

**Department /Division:
Business Administration & Law and Sport Management
Department Collegial Review Document
Effective Fall Semester, 2012**

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

I. Overview

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Business Administration and Law, and Sport Management. The document is guided at the highest level by *The Code* of the UNC system and by the *Faculty Handbook* of Western Carolina University. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some cases by the college. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures, the faculty member should have familiarity with *The Code* and with the *WCU Faculty Handbook* (section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the faculty member should also have available the *Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier*, a separate document disseminated annually by the Office of the Provost.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

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

- **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** – Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.
- **Professional Administration of the Class** – Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. While good teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise – and different disciplines often approach teaching differently – teaching is also a profession that requires common duties regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials

available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor's ability to perform the duties associate with the job.

- **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 the 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. Sources of Evidence

- a) Peer review of teaching materials.** Typically, the colleague conducting direct observation of instruction shall also review teaching materials (including, at a minimum, a substantive assignment, an exam, and the syllabus—but including other materials the candidate may wish to submit). Tenure-track faculty members are required to submit a syllabus from every course taught. Peer review of teaching materials is a part of all evaluation processes other than Post-Tenure Review (**4.05B2b**; and note paragraph “c” below.).
- b) Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the three areas of effective teaching, is a component of all evaluation processes other than post-tenure review.** 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?”. Faculty are welcome to include reference to additional indicators of effective teaching, such as results from structured means of collecting student feedback other than the SAI (e.g., a WebCat survey, mid-course student comments, “one-minute” exercises regarding usefulness of an assignment, etc.), as well as unsolicited student written comments concerning course or instructor effectiveness. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be included in the self-evaluation of teaching (and see General Comments).
- c) Direct observation of instruction.** All tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by direct observation of teaching annually, by peers and/or department head, using departmental protocol (**UNC 400.3.1.1[G] II 1c**). Peer observers are randomly assigned by the department head. **Peer observers must be full-time faculty members in the department. They may be fixed-term, tenure-track, or tenured faculty members.** Unless otherwise indicated by the department head, the colleague conducting the direct observation shall also review

a sample of the candidate's teaching materials (note paragraph "a" above).

- d) Student assessment of instruction**, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument, is required of all sections of all courses taught by untenured faculty. SAIs are required of tenured faculty in all sections taught at least one semester per academic year. (4.05A)

3. Criteria that May Be Considered

- a) Instructional Contributions and Considerations of Teaching Workload.** Evaluation of faculty teaching also considers work that is related to course teaching load and overall instructional program demands, as indicated by:

- Number of undergraduate and graduate courses taught, including independent study courses, academic internships, academic cooperative, or practicum/apprenticeships taught/supervised
- Number of students taught
- Number of different class preparations
- Intensity of grading demands made by the course as designed (e.g., writing intensive, research intensive)—and evidence of provision to students of exceptionally substantial feedback in the grading process
- Number of new course preparations (courses not previously taught); course and curriculum development
- Number of courses moved, if any, from traditional delivery to 'hybrid' format or online platform
- Number, if any, of online courses taught

- b) Additional indicators of quality teaching that may be considered** (Not prioritized; not intended to be exhaustive; related documentation in brackets)

Evidence of incorporation of some of the following into the teaching/learning environment:

- Innovative practices and the use of pedagogical research in instruction
- Relevant, recent faculty research into the teaching/learning process
- Effective use of technology in enhancing the teaching/learning environment (including use of WebCat, construction of course-related Web pages, participation in new technology initiatives, etc.)
- The encouragement and fostering of student technological competency [WCU Mission]
- The promotion of, and increased emphasis on, "entrepreneurial thinking" and innovation [UNCT]
- Experiential learning opportunities across degree programs and throughout curricula (through such activities as internships, job-shadowing, undergraduate research, community and service projects, project-based and active learning, work-study programs,

- study abroad, and business mentors—and other forms of community engagement) [QEP, UNCT, Carnegie]
- Student research and public service in partnership with nonprofit organizations focused on community needs [UNCT]
 - Elements of residential life, student leadership, and career planning/education [QEP, UNCT]
 - Relevant interdisciplinary perspectives and co-curricular activities [QEP, UNCT]
 - Relevant international perspectives [UNCT]
 - Ethical perspectives, and the encouragement of behavior characterized by honesty, integrity, and responsibility [WCU Mission, UNCT]
 - Group-learning experiences, collaboration, active learning experiences, and encouragement of experience with diverse groups of peoples, cultures, and ideas [WCU Mission, VSA, NSSE, UNCT]
 - Exercises fostering critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and problem-solving skills [WCU Mission, CLA, UNCT]
 - Synthesis of knowledge and integration of ideas [QEP, UNCT]
 - Quality communication skills [WCU Mission, CLA, UNCT]
 - Stewardship of the natural and cultural environment [WCU Mission, UNCT]
 - Student self-reflection and self-appraisal [QEP]

Additional indicators of maintaining currentness in one's field, including:

- Recognition by peers through nomination for and receipt of teaching excellence awards
- Attaining or maintaining professional certification pertinent to the teaching discipline, if relevant to the field
- Professional internships
- Other evidence of ongoing professional development related to teaching

Other indicators of quality teaching and learning, including:

- Evidence of instructional quality and standards as developed through consultation with colleagues or the Faculty Development Center to meet the objectives set forth in the course syllabus—and a clear relationship between those goals and departmental and college goals and mission
- Student mentoring (including oversight of student research, oversight of student honor's project, oversight of student internship for academic credit, mentoring of work-study assignees and interns, etc.)
- Participation in Faculty Learning Communities and Faculty Development workshops, institutes, or retreats
- Use of teaching portfolios, as developed by departmental units
- Serving as graduate school faculty

- Supervising a student master's thesis; serving on thesis committee
- Cross-disciplinary and inter-institutional teaching collaboration
- International teaching experiences
- Extraordinary application of teaching energies and/or creativity
- Additional evidence of effective teaching

4. Methods of Evaluation

- a) As evidenced by requisite course-material review, peer observation, self-assessment, SAIs, and such other indicators as may be deemed appropriate, **norms for the three categories of teaching effectiveness are:**

Exceeds Expectations

- Is clearly a very good or excellent teacher according to students, colleagues, and documentation
- Maintains high quality syllabi and course materials that are updated to ensure continuous improvement
- Demonstrates continuous improvement in teaching/learning methods; may take advantage of faculty development opportunities; may demonstrate evidence of innovation in the classroom
- Submits an outstanding or superior self-evaluation
- Demonstrates evidence of achieving or incorporating many aspects of 'Additional Indicators of Quality Teaching'
- Is involved with student development outside of class
- Manages the equivalent of a standard or exceptional instructional workload, while maintaining quality.

Meets Expectations

- Is an effective teacher according to students, colleagues, and documentation
- Maintains quality syllabi and course materials that are updated to ensure continuous improvement
- Demonstrates continuous improvement in teaching/learning methods
- Is involved with student development outside of class
- Manages the equivalent of a standard instructional workload

Unacceptable

- Is a poor or below average teacher according to students, colleagues, and documentation
- Maintains syllabi and course materials that do not reflect currency and/or are of poor quality
- Exhibits a pattern of inconsistency or unavailability in meeting posted office hours and appointments
- Little involvement in student development outside of class
- Is the subject of unusually frequent student complaints

5. General comments

- a) **Professional Development.** Professional development activities in the area of teaching are positively valued and should be described in the self-evaluation of teaching.
- b) **Importance of Teaching.** Teaching contributes substantially to the overall evaluation of faculty performance
- c) **Review of Teaching Materials.** The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, each with its own unique contribution, including peer review of substantive teaching materials.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. **WCU recognizes types of scholarly activity as generally classified and described by educational scholar Ernest Boyer.** Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.

Expectations of scholarly activity should be consistent with peer institutions.

Faculty members should demonstrate that they are current and scholarly in their disciplines as reflected in the ways they teach and serve. They are also expected to demonstrate regular, quality activity in one or more types of scholarship outlined below. The relative emphasis on each type of scholarship will be determined by the faculty member in conjunction with the Department Head and university mission and needs.

- a) **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works.
- b) **Scholarship of integration** – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
- c) **Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
- d) **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

2. **Sources of Evidence** (including acceptable processes for peer review)

It is noted here that an activity that qualifies as scholarship, regardless of type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) the activity is subjected to external scholarly review; (2) there is clear evidence of methodological rigor; (3) the activity results in substantive outcomes or implications

beyond the scope of the activity itself; (4) the outcomes are disseminated to a professional audience.

Faculty members are expected to produce, on average, one significant scholarly work per year that fits into one of the four categories of scholarship described in this document over a five-year period. While scholarship can take various forms, a publication in a scholarly journal is the general standard by which other activities will be evaluated as a means of determining equivalency. For the purposes of this department, this standard can be achieved if the journal is peer-reviewed, meets selectivity requirements, and/or serves as an outlet with substantial national or regional impact as evidenced by inclusion in acceptable scholarly indices.

Scholarship in the Department of BLSM is described in terms of work products that meet expectations. A work product that meets expectations, which is defined as meeting a minimum standard, will be determined with reference to such criteria as “degree of difficulty,” “potential impact,” and “value to the mission of the department and/or the university” Engagement activities must produce an artifact that is reviewed and certified as a Notable Scholarly Work Product by three members selected from the appropriate discipline-specific academy, such as the Academy of Legal Studies in Business. Published outcomes are more highly valued than unpublished outcomes, top-tier journals more highly than 2nd-tier, national conferences more highly than regional. Faculty members must demonstrate continuous work on scholarship and substantial progress on their research agenda annually. Although the totality of work product that “meets expectations” cannot be comprehensively defined, the following guidelines should be useful to the candidate and review committees:

- a) Research, Publications and Other Scholarly Activities, *Acceptable Outcome*:
 - Publication in a quality peer-reviewed scholarly journal.
 - Publication in a law review indexed in Westlaw or LexisNexis, or some other indication of quality or impact.
 - Publication of an article, case, or chapter in an edited book with a nationally-recognized publisher
 - Publication of an edited book, as editor, with contributions from other scholars
- b) Research, Publications and Other Scholarly Activities; *Notable Scholarly Work Product*. (Two of the following shall be typically considered the equivalent of one of the acceptable outcomes above.)
 - Publication in refereed proceedings
 - Publication in non-refereed scholarly journal
 - Published book reviews, journal abstracts, or cases in a quality refereed journal

- Participant in a funded external grant proposal
 - Peer-reviewed presentations before academic or scholarly associations at the regional, national or international level
 - Other (See APPENDIX A)
- c) Research, Publications and Other Scholarly Activities; *Exceptional Outcome*: (One of the following shall be typically considered the equivalent of two of the acceptable outcomes as described above.)
- Publication as first or second author in a peer-reviewed quality journal with a submission rejection rate 80% or higher.
 - Publication of an article in a recognized quality specialty law review indexed in WestLaw or LexisNexis, or in a law school's lead journal, indexed in Westlaw or LexisNexis
 - As first or second author, first publication of a quality scholarly book or textbook with a nationally-recognized publisher and subject to significant external review
 - Principal investigator on a competitive, peer-reviewed external research grant of \$20,000 or more

3. Methods of Evaluation. Faculty members are expected to maintain their intellectual qualifications and current expertise as defined by the AASCB. These qualifications can be either academic or professional as defined by the Boyer model.

a) Norms for the five evaluative categories of scholarly activities effectiveness are:

Outstanding

- Documented completion of at least eight *acceptable* format research activities in the most recent five-year period

Exceeds Expectations

- Documented completion of at least six *acceptable* format research activities in the most recent five-year period, and
- Completion of other research activities in *acceptable* formats and/or *notable scholarly work* efforts that indicate a strong likelihood of continued scholarly activity in acceptable formats.

Meets Expectations

- Documented completion of at least five *acceptable* format research activities in the most recent five-year period.

Below Expectations

- Documented completion of at least two *acceptable* format research activity in the most recent five-year period, and
- Completion of other research activities in *acceptable* formats and/or *notable scholarly work* efforts that indicate the possibility of continued scholarly activity in acceptable formats.

Unacceptable

- No completion of *acceptable* format research activity in the most recent five-year period.
- Little or no evidence of substantial progress toward completion of *acceptable* format research activities.

4. General comments –

- a) Professional development** - Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are positively valued and are described in the category of *Other Notable Scholarly Engagement and Work Product*.
- b) Grant awards** – (As noted above under *Exceptional Outcomes*, *Acceptable Outcomes* and in Appendix A *Other Notable Scholarly Work Product*.)
- c) General comments**

Departments should recognize and evaluate a wide variety of scholarly activities consistent with the department's and the University's mission. Scholarly activities should not be rigidly categorized. Many activities and products can be classified as more than one type of scholarship.

Special consideration shall be given to faculty who submit evidence of a recognized scholarly work product created in conjunction with a student or students.

These guidelines are not exhaustive, nor do they focus on “borderline” cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in this department. It is recognized that infrequently a candidate may present “interesting things” that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimately scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary nature.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

Overview. “Faculty members are expected to participate in service. Service is expected to increase over a faculty member's time of employment. Primarily, service requires general expertise and is done as an act of good citizenship. Service at the department, college/school university, and UNC system levels includes serving on committees (e.g., search committees, curriculum committees, and review committees), recruiting students, mentoring new faculty members, and advising administrators.” (*Faculty Handbook*)

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

“Service may also require special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership. Examples of such service include exercise of special technological, research or pedagogical skills, involvement with students in extracurricular activities, leadership in university or UNC system governance, taking on special administrative assignments (e.g., being department head, directing a graduate program, administering a grant obtained by the University, participating in discipline-specific and/or regional academic accreditation efforts), or participating in Department, College, University, or UNC system initiatives (e.g., application and facilitation of UNC Tomorrow recommendations, Carnegie Foundation [elective] classifications, WCU QEP implementation).

Service must provide recognition for WCU and/or must support the mission of the department, College, university, and/or UNC system. Some portion of a faculty member’s service activity may support his/her professional development.

1. Types of Service/Sources of Evidence

a) Institutional service –

- Committee and task force memberships (at all levels)
- Peer review of colleague(s) (including classroom observation and review of peer course-related materials)
- Elected positions (e.g., service on Faculty Senate or UNC Faculty Assembly)
- USI 130 and Learning Communities
- Student co-op supervision
- Program Director
- See also “*Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership*” below

b) Community engagement – Service includes community engagement (e.g., providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, national, or international level). Community engagement includes the following (Not prioritized; not exhaustive):

- Off-campus instruction and regional service, including Cherokee, Asheville, other locations as assigned
- Role in and/or contributions to external engagement which does not demonstrate scholarly work or use of scholarly principles [contrast with scholarly contribution] including:
Fee paid or pro bono workshops; consulting; lectures, presentations, or panel discussions; grant writing, grant administration, or grant activities; collaborative involvement with on-campus and/or off-campus agencies supporting economic development or external engagement for businesses, non-profit organizations, professional associations, civic groups, schools, colleges, universities, individuals, or local, state or

federal agencies, with or without the involvement of students.

c) Professional Involvement and/or Engagement (or other service to one's discipline or the larger community)

- Reviewing for professional journals, books, or other academic outlets or expressions
- Attendance and participation in professional organizations and conventions at the local, regional, national or international level
- Memberships in professional organizations; participation in state agency activities or initiatives (outside higher education)
- Presentations before organizations at the community, local, regional, national or international level
- Participation as a reviewer, discussant, moderator, or program committee member at professional meetings at the local, regional, national or international level
- Other regional, national, or international service towards advancing the quality of higher education
- Creation and display of educational exhibits
- Officer positions or committee memberships in professional organizations at the local, regional, national or international level

d) Other Service to the Institution, including special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership (not prioritized; not exhaustive)

Additional Non-credit Instruction, Workshops, or Involvement

- Continuing Education
- Institute for the Economy and the Future
- Small Business and Technology Development Center
- College of Business
- Other professional schools
- North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching

Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership (activities at the Departmental, College, University, and UNC system levels, including work on accreditation documents, etc.)

- Develop and maintain contacts with employers, alumni, and other constituents
- Chair positions of appointed committees
- Credit by examination activities (i.e., examination preparation, administration, and evaluation)
- Number of independent studies, co-op programs or internships advised

e) **Advising and Other Activities with Students** – “Advising students is a significant form of service. Advisers are expected to be informed about curriculum and related processes, to be available to those they advise, and to help students in their academic and career planning.” Advising includes assistance with the following activities (Not prioritized; not exhaustive.)

- Advising declared and undeclared majors; *as noted in the Faculty Handbook, advising loads of more than 33 should be given special compensation and/or consideration*
- Registration
- Career selection and placement assistance; letters of recommendation
- Student organizations
- Orientation programs
- Recruitment programs
- Retention activities
- Assistance with study skills and referrals from appropriate counselors

2. Methods of evaluation

a) **Norms for the five categories of service activities effectiveness are:**

Outstanding

- Makes notable contributions of service to several of the following areas: the UNC system, university, College of Business, department, profession, community, or region—while making an exceptionally significant contribution of service to at least one of those areas. Noting the categories and descriptions listed above, examples include: Exceptional advising activities and commitments; (or) exceptional community engagement activities; exceptional involvement with complementary organizational subunits (e.g., SBTDC); exceptional service to the institution or profession, as suggested by the following examples: Chair of a major committee; officer of the College; officer or committee chair serving as delegate to Faculty Assembly of the UNC System; service as an elected member of Faculty Senate; chair of several minor committees; officer of a nationally or regionally recognized professional organization; officer of a significant community or regional organization; initiation and follow-through with a major activity or project at the college, university or UNC System level, or for a major professional, business, community, or regional organization
- Meets all required department, college, and university responsibilities

Exceeds Expectations

- Significant advising activities and commitments; (or) significant community engagement activities; significant involvement with complementary organizational subunits; significant service to the institution or profession, as suggested by the following examples: Participation at the college or university level, such as being a member of a major committee; chair of a minor committee; or serving on several committees. Examples also include, fulfilling the responsibilities of a faculty member who is ill or who otherwise fails to make the expected contributions, initiating and following through with departmental initiatives, conducting significant and ongoing consulting activities
- Meets all required department, college, and university responsibilities

Meets Expectations

- Meets all required departmental, college, and university responsibilities. For example: serves as an informed participant at departmental meetings, completes agreed upon work in a timely and professional manner; occasionally serves on college or university committees and meets related obligations; meets typical advising responsibilities; presents evidence of some community engagement activities, and/or engagement with complementary organizational subunits (e.g., SBTDC, Outreach); and/or service to the discipline or profession.
- Meets all required department, college, and university responsibilities

Below Expectations

- Rarely serves on a department, college, or university committee
- Little evidence of community or professional engagement
- Unprepared for committee meetings or routinely fails to attend scheduled meetings
- Fails to complete or is routinely late in providing expected, requested, or required contributions to the department, college, or university

Unacceptable

- Avoids department, college, or university responsibilities
- Fails to participate in service activities

3. General comments

a) Professional development – NA

b) General comments – Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity in two of the three institutional

levels (department, college/school, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one of the areas of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department; they should be described in the self-evaluation statement and documented as warranted in the appropriate dossier appendix.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

- 1. Overview** – All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This performance evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. Deadlines for completion of the review process are determined by the Deans and Provost.
- 2. Composition of the AFE Document Review process** - AFE files are reviewed and evaluated by the Department Head, rather than by a faculty committee; however, there is an AFE Document Review process. Once a year the department chair shall announce a meeting for the purpose of reviewing, discussing, and potentially amending the AFE document. All interested departmental faculty (full-time fixed term, tenure-track, and tenured) may attend this meeting and vote on any proposed amendments.
- 3. Procedures and preparation of documentation**
 - a)** All full-time faculty members must prepare and submit electronically an AFE document to the Department Head that includes:
 - 1) Teaching**
 - a.** Copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.
 - b.** A self-evaluation addressing the three areas of teaching effectiveness (as outlined in Section II.A.1. above), a statement of teaching philosophy, a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for courses taught during the period of review. In addition, this evaluation must include a narrative on pedagogical content knowledge. Specifically, 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?” (as outlined in Section II.A. 2.b above).

- c. Student Assessment of Instruction
 - d. Description of Professional development activities appropriate to teaching
- 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity**
- a. List scholarly activity completed during the academic year (previous 12 months from time of submission of file). Clearly distinguish between published work and work in progress. Do not duplicate entries from previous years. If an item appeared previously with a different status (e.g., article submitted), clearly indicate that it was listed previously, and how.
 - b. Describe professional development activities appropriate to scholarship
- 3) Service - Describe service to the department, college, university, and external community as addressed in the CRD during the immediately previous 12 months. Address advising activities as well.**
- b) Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document: Include**
- Self-evaluative statement addressing the three areas of teaching effectiveness, citing examples from the current year
 - Peer review of teaching
 - Samples of teaching materials, if desired
 - Scholarly products (do not include the same products in multiple years).
 - Documentation of service for the most recent 12 months.
 - Any other documentation the faculty member wishes to provide.

The Department Head shall prepare a written AFE Statement, addressing the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty member may prepare a rebuttal statement if s/he wishes.

- c) Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05 F). All part time faculty members must prepare and submit electronically an AFE document to the Department Head that includes:**
- Copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.
 - Student Assessment of Instruction
 - Description of professional development activities appropriate to teaching
 - Some fixed-term faculty members are required to do service and/or scholarship as well pursuant to either their contract or negotiated release time awarded.
 - A statement on pedagogical content knowledge as outlined in Section II.A. 2.b.

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

1. **Overview** – These guidelines reflect Sections 4.06 and 4.07 of the *Faculty Handbook* of Western Carolina University. Faculty considered under these guidelines will be from the annual list of faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as generated by the Office of the Provost.
2. **Composition of review committee (4.07D1)** - The tenure and promotion advisory committee is termed the Collegial Review Committee (CRC) and consists of tenured departmental faculty members, as stipulated below, with the department head as (non-voting) chair.
 - a) If there are fewer than three tenured faculty in the department, the Provost, in consultation with the department head and the dean, will select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of three tenured faculty.
 - b) In the event there are more than six tenured faculty members in the department, an election shall be held annually among full-time faculty to elect six members to serve.
 - c) Committee members may not be present when their own dossiers are being considered.
 - d) When the department head is the person being considered by the committee, the department head shall be excused, and the committee shall elect a pro tem chair (voting) from its membership. The pro tem chair shall submit the committee's recommendations directly to the appropriate dean.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean's office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the CRD schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels. It is the responsibility of the candidate to comply with requirements specified in (1) the departmental CRD, (2) the Guidelines for Preparation of the Dossier, and (3) the timetable for the review process.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. **Overview**
 - a) **Introduction**

Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty. The purpose of this review is to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence

among tenured faculty. This is achieved by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance, offering suggestions to enhance performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty members whose performance is found less than satisfactory, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions for those whose performance remains deficient. Post-tenure review shall be consistent with the University of North Carolina Board of Governors' policy of giving teaching primary consideration.

b) Faculty to Be Reviewed

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) involve teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

2. Composition of Review Committee

The department will establish a PTR committee consisting of three tenured departmental colleagues, excluding the department head. Whenever the department finds it impossible to form a committee containing at least three tenured faculty, the matter will be referred to the Provost. The Provost, in consultation with the tenured faculty of the department, the department head and the dean of the college, will, by selecting tenured faculty from similar departments, constitute a committee of three tenured faculty for the department.

3. Procedures and Preparation of Documentation

a) Timetable

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 Western Carolina University, prior post-tenure review, or return to faculty status following administrative service. Exceptions shall be made in the following cases: 1) when on leave from duties, that period shall not be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events and/or 2) when temporarily assigned to duties away from Cullowhee/Asheville during the period of a required review, PTR occurs upon return.

b) Materials to Be Submitted for Review

A faculty member being reviewed will provide the four most recent annual faculty evaluations and a current curriculum vitae (CV).

c) Procedures

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.

The tenured faculty of each department shall establish a procedure for post-tenure review. These procedures must be approved by the dean of the college and the Provost. The department will establish a PTR committee as described under “Composition of the Review Committee.” The PTR committee shall present their written evaluations to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head shall then append his/her evaluation relative to the mission of the University, college, department, and program. Where merited, feedback should include recognition for exemplary performance. A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties. The faculty member then has the option of attaching a written response. Faculty response to a negative review will also be shared with the next highest administrative level.

d) Criteria

Criteria for acceptable faculty performance include professional competence, conscientious execution of duties—taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the department head—and efforts to improve performance. Exemplary faculty performance, as determined by the department, involves sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

e) 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 department head, in consultation with the faculty member, PTR committee, and dean of the 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, and (3) other support provided by the administration. The department head and PTR committee will monitor the faculty member's progress relative to the development plan and provide verbal and written feedback to the faculty member semi-annually.

The plan shall also include a clear statement of consequences should adequate progress not occur by the end of the third year. The consequences may range from suspension of pay raises to, in the most extreme cases, reduction in rank, temporary suspension of employment, or termination of employment.

f) Due Process

Due process and the right to appeal a determination is guaranteed the faculty member under review in accordance with the *WCU Faculty Handbook*, *WCU Policies*, and the *UNC Code*.

The Faculty Hearings Committee shall consider problems and appeals that arise from PTR.

IV. Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review IN BLSM

The criteria for meeting expectations in BLSM:

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) [4.05]

1. Teaching

For a satisfactory AFE a faculty member must, at a minimum, “**meet expectations**” in this category for the year being evaluated.

2. Scholarship

For a satisfactory AFE a faculty member must, at a minimum, produce one “**acceptable outcome**” in this category for the year being evaluated.

Special note: For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that a program of research is being developed.

3. Service/Engagement

For a satisfactory AFE a faculty member must, at a minimum, “**meet expectations**” in this category for the year being evaluated.

4. General comments

Note General Comments II-A-5-b, II-B-4-c, and II-C-3-b

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching – In order to be recommended for Reappointment, a faculty member must, at a minimum, “**meet expectations**” in this category.

2. Scholarship –

In order to be recommended for **Reappointment**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category.

Special note: For the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectation for the completion of scholarly activity, only the indication that a program of research is being developed.

3. Service

In order to be recommended for **Reappointment**, a faculty member must, at a minimum, “**meet expectations**” in this category.

4. General comments

Note General Comments II-A-5-b, II-B-4-c, and II-C-3-b

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching

In order to be recommended for **Tenure**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category on average for the applicable period

2. Scholarship

In order to be recommended for **Tenure**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category on average for the applicable period.

3. Service

In order to be recommended for **Tenure**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category on average for the period prior to the application.

4. General comments

Note General Comments II-A-5-b, II-B-4-c, and II-C-3-b

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07) High Levels of performance are expected for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

1. Teaching

In order to be recommended for **Promotion to Associate Professor**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category on average for the applicable period and exceed expectations at least 25% of the time.

2. Scholarship

In order to be recommended for **Promotion to Associate Professor**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category on average for the applicable period and exceed expectations at least 25% of the time

3. Service

In order to be recommended for **Promotion to Associate Professor**, a faculty member must “**meet expectations**” in this category on average for the applicable period and exceed expectations at least 25% of the time.

4. General comments

Note General Comments II-A-5-b, II-B-4-c, and II-C-3-b

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07) (Except under documented exceptional circumstances, the general guidelines for promotion to the rank of full professor in this department are as follows.) Superior Levels of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are expected for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

1. Teaching

In order to be recommended for **Promotion to Professor**, a faculty member must “**exceed expectations**” in this category **for the majority of the applicable period**.

2. Scholarship

In order to be recommended for **Promotion to Full Professor**, a faculty member must “**exceed expectations**” in this category **for the majority of the applicable period**.

3. Service

In order to be recommended for **Promotion to Full Professor**, a faculty member must, “**exceed expectations**” **for the majority of the applicable period**.

4. General comments

Note General Comments II-A-5-b, II-B-4-c, and II-C-3-b

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching

In order to be deemed **satisfactory for Post Tenure Review**, regardless of rank in the department, a faculty member must, at a minimum “**meet expectations**” in this category **for three of the four years** prior to review. Peer review of teaching materials not required; direct observation of teaching not required.

2. Scholarship

In order to be deemed **satisfactory for Post Tenure Review**, regardless of rank, a faculty member must at a minimum “**meet expectations**” in this category **for three of the four years** prior to review.

3. Service

In order to be deemed **satisfactory for Post Tenure Review**, regardless of rank, a faculty member must, at a minimum “**meet expectations**” in this category **for three of the four years** prior to review.

4. General comments

Note General Comments II-A-5-b, II-B-4-c, and II-C-3-b

Approved by:

Department Head

Date

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

APPENDIX A

Research, Publications and Other Scholarly Activities: *Other Notable Scholarly Engagement and Work Product*

- Publication of workbooks and test support used in conjunction with instruction with a regionally- or nationally-recognized publisher.
- Publication of a scholarly book or textbook, not previously described.
- Invited or non peer-reviewed program presentations at the local, regional, national or international level
- Honors by recognized professional organizations of research and creative scholarly activities
- Attendance and participation in academic research organizations and conventions at the local, regional, national or international level
- Successful internal grant proposal
- Competitive (external) research grant applications
- Editing of professional publications
- Articles under review and unpublished manuscripts.
- Chaired positions at meetings of learned societies
- Scholarly roundtable or panel participation
- Maintaining professional certifications
- Advanced graduate study
- Other relevant activities and experiences, as documented and determined appropriate by the department head and/or CRC committee