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I. Overview

Through its teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service, the English Department demonstrates its commitment to the core principles of a humanities-based education not only by studying and analyzing language and literature, but also by participating in the cultural and social institutions that generate those linguistic and artistic discourses. The Department of English seeks to attract and retain colleagues who are productive and scholarly in everything they do. Our first priority is to be very good teachers, and to be scholarly in our teaching. The department seeks to balance teaching, scholarship, and service, but individual balances will differ. We vary in terms of the types of scholarship we pursue, our investment in service and engagement, and our balance between research and practice. These guidelines are meant to help develop productive and gratifying careers, with flexibility appropriate to a wide range of individuals.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:

   a) Pedagogical content knowledge: An instructor’s pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline’s central concepts, skills, and recent advances through a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. Teachers become more effective as they repeatedly engage in these teaching acts and find out what is easiest and most difficult for their students and modify their teaching accordingly.

   b) Professional Aspects of Teaching: Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise — and different disciplines often approach teaching differently — teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, holding classes and making suitable use of class time.

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

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence

   a) Self-evaluation of teaching: Addresses pedagogical content knowledge (1a) (4.05A)

Conducted by the faculty member. Faculty members should be able to evaluate the current state of their pedagogical content knowledge for a particular course by responding to the questions: “What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?”; and “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills and advancements for the courses I teach?” The faculty member should focus the self-evaluation on one course, preferably varying that course from year to year.
b) Peer review of teaching materials --including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc—and direct observation

The evaluation will consist of a review of at least the following documents, which will be provided to the faculty observer by the faculty member:
1) copy of the course syllabus;
2) copy of one course assignment / activity to which substantial grade weight has been assigned
3) two samples of student work related to that assignment / activity;
4) copy of the mid-term or final examination material.
These materials should reflect one designated course—preferably the course that is visited for the peer evaluation. When feasible, the sub-committee should ensure that materials for different courses are evaluated from year to year.

Each faculty member will also be evaluated once per year by a faculty member who will visit a class session on an agreed-upon date. The evaluation will be guided by a standardized rubric that has been adopted by the Peer Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (PATE) committee.

The peer review of teaching materials and direct observation should be used to as evidence in all three areas above (1a: Pedagogical content knowledge, 1b: Professional Aspects of Teaching, and 1c: Student Response to instruction).

c) Student assessment of instruction (SAI), using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument--required of all sections of all courses taught. (4.05A)

The English Department requires SAI for all sections of all courses, collected from students via the end-of-semester course evaluations. The PATE committee will view the frequency count for each scaled item as evidence of Student Response to Instruction (I.B.1.c) and Professional Aspects of Teaching (I.B.1.b).

3. General comments

a) Professional Development – The English Department values professional development of teaching, whether through workshops and other on- or off-campus.

b) Program Directors – When possible, and depending upon the complexity and workload of the assignment, the English Department normally considers program directorship or the equivalent (such as coordinating the annual literary festival) as warranting a one- or two-course per year reduction in teaching.

c) Supervision and mentoring of new faculty, teaching interns, professional writing and other interns, teaching assistants, research assistants, theses, and graduate writing students – The English Department considers such supervision and mentoring as valuable teaching functions. In the absence of formal evaluation of this teaching, the candidate is encouraged to present such evidence as seems appropriate to demonstrate the quality of supervision and mentoring.

d) Evaluation of SAI Data –The Collegial Review Committee (CRC), the PATE committee, and the DH will not simply compare mean scores for student evaluations, but will examine the data in more detail to determine whether the students feel they are receiving an adequate education.

e) Teaching Awards – Receiving a teaching award and/or being named a finalist for a teaching award is recognized as a measure of teaching excellence. The department also encourages engaged teaching and examples of engaged teaching should be adequately noted.

f) Letters and testimonials –Since they are ad-hoc and do not represent information collected systematically, the department generally does not consider letters from students or alumni when evaluating teaching.
B. Scholarship and Creative Works

1. Overview

WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four TYPES described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.

The Department of English has established a scale that will serve as points of comparison for scholarly and creative works. Scholarly, technical, or creative works are worth from one to five units. The unit requirements for the purposes of AFE, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review are provided in Section IV, “Criteria.”

*The scale is meant to provide guidance, only; any candidate can make a case that a single project merits more units than those mentioned here and the DCRC and/or DH may assess projects at fewer points if a project does not meet the quality, scope, or import of the examples provided.*

Units awarded for one Boyer type of scholarship (Discovery, Application, etc.) shall be equivalent to units for other types. Candidates will be allowed to pursue their scholarly interests in any Boyer function they choose and are not required to complete projects in multiple functions.

- **Associate Professor**
  Successful candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to complete the equivalent of EIGHT (8) units of scholarship.
  - For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, at least FIVE (5) of those eight units must be earned in one or more project(s) that equal or exceed TWO (2) units.

- **Full Professor**
  Successful candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to complete the equivalent of EIGHT (8) units of scholarship beyond what was completed when awarded promotion to Associate Professor.
  - For promotion to Full Professor, at least FIVE (5) of those eight units must be earned in one or more project(s) that equal or exceed THREE (3) units

In the Collegial Review process, the candidate will have the opportunity and the responsibility to make the case for the unit values of each project. No single project will be worth more than five units. Part of the DCRC's job is to independently corroborate the unit value of each project.

The Department of English recognizes some of the work of program directors as applied scholarship according to the Boyer model if that work meets the standards for Boyer scholarship (i.e. derives from disciplinary research, is disseminated to peers, and receives external peer review).

The department may consider additional factors affecting a candidate's record. It may choose to recommend a candidate for tenure or promotion despite a shortage of scholarly units or, conversely, to recommend against tenure and promotion even when a candidate has sufficient scholarly units. The department values faculty with coherent and continuing scholarly/creative records; such records are more important to the department than an individual's point total.

The following list provides general examples that represent work on a scale of one to five units.
a) **Five units**: Projects worth five units contain multiple chapters or multiple components, reflect the highest level of productivity in the field, and represent significant, peer-reviewed publications. Examples include a first edition of a scholarly or creative book with a university or other press that is considered significant according to the discipline of the work; a first-tier award such as a National Book Award or the PEN/Faulkner award would also reflect this level.

b) **Four units**: A co-authored scholarly book or creative work; a first edition of a textbook; a substantial an extremely competitive national or international award; creation or ongoing editorial control of an important online site like Purdue's OWL (Online Writing Lab).

c) **Three units**: Projects worth three units or more exceed the benchmark (Boyer) expectations of scholarship in the discipline. Examples of projects worth three units include a first edition of an edited collection; a poetic chapbook or novella; a substantial article in a refereed journal that is widely recognized as having the highest status within the discipline; receiving a highly competitive, multi-year grant funding scholarly or creative activity.

d) **Two units**: Projects worth two units meet the benchmark (Boyer) expectations of scholarship in the discipline. A substantial peer-reviewed article in a reputable disciplinary journal; publication of a sequence of poems, a short story or personal essay in a peer-reviewed venue; certain selective conference proceeding publications; a chapter in an edited collection; an important state or local award for one’s work; receiving certain competitive external grants.

e) **One unit**: Projects worth one unit represent scholarly productivity valued by the department and reflect projects approaching the benchmark (Boyer) in the discipline. A refereed conference paper; a book review; most conference proceedings publications, an encyclopedia article, an invited poetry reading; technology development, such as learning a new computer language in direct support of teaching and scholarship; receiving a competitive internal grant related to one’s scholarship.

All of these are based on exceeding, meeting, or approaching the criteria for scholarship established by Schulman and Hutchings (1998) and the concept of scholarly benchmarks in a discipline as outlined by Boyer (1990). Projects must be public, subject to critical review, and presented in a form that allows use and exchange by other members of the scholarly community.

The DCRC will assess the value of projects, but the following provides general guidelines:

1. Published pieces are valued more highly than unpublished pieces (but publishing is not limited to print publishing).
2. A contract to publish a written volume shall be considered to be equivalent to the publication itself. That does not apply to a book that has not yet been written.
3. The quality of the journal, site, or venue in which a work appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.
4. The department values multi-disciplinary research, collaboration and co-authorship, but sole author status is valued slightly higher than the other alternatives.
5. Presentation at national or international conferences is valued more highly than presentation at regional or local conferences. Organizing a symposium and participating in it is valued more highly than just participating.
6. Publishing the first edition of a book or first creation of a web site is valued more highly than publishing subsequent editions of that book.

---

1 The department recognizes that “substantial” is not necessarily indicated by page count. While length of a published piece may indicate its level of substance and import, other factors – such as disciplinary standards and quality – affect any scholarly or creative work in the various disciplines within English.
7. With published books or works of equal scope, scholarly treatises that involve original research are valued more highly than the production of textbooks or edited collections.
8. Accreditation documents, technical reports such as outcome evaluation projects or “white papers” will be evaluated differentially based on factors such as scope, societal impact, length, sophistication of intended audience, relationship to scholarly expertise, amount of original research required, and so forth.
9. Grant proposals may be assessed as contributory to Scholarship and Creative Works similar to a paper presentation, while funded proposals are more highly valued and will be assessed akin to article publication and will be judged based on grant amount and competitiveness. When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.
Applying for but not receiving a grant is still valued.

Using these general guidelines, the DCRC will verify and if necessary revise “unit” totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Following are specific unit examples for each Boyer type. The list is meant solely as a guide for assessing the value of scholarly work during different phases of completion. It is intended neither as an exhaustive list of projects nor as a way to limit future possibilities, but as a comparison guide for committee members and candidates. Faculty who wish to have a project vetted as appropriate scholarship should follow the process outlined in IL.B.2: Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review.

a) Scholarship of discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities, artistic products, performances, technical documents, or literary works.

Five Units: Publication or contract for publication of a completed or nearly completed book (authoring critical studies or works of fiction, drama, nonfiction, poetry, or technical studies) published with peer-reviewed, reputable presses, and projects of demonstrably equivalent scope.

Four Units: A coauthored monograph, book-length creative work, or technical study; editorial direction of a series of creative or scholarly volumes or web projects.

Three Units: A poetic chapbook or novella.

Two Units: An article, a chapter in an edited collection, a sequence of poems, a short story or personal essay in a nationally or internationally recognized, peer reviewed publication.

One Unit: A refereed conference paper, a book review, or an encyclopedia article.

b) Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.

Many anthologies, textbooks, and encyclopedia or review articles would fall into this category; reports on integrative teaching or scholarship also would fall into the category.

Five Units: Publication or a contract for publication from a respected press of a completed or nearly completed book designed for teaching professionals, possibly co-authored by more than one faculty member, based on original research (e.g. a grammar text based on independent research into regional dialects and usages)

Four Units: A textbook that focused on how to use the teaching film in literature classrooms.

Three Units: The design and the application of an interdisciplinary teaching module that satisfies the criteria for the scholarship of integration with a “public expression” that may include but is not limited to successful external grant applications, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, or other forms of customized peer-review. A multi-year, nationally competitive grant that funded the transfer of a body of work onto the web (Digital Humanities) according to standards agreed upon by the field.
Two Units: Collaborative, multidisciplinary creative projects or the creation of a website or multimedia application that featured such works, or a one-time competitive external grant.

One Unit: Lectures and interviews about such projects, refereed conference proceedings that were not accompanied by other publication, interdisciplinary performances or presentations, encyclopedia entries, or unfunded grant applications.

c) Scholarship of application -- Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by external peers.

Much of the technical and professional writing field’s output falls into this category, which would include web sites, white papers, usability tests, multimedia applications, and evaluation of software packages. All of these would necessarily be accompanied by some recognized form of external peer review. Applied knowledge of accreditation standards, assessment practices, and ESL case studies might also fall into this category.

Four Units: A substantial theoretical handbook, multiple articles or documents (accompanied by reviews by members of peer institutions) resulting from direction of a writing or secondary education program or other academic curricular activity.

Three Units: An edited volume on applying usability standards in a project.

Two Units: A nationally or internationally recognized publication, analyzing web sites according to current standards. Public expression of the design and application of methods for teaching literacy in the community -- public expression may include successful external grant applications, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, and other forms of customized external peer review. An invited usability review of an important software release if accompanied by appropriate documentation of scholarly activity. Editing or serving as design/layout coordinator for a professional volume/book/manual authored or edited by another professional and published by a reputable press.

One Unit: Designing and applying methods for teaching literacy in the community or writing the accreditation documents. Conference presentations, book reviews, encyclopedia articles or unfunded grants related to scholarship of application.

d) Scholarship of teaching and learning -- Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

Five Units: A peer-reviewed monograph on innovative teaching practices in any department discipline (literature, TESOL, creative writing, technical writing, secondary school teaching).


Three Units: An edited or co-edited single volume on teaching practices. A substantial, competitive, multi-year grant associated with improving teaching practices.

Two Units: A peer-reviewed national/international publication or conference proceeding written by the candidate based on designing and implementing an innovative approach to teaching a course, online module, or webinar. A funded substantial competitive external grant associated with teaching.

One Unit: Lectures/interviews regarding the design and implementation of an innovative approach to teaching a course. Book reviews, conference presentations, or encyclopedia articles associated with teaching.
2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review.**

The Department of English recognizes that conventional forms of peer review and distribution of knowledge remain an essential aspect of making knowledge in the field, but also acknowledges the importance and the acceptability of other forms of scholarly assessment, as well as the need for alternate forms of peer review that accommodate the wide range of print and electronic venues for publication now available to scholars. In order to be considered as scholarship, projects must be public, subject to critical external peer review, and presented in a form that allows use and exchange by other members of the scholarly community. These criteria are established by Shulman and Hutchings (1998). Faculty who pursue projects that require a customized version of external peer review should adhere to the following procedures.

a) The standard for customized types of peer review will be a panel of three external reviewers who will write a substantive peer review of the project that will become part of the CRD dossier.

b) Faculty will submit a list of five potential reviewers to the DCRC; if the faculty member so desires, two other potential reviewers may be specifically excluded from the panel. The DH and the DCRC will select the panel of reviewers; at least two of these reviewers will be taken from the list of five. The DH and the CRC have the right, but are not required, to select a third reviewer not on the list of potential reviewers.

c) Faculty who pursue projects that will require customized peer review should make the DH aware at an early stage and should receive regular feedback from the CRC to ensure that both the individual’s and the department’s expectations for the scope, the viability, and the scholarly quality of the project are maintained.

3. **General comments**

a) **Grant proposals and awards:** The writing, the submission, and the acceptance of grant proposals will be considered as legitimate forms of scholarship and may be considered as components of any of the Boyer Functions and will be assessed according to the departmental expectations. Receiving Fellowships or other types of Academic Awards that lead to the production of scholarship will be considered as important aspects of scholarly public expression and/or peer review.

b) **Professional development:** The Department of English recognizes the value of a wide range of professional development. Activities related to scholarly work in one’s field such as developing programming abilities, learning or upgrading software proficiencies, participating in seminars, conferences, symposia, and other forms of scholarly exchange will be considered an important aspect of demonstrating progress.

c) **Determining value of projects:** A candidate’s assertion of a project’s weight will be assessed by the DCRC and DH. Faculty are encouraged to submit Boyer project plans to the DCRC prior to undertaking them for input on the extent to which the project meets departmental criteria; such feedback may be requested from the DCRC at any time—even outside the annual review timetable. If the DCRC assesses a project at a level different from that proposed by the faculty member, the faculty member has the right to argue for a reassessment of value during the next review process (i.e. reappointment). But ultimately, in cases of different assessment of the weight of a project, the DCRC’s assessment supersedes the faculty member’s.
C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service

   a) Institutional service – Active participation on departmental, college, and university committees; regular attendance at departmental meetings and departmentally sponsored activities (i.e. the Spring Literary Festival, the Undergraduate Research Expo, the Graduate Symposium); regular participation in recruitment activities and graduation events. The Department expects faculty to attend one university Open House per year, one graduation event (fall, spring, or summer) per year, and, as teaching schedule allows, the Department’s annual recruitment drive.

   b) Community engagement – Faculty participation in university activities; in the local, regional, or national community, as volunteers, board members, officers, or presenters for local programs; in the community of the discipline at the regional or national level, including conference attendance; and similar activities. The English Department values service that connects students with the community or brings faculty expertise to bear to benefit the community.

   c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership – Directing programs or concentrations; chairing department or university committees; organizing conferences or festivals; executive service on search committees, Faculty Senate, Teaching Award committees, etc.; maintaining department web pages; mentoring new faculty; advisement of student organizations; and similar commitments.

   d) Advising – Faculty are expected to advise students well. Faculty are to meet with individual advisees each semester to assess each student’s progress within his or her concentration, assist the student in choosing courses that will allow timely completion of the program, and answer questions about career options. Furthermore, faculty are expected to maintain their awareness of changes to various concentrations and advisement procedures.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence – Faculty will list service commitments and may describe particular achievements or time demands. For most service, faculty may present any appropriate evidence, such as commendations from committee chairs, meeting minutes, programs from events, etc. To meet expectations, tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to advise, participate on departmental committees (service at the university level is expected by the end of the probationary period), attend department meetings and functions, and participate in recruitment and graduation. To exceed expectations, faculty may serve as program director (assuming responsible direction), organize a conference or festival, chair committees, serve in demanding roles such as Faculty Senate or search or teaching award committees. If they do not meet expectations, the DH will note service as unsatisfactory and discuss the matter with the faculty member. Those who frequently do not fulfill service obligations risk denial of tenure or promotion.

3. General comments –

   a) Professional development – The department encourages attendance at advising workshops and holds regular sessions to review English advising issues and curriculum.

   b) Consistent with good citizenship, faculty on the tenure track should be wary of overextending themselves. The department tries to avoid heavy service demands on faculty just starting out on the tenure track, but to involve them in service that will help integrate them into the university community. Sometimes significant service is required of tenure-track faculty and is unavoidable. The department will consider such service as part of the candidate’s complete record.
III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) (4.05)

1. Overview -- Supplemental to the annual appointment/reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the DH shall complete an evaluation of faculty members each spring semester for the previous academic year. The purposes of Annual Faculty Evaluation are a) to assist faculty in knowing how their work is being evaluated; b) to assist faculty in bringing their work to a high level of professional quality; c) to promote the continuing professional development of faculty; d) to provide a professional basis for assessment when decisions are being made regarding the status or merit pay increases of faculty.

2. Composition of the Peer Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (PATE) committee – The PATE Committee is responsible for providing the required peer assessment of teaching effectiveness, which is based upon direct observation of teaching, materials review, and SAI data. The PATE committee will be composed of at least three tenured and three other tenure-line English faculty, as follows:

   one professor or associate professor, who will serve as Chair;
   one associate professor or professor (if the chair is an associate professor);
   one assistant professor; and
   three additional members, irrespective of rank.

   At least half the membership should be tenured. Those automatically excused from serving on AFE are

   the DH;
   the Director of WRCS (who is involved with GA teaching effectiveness evaluation);
   the Director of English Education (who is involved with student intern teaching effectiveness);
   members of the DCRC;
   those holding full-time administrative appointments.

   Election of the committee is concurrent with election of the DCRC committee at the beginning of the academic year.

   The DH reviews all of the information provided by the PATE Committee plus other materials made available (see III.A.3.). The DH then writes the AFE based on all of the evidence available. This process is the same for all members of the Department.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation

   a) All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:

      1. Teaching
         a) a self-evaluation addressing the three aspects of teaching, especially pedagogical content knowledge (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), including a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review, with a listing of such courses and number of students in each.
         b) copies of PATE statements (which includes direct observation information).
         c) Student Assessment of Instruction.
2. Scholarship and Creative Activity

List of Scholarly Activities for the year, such as publications and presentations, giving details and making clear the current status of works in progress. Care should be taken to avoid repetition.

3. Service

List of Service Activities, such as committee work. List should include statement of role and any notable accomplishments/activities.

b) Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document – Faculty may use the departmental AFE form, supplementing it with listings and documentation as appropriate.

c) Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors – Everyone who teaches in the English Department will prepare the above materials. Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated primarily on teaching, but the collaborative nature of the composition program will be taken into consideration.

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

1. Overview – The Collegial Review system serves as a developmental process for the individual faculty member and for the department as a whole.

2. Composition of Departmental Collegial Review Committee (DCRC) (4.07D1) – Six English faculty who hold tenure at the time of election shall be selected by ballot at the beginning of the fall semester. The DH serves ex officio as chair of the committee, and thus does not vote. The departmental office administrator will prepare, distribute, and count the votes, allowing at least two but no more than ten workdays for ballots to be returned. The ballot will list the names of all tenured faculty, except the DH, faculty with fulltime administrative appointments, and faculty scheduled to be on leave during either or both semesters of the next academic year. Any eligible faculty member who expects to retire or resign prior to the beginning of the next spring semester should request that her or his name not appear on the ballot. Faculty being considered for promotion shall be ineligible for service on this committee; if an elected person is unable to serve for any reason, the replacement shall be the person receiving the next highest number of votes in the latest election. If there is a tie for the next highest number, another election by ballot shall be conducted. When appropriate, the conditions of the UNC policy on employment of related persons shall apply. Counted ballots shall remain on file in the English Office and will be made available for inspection upon request.

When the department receives approval to search for a new, or to fill an existing, position, the CRC shall appoint hiring committee(s) to conduct those searches. The DCRC will consider the focus of the search when determining who best to serve on those hiring committees.

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 a schedule for when documents are due and when decisions are made at the various review levels.

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

1. Overview – PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) are teaching and/or service and/or research. A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo PTR during any academic year. Faculty for whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than
the fifth academic year following the most recent of any of the following review events: award of
tenure or promotion at WCU, prior post-tenure review, or return to faculty status following
administrative service. Exceptions shall be made in the following cases: 1) A period when a faculty
member is on leave from duties, in teaching and/or research and/or service, shall not be included as
part of the five years between mandatory review events. In such cases, the maximum interval shall
be extended accordingly. 2) A faculty member who is temporarily assigned to duties away from
Cullowhee/Asheville during the period when a review is required shall undergo review during the
academic year when duties in the area are resumed.

2. Composition of PTR review committee – The Collegial Review Committee (CRC) will also
review all candidates for Post Tenure Review.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation- Performance to be reviewed is limited to the five
years preceding review or to the period subsequent to the prior review event, whichever is less. A
faculty member being reviewed will provide

- the four most recent Annual Faculty Evaluations
- the Annual Report of Faculty Activities Summary Sheets
- 1-2 page self-evaluation statement
- current Curriculum Vitae.

The DCRC shall review and discuss these materials, then prepare a written evaluation representing
the collective opinion of the committee for presentation to the DH. The evaluation should state
specifically that the faculty member's performance is regarded as satisfactory or unsatisfactory and,
if unsatisfactory, should provide specific documentation representing the opinion of the committee
to the DH, who will provide copies to the faculty member and meet with the faculty member to
discuss the review. The DH shall then append his or her evaluation relative to the mission of the
university, college, and program. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response.
When a DH is reviewed, the dean shall perform the roles ordinarily performed by the DH.

4. Outcomes: In the case of a satisfactory review, results are documented for university award and
merit pay decisions. In addition, suggestions to enhance performance may be provided. In the case
of an unsatisfactory review, the DH, in consultation with the faculty member, DCRC, and dean of
the faculty member's college, will create a three-year development plan within one month of the
review. The plan shall include (1) specific improvements to be accomplished within three years, (2)
resources to be committed to the improvement efforts, (3) other support provided by the
administration. The department and CRC will monitor the faculty member’s progress relative to the
development plan and provide verbal and written feedback to the faculty member semi-annually.

IV. English Department Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion,
and Post Tenure Review

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Teaching – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive
satisfactory overall evaluations on teaching materials, on self-assessment in each of the three
aspects of teaching (including reflection on student response to instruction), student evaluation, and
peer observation.

2. Scholarship—In order to meet expectations in terms of AFE, all tenured and tenure-track faculty
members must demonstrate regular productivity in one or more types of scholarship as defined by
Boyer's "functions of scholarship." However, candidates are not required to pursue projects in more
than one Boyer function.
3. **Service** – In order to meet expectations, all tenured and tenure-track faculty should be contributing to committee service at appropriate levels, attending department meetings and events, and other forms of service (see section C above).

4. **General comments** – The department encourages attendance at professional development workshops sponsored by the Advising Center and holds regular sessions to review English advising issues and curriculum. The university offers frequent workshops, many of which would assist faculty in developing good service records.

**B. Reappointment (4.06)**

1. **Teaching** – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall evaluations on teaching materials, on self-assessment in each of the three aspects of teaching, student evaluation, and peer observation.

2. **Scholarship**—Candidates for reappointment will be required each year to demonstrate verifiable progress within one or more of the Boyer functions of scholarship, and over the course of the probationary period to demonstrate regular, verifiable progress towards the departmental expectation of eight units of scholarship. During reappointment, the candidate will have the opportunity and the responsibility to make the case that a given project meets the departmental standards as laid out in 4.05C of this document.

3. **Service** – The department tries to avoid heavy service demands on faculty just starting out on the tenure track, but to involve them in some service that will help integrate them into the university community. As they progress through the probationary period, service should expand to the university level. Consistent with good citizenship, faculty on the tenure track should be wary of overextending themselves.

4. **General comments** – The department recognizes the diverse talents and responsibilities of faculty members and allows for much variation in meeting expectations.

**C. Tenure (4.07)**

1. **Teaching** – The faculty member should receive high overall evaluations of teaching materials, of his or her self-assessment (including reflection on student response to instructions), of student evaluation, and peer observation.

2. **Scholarship**—Candidates for tenure will be required to complete at least **EIGHT (8)** units of scholarship and/or creative works over the probationary period. **FIVE (5)** of which should belong to the category of **TWO (2)** units or more for any given Boyer function. Units for one function of scholarship shall be equivalent to units for other functions, but one very large project (i.e. a book notable in its field) would be equivalent to five units of scholarship. Candidates will be allowed to pursue their scholarly interests in any Boyer function they choose and are not required to complete projects in multiple functions. At least five units of scholarly units, however, must derive from projects in categories of “two units” or more for any given Boyer function.

3. **Service** – The department tries to avoid heavy service demands on faculty just starting out on the tenure track, but to involve them in some service that will help integrate them into the university community. As they progress through the probationary period, service should expand to the university level. Consistent with good citizenship, faculty on the tenure track should be wary of overextending themselves. After receiving tenure, faculty are expected to take leadership roles in the department, college, and university.

4. **General comments** – What we look for in tenured faculty is reliable, balanced production in all three areas.

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

1. **Teaching** – In order to meet expectations in teaching, the faculty member should receive satisfactory overall evaluation on teaching materials, on self-assessment in each of the aspects of
teaching (including reflection on student response to instruction), student evaluation, and peer observation. Some signs of excellent, not just acceptable, teaching should be evident.

2. **Scholarship**—Promotion to Associate Professor is generally considered concurrently with application for tenure, and scholarly requirements for promotion is not in addition to the scholarship needed for tenure. Candidates are required to complete at least EIGHT (8) units of scholarship and/or creative works over the probationary period. FIVE (5) of which should belong to the category of TWO (2) units or more for any given Boyer function.

3. **Service**—As associate professors, faculty will be taking leadership in developing departmental programs and curriculum. They will be involved in the university at all levels.

4. **General comments**—What we look for in an associate professor is reliable, balanced production in all three areas.

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

1. **Teaching**—Teaching should regularly be evaluated as exceeding expectations—particularly for the three years leading up to the review.

2. **Scholarship**—Candidates for promotion from associate to full professor will be required to complete at least EIGHT (8) units of scholarly or creative work, FIVE (5) of which should belong to the category of THREE (3) units or more for any given Boyer function. This work is in addition to that which was completed for promotion from assistant to associate professor.

3. **Service**—At this level, service should include numerous assignments at all levels, including regional or national leadership in disciplinary organizations or community engagement; but it should certainly include service at the university level.

4. **General comments**—What we look for in full professors is reliable production in all three areas, with superior qualities in teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

1. **Teaching**—Teaching should meet expectations without patterns of problems or excessive absence, as evidenced by AFEs and other related materials.

2. **Scholarship**—In order to “meet expectations” for post-tenure review, all tenured faculty members must demonstrate regular productivity in one or more types of scholarship as defined by Boyer’s functions.

3. **Service**—Tenured faculty are expected to continue contributing at the departmental, college, and university levels; the department also values service to one’s field or one’s community related to disciplinary expertise or professional duties as a faculty member.

4. **General comments**—Criteria for acceptable faculty performance include professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties—taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the DH—and efforts to improve performance. Exemplary faculty performance involves sustained excellence in teaching, scholarly/artistic achievement, and service.
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