization, nonacademic professional organization, high school, or community college
- Publications
  - A review of literature or integrated review on a disciplinary topic
  - An article or book chapter on the application of a discipline or discipline-related theory, research method, or clinical practice issue
  - A critical book review published in a professional journal
  - A textbook in discipline published
  - An edited book in discipline published

Scholarship of Application/Engagement
- Scholarly Activity
- Study conducted to solve a departmental problem or formulate departmental or institutional policy
- Testifies or consults as expert witness
- Provides off-campus consulting services related to discipline
- Obtains/maintains national certification in area of practice
- Unpublished Scholarly Activity (See B1)
- Develops a new intervention or process for dealing with a problem related to CSD practice
- Writes program development grants and/or manages successful grants
- Conducts a study for a local organization or government agency related to the discipline
- Conducts a study to solve a community problem related to the discipline
- Publications
- An article that outlines a new research problem identified through application of CSD knowledge
- An article that applies CSD knowledge or skills to a clinical practice problem

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**
- Scholarly Activities
- Chairs student research projects or theses
- Serves as member of student research projects or theses
- Develops a new course with related syllabus and teaching materials
- Develops new media to deliver course or course material
- Introduces the result of one’s scholarship (discovery) into teaching content or methods
- Unpublished Scholarly Activity (See B1)
- Presentation of a new teaching technique to peers
- Development of a significant collection of resource materials for a course
- Experimentation with new teaching or testing methods – altering until it is successful
- Creation of a strategy or approach to help students think critically or conceptually
- Publications
- Publication on the use of a new teaching strategy or approach, or testing method to help students think critically or conceptually
- Publication on a new teaching or testing method and the alterations that made it successful

3. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review— The following are key expectations and examples that meet the criteria for scholarly behaviors, but should not be interpreted as all inclusive. Faculty should document whether their scholarly activities are peer reviewed, invited, peer evaluated, or anonymous peer review or evaluation. (Guidelines for external peer review of scholarship are provided in Appendix D – External reviewers will be approved by the Department Head after selection by the candidate). Faculty should also note if publications were subject to an editorial board or other editorial review. For AFE evaluations ratings will include “meets expectations” (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating two areas of Scholarship); “exceeds expectations” (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating four or more collective behavior(s) in two or more areas of Scholarship); and “does not meet expectations” (does not provide documentation or evidence demonstrating behaviors in the Scholarship areas noted above). If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s). For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates’ collective scholarly work must include examples from the Scholarship of Discovery and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Published materials must include first authorship. For promotion to Professor, 40% of candidates’ collective scholarly work must be from the Scholarship of Discovery. Published materials must include significant first authorship.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Evaluation is based on service to the school, college, university, profession, and community. Performance of service should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion. Service will normally constitute 20% of the AFE/TPR for Educator/Scholar track faculty members and 30% for Educator/Practitioner track faculty members. Evaluation of service will be based on the following
key questions, expectations, and examples/behaviors provided under each type of service. Minimal expectations are provided to assist first year faculty members with guidelines for successful reappointment. They are also provided as a baseline that all faculty members are expected to meet and exceed.

2. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require evidence of sustained growth in the areas mentioned below. Reappointment in years 1 through 5 is based upon documented growth in 3 or more of the areas provided below as evidenced by a candidate’s cumulative record and support file. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is supported by the record attained during the reappointment process and AFE evaluations of "exceeds expectations" in service for the majority of years at WCU. Promotion to Professor is supported by a candidate’s cumulative record demonstrating excellence in 4 or more of the areas provided below and AFE evaluations of "exceeds expectations" for 3/4 of years at WCU. Positive post tenure review requires AFE evaluations of "exceeds expectations" for 3 years of the review cycle.

Key Questions:
- Has this person made significant contributions to the department, WCU Speech and Hearing Center, college, university, profession, and/or region/community?
- Has this person completed assigned tasks and successfully assumed leadership roles in the above-mentioned settings?

Minimum Expectations
- Citizen of Department, Speech and Hearing Center, Profession, & Community Member of one departmental committee
- Engages in established recruitment activities
- Attends one commencement a year
- Attends department/college/university events
- Member of professional association(s)
- Represents WCU to community groups
- Completes assigned clinical activities

Department Service
- Faculty liaison with clinical agency
- Helps mentor new faculty
- Advises successfully as evidenced by student program progress
- Participates in projects/accreditation
- Chairs committee as needed
- Participates in searches for new faculty
- Creates and conducts other recruitment activity
- Creates/revises recruitment tools
- Creates/revises clinical procedures/activities
- Promotes clinical activities
- Mentors student organizations
- Participates in extra committees (ad hoc), task force, etc.

College Service
- Serves on college committee
- Chairs college committee as needed
• Collaborates with other disciplines
• Receives honors/awards for service

**University Service**
• Serves as Faculty Senator (if qualified)
• Serves on university committee as qualified
• Chairs university committee as needed
• Receives honors/awards for service

**Professional Service**
• Active in professional association(s)
• Leadership in professional association(s)
• Holds office at local, state, regional, or national level
• Serves on committee at local, state, regional, or national level
• Chairs committee at local, state, regional, or national level
• Engagement at state, regional, or national levels (ad hoc committees, task forces, etc.)
• Receives honors/awards for service

**Community/Region Service**
• Active as health professional in community
• Engages in health-promotion activities or service through community agencies
• Participates in health agency activities
• Provides consultation on health issues to community/region or professional organizations
• Provides leadership in community/region organizations
• Receives honors/awards for contributions in community/region

3. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence — For the AFE, the Educator/Scholar Faculty must meet Department/Profession/Community Citizenship Expectations and will be rated further using the following descriptors “meets expectations” (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating one or more behaviors in each area of service to the department, college or university, profession or community); “exceeds expectations” (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating two or more behaviors in each area of service to the department, college or university, profession or community); “does not meet expectations” (does not provide documentation or evidence meeting minimal expectations and demonstrating behaviors noted in “meet expectations category”). For the AFE, Educator/Practitioner faculty must meet Department/Profession/Community Citizenship Expectations and will be rated further using the following: “meets expectations” (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating one or more behaviors in an area of service to the department, college, profession/community); “exceeds expectations” (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating two or more behaviors in each area of service to the school, college, profession/community); and “does not meet expectations (does not provide documentation or evidence meeting minimal expectations and demonstrating behaviors noted in “meet expectations” category). Service ratings for Educator/Practitioner faculty will also encompass departmental assignments specific to clinical management and supervision. If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with actions outlined to address the area(s).
III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview – Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the CSD Department Head will complete an annual faculty evaluation (AFE) of all full-time CSD faculty members each spring semester. Faculty members will complete the AFE summary form provided by the Departmental office and turn it into the Department Head with supporting documentation prior to the 10th of April. The Department Head will use this information and the guidelines provided in section II of this document to evaluate each faculty member's annual performance. Written performance summaries will be provided to faculty members for review by the 20th of April. Each faculty member will schedule time with the Department Head to review and sign their performance summary. If faculty members disagree with their performance summaries, they will be asked by the Department Head to write a response which will be attached to the written AFE. Upon completion of this process, AFE summaries will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences for review and subsequent action.

2. Procedures and preparation of AFE documentation – All faculty members will be expected to provide documentation of annual activities in teaching, service, and scholarship.

   a. Teaching – Teaching materials must include student assessment of instruction, a self-evaluation instruction addressing the seven dimensions of teaching outlined in Section II. A 1. of this document (this may be a brief written personal narrative), and a peer observation/evaluation of teaching as dictated in Section II A. 2 of this document (the Department Head will be available to conduct all observations/ faculty members can also submit observations by other peers).

   b. Service – Service documentation can include letters, evidence of committee/professional appointments, and other materials supporting service activities.

   c. Scholarship – Scholarship documentation can include any evidence of scholarship as articulated by the Boyer Model. These things may include published and unpublished materials, invitations for editorial responsibilities, letter or other products related to presentations or products. External review of scholarship is encouraged for candidates seeking tenure or promotion actions as a means of providing peer review. External reviews can be arranged by the candidate after approval of reviewers by the Department Head (See Appendix D). See process described below.

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

1. Overview – All tenure track faculty members will participate in evaluation specific to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually during their probationary period. Tenured faculty will be evaluated upon their decision to pursue promotion. Educator scholar track faculty will be eligible to request an annual review to support promotion efforts through WCU’s Department of Human Resources. Evaluations will occur in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship.

2. Departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committees – For Educator/scholar track faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion review committees will be composed of the Department Head (non-voting) and all tenured faculty members in CSD (candidates for Promotion/PTR will not serve on their own review committees). If the resultant committee is
comprised of less than three tenured faculty (exclusive of the Department Head), the Department Head, in conjunction with the CSD faculty, CHHS Dean, and Provost will select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three tenured faculty. For educator scholar track faculty, promotion committees will be composed of the department Head, one tenure track faculty member, and one educator scholar track faculty member (not the candidate for promotion).

3. Specific Expectations for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion - Below are specific expectations for educator scholar track faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Also included are expectations for promotion for the educator practitioner track.

**Educator Scholar Track**

**To be recommended for reappointment the faculty member must:**

**Teaching:** provide evidence of an annual record that meets or exceeds evaluation expectations described in section II A. 2 of this document.

**Scholarly Activity:** provide evidence of an annual record that meets or exceeds evaluation expectations described below.

**Service/Engagement:** provide must provide evidence of an annual record that meets or exceeds evaluation expectations described in section II C. 2 of this document.

**To be recommended for tenure the faculty member must:**

**Teaching:** forward a cumulative record of teaching providing evidence of: 1) positive collegial reviews of teaching; 2) positive student assessment of teaching; and 3) evidence of efforts to improve teaching efforts and/or be innovative in the classroom. Other evidence can include the receipt of teaching recognitions or awards, positive outcome measures from students, and instructor self-assessments.

**Scholarly Activity:** forward a cumulative record of scholarship providing evidence of: 1) 4 to 5 peer-reviewed articles with the presence of first authorship – 25% of scholarship must be in the Scholarship Discovery/Scholarship of Integration; and 2) professional presentations at local, regional, and national levels. Other evidence can include proceedings or other non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., chapter, newsletter entries, product reviews), presentations, editorial responsibilities, funding, and the creation of products associated with scholarship (e.g., web products).

**Service/Engagement:** forward a cumulative record of service providing evidence of: 1) department, college, and university engagement; and 2) collegial activities. Other evidence can include service to the region/discipline and exemplary advisement and student mentorship.

**To be recommended for promotion to associate professor the faculty member must:**

**Teaching:** forward a cumulative record of teaching providing evidence of: 1) positive collegial reviews of teaching; 2) positive student assessment of teaching; and 3) evidence of efforts to improve teaching efforts and/or be innovative in the classroom. Other evidence can include the receipt of teaching recognitions or awards, positive outcome measures from students, and instructor self-assessments.

**Scholarly Activity:** forward a cumulative record of scholarship providing evidence of: 1) 4 to 5 peer-reviewed articles with the presence of first authorship – 25% of scholarship must be in the Scholarship Discovery/Scholarship of Integration; and 2) professional presentations at local, regional, and national levels. Other evidence can include proceedings or other non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., chapters, newsletter entries, product reviews), presentations, editorial
responsibilities, funding, and the creation of products associated with scholarship (e.g., web products).

**Service/Engagement:** forward a cumulative record of service providing evidence of: 1) department, college, and university engagement; and 2) collegial activities. Other evidence can include service to the discipline and exemplary advisement and student mentorship.

**To be recommended for promotion to full professor the faculty member must:**

**Teaching:** forward a cumulative record that provides evidence of superior teaching abilities including: 1) peer-review; 2) student assessments; and 3) innovations in the classroom/efforts to improve teaching. Other evidence can include the receipt of teaching recognitions or awards, positive outcome measures from students, and instructor self-assessments.

**Scholarly Activity:** forward a cumulative record that provides evidence of superior scholarly activities including: 1) 10 to 14 peer-reviewed articles (cumulative record over WCU career – may include credit years from other institutions) with the presence of first authorship – 50% of scholarship must be in the Scholarship Discovery/Scholarship of Integration; 2) sustained professional presentations at local, regional, and national levels; 3) applications for external funding; 4) invited blind letters of review. Other evidence can include proceedings or other non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., chapters, newsletter entries, product reviews), presentations, books/monographs, editorial responsibilities, funding, and the creation of products associated with scholarship (e.g., web products).

**Service/Engagement:** forward a cumulative record that provides evidence of superior service including: 1) department, college, and university engagement; and 2) collegial activities. Other evidence can include service to the discipline and exemplary advisement and student mentorship.

**External Peer Review** – External peer review of scholarship is required for all candidates pursuing promotion to professor. Candidates will work in conjunction with the Department Head to identify 3 possibly reviewers qualified to provide evaluations in expertise areas. The Department Head will select one reviewer, provide them with the Department’s collegial review document/the candidates portfolio, and request a review within a three week period. The review will be conducted using the guide provided in Appendix D. Once received, external peer review materials will be placed in candidate’s documentation files by the Department Head.

**Educator Practitioner Track**

**To be receive departmental endorsement for promotion through WCU’s Department of Human Resources the faculty member must:**

**Teaching -** Forward a cumulative record of at least three consecutive AFEs documenting teaching that “exceeds expectations.”

**Service –** Forward a cumulative record of at least three consecutive AFEs documenting service that “exceeds expectations.”

4. Preparation of documentation – For Educator/Scholar faculty, the candidate list for reappointment and tenure is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Candidates eligible for promotion declare their intentions to the Department Head who apprises them of the review schedule. Candidates seeking the actions mentioned above create a dossier that reflects their record of teaching, scholarship, and service. 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. Specific roles, responsibilities, and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are described in Section 4.0 of the Faculty Handbook.
C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Overview – In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review the faculty member must: Teaching: provide evidence of an annual AFE record that meets or exceeds evaluation expectations described in section II of this document. Positive reviews will be shared with the faculty member by the Department Head. Negative reviews will result in an action plan devised by the Department Head, Dean, and faculty member in question addressing the needs of the faculty member. See Appendix C for specific information about the PTR process and follow-up.

2. Composition of the review committee – The Post Tenure Review committee will be the same as the Educator/Scholar Track AFE committee.

3. Preparation of documentation – see Appendix C
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Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion for Educator/Practitioner Track

1. Faculty Appointment for Educator/Practitioner - Practitioner/educator faculty may hold the following academic titles: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor.

2. Initial appointment to the Practitioner/Educator track will, in most cases, be at the Assistant Professor rank.

3. Assistant Professor is the first professorial rank. Individuals achieving this rank should have demonstrated advanced clinical skills, documented teaching competency, and clear evidence of beginning clinical scholarship. Requirements are outlined in Section One of this document.

4. Non-tenure faculty are eligible for promotion to a higher rank according to University and Department guidelines.

5. Academic title is determined by the established criteria for that rank as delineated in the Faculty Handbook.

6. Criteria for each rank are described under broad categories and are intended to serve as guidelines. To be initially appointed or promoted to a rank higher than Assistant Professor, the criteria for the preceding rank should be met as well as criteria for the rank being sought.

7. Faculty currently employed on tenure track lines who hold a master’s degree as their highest degree may continue on their tenure track; any new faculty who do not have a doctorate or satisfactory progress towards a doctorate will be appointed only to the non-tenure track or as adjunct faculty.

8. Faculty employed in a non-tenure track position may, upon completion or satisfactory progress towards completion of a doctorate and/or availability of a tenure track position, apply for vacant tenure track positions for which they may be qualified.

9. Faculty in tenure track positions who do not earn tenure may not be reappointed to a non-tenure track position.

10. Full-time faculty appointed to the non-tenure track are considered fully affiliated faculty.

11. Criteria for Evaluation, Appointment, and/or Promotion – see Sections One and Two of this document.

12. Faculty with excellent records and at least two years of service at WCU upon application (letter of request) may be offered reappointment with two year contracts at the discretion of the Department Head, following positive peer-review and the AFE. Faculty with excellent records and at least six years of service at WCU upon application (letter of request) may be offered reappointment with contracts up to three years at the discretion of the Department Head, following positive peer-review and the AFE. Renewal of two to three year contracts may be offered at the discretion of the Department Head, following positive peer-review and AFE. Contracts must be approved by the Dean and Provost.
Appendix B

Process for Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE)

1. Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the Department Head shall complete an evaluation of all full and part-time faculty members each spring semester.

2. Each full-time faculty member in the department will be evaluated on criteria noted in Section Two of this document.

3. Part-time faculty member will be evaluated for their effectiveness as teachers based on selected AFE criteria in Section Two, student evaluations forms, course syllabi and objectives.

4. In January of each year, all full-time faculty will submit teaching materials to the Department Head (as outlined in Section Two of this document titled “Colleagues’ Reviews of Teaching Materials”). The Department Head or faculty designee will review the materials and make written recommendations April 1st of the same academic year. These recommendations will be included in the Department Head’s AFE summary.

5. On April 1st of each year, all full-time faculty members will submit to the Department Head a file documenting their performance related to teaching, scholarship, and service, and an updated CV. Evidence related to teaching will include data from three sources: student assessment of instruction, peer evaluation, and instructor’s self-report and evaluation (see Section Two of this document).

6. The Department Head will prepare a written summary of evaluation using data supplied by the faculty member, the FAC, and the criteria noted in Section Two of this document.

7. At the conclusion of the evaluation process each year, the Department Head will consult with each member of the faculty to review the results of his/her evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance. The written summary of evaluation will be shared with the faculty member. As a minimal requirement, the faculty member should sign the summary to indicate receipt, but will be provided the added opportunity of replying to indicate written acceptance of findings or of providing a written rebuttal to be attached to the Department Head’s summary.

8. A copy of AFE summary results prepared by the Department Head will be submitted to the Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences, following the completion of the spring semester.
Appendix C
Process for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

Process

1. When tenured faculty become eligible for consideration, the Departmental TPR Committee will also serve as the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. The Department Head will be a non-voting member and will be excused if under consideration.

2. Tenured faculty undergoing review will be excluded from service on the PTR Committee for that year.

3. The review will be based on the AFE for each of the previous four years and current curriculum vitae.

4. Faculty for whom PTR is a requirement will be reviewed in the fifth academic year following:
   a. Award of tenure or promotion, or
   b. Prior post-tenure review, or
   c. Return to faculty status following administrative leave

5. The PTR Committee will submit a written report of its findings to the Department Head.

6. The Department Head will provide the faculty member with a copy of the written report.

7. Within two weeks of receiving the report, the faculty member will schedule a meeting with the Department Head to discuss the results. The faculty member may submit a written response at this time.

Criteria

1. The faculty member’s performance for post-tenure review will be judged satisfactory if he or she has demonstrated satisfactory performance in all categories in the school’s AFE in each of the previous four years.

2. The faculty member’s performance for post-tenure review will be judged unsatisfactory if either of the following two results are recorded in any of the four AFE’s submitted to the PTR Committee for review:
   a. The candidate (a) received a rating of unsatisfactory in any category on one or more of the four AFE’s submitted for review, AND
   b. The candidate did not demonstrate, in the year following any unsatisfactory rating, sufficient improvement to receive a satisfactory rating in the same category or categories previously rated unsatisfactory, OR
   c. The candidate receives a rating of unsatisfactory in any category on the AFE immediately proceeding the year of post-tenure review.

Outcomes

1. If the PTR Committee judges a faculty member’s performance to be unsatisfactory, the committee will provide suggestions for improvement in the area(s) judged to be unsatisfactory.
2. Within one month following the review, the faculty member and Department Head will develop a three-year plan for improvement, subject to approval by the dean. The plan will clearly outline the criteria for acceptable performance and the consequences for not achieving satisfactory performance by the end of the three-year period. These consequences may affect pay increases, professional rank, and/or employment status.

Appeals and Due Process

See the Faculty Handbook Section 4.08 for information related to appeals and due process.
Appendix D

External Peer Review of Scholarship:

Please Print

Portfolio written by: ________________________________

Portfolio reviewed by: ______________________________

Instructions:

In order to provide feedback to the author of the portfolio, you are asked to assess the: (1) quality of the candidate’s documentation and (2) quality of his or her scholarship. Please review criteria for promotion to professor provided in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorder’s Collegial Review Document to completing your ratings.

When asked to provide judgment ratings, please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>adequately</th>
<th>to a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each question, circle the number that best represents your judgment. If there is inadequate information to make a judgment, circle NA. You may provide explanatory comments for low ratings or superior performance.
Quality of the Documentation

1. To what extent is the material presented in the portfolio effectively organized?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

2. To what extent does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating his/her work?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

3. To what extent does the scholar present his/her message with clarity and integrity?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Overall, to what extent did the scholar effectively document his/her work such that it could be evaluated and rewarded?  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement....
For ratings of 4 or below, please provide your rationale for the rating an/or make suggestions for improvement. In addition, feel free to provide positive feedback detailing superior performance.

Comments:
Quality of Research

1. Does the scholar’s aggregate work represent a meaningful line of research in the discipline?  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

2. Is there evidence that the scholar’s work is recognized by others doing similar work?  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

3. Is the scholar’s work likely to impact the field of speech language pathology?  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

4. Overall, to what extent does the scholar’s work demonstrate significance?  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

Comments, strengths, or suggestions for improvement... For ratings of 4 or below, please provide rationale for the rating and/or make suggestions for improvement. In addition, feel free to provide positive feedback detailing superior performance.

Comments:

Recommendation

Based upon the materials reviewed and the evaluative guidelines provided by this candidate’s Department Head would

_____ recommend him/her for promotion to professor with confidence.
_____ recommend him/her for promotion to professor.
_____ not recommend him/her for promotion to professor.