

**Department /Division: School of Nursing
Department Collegial Review Document
Effective Fall Semester, 2008**

**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 School of Nursing. 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 issues 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 school-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.

Faculty performance is reviewed and evaluated each year by two formal processes, using two separate systems which are the Tenure Promotion and Reappointment (TPR) and the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE). In the fall and spring, individual faculty members are considered for reappointment, tenure and promotion; at that time, the cumulative record is appraised by the School of Nursing (SON) Collegial Review Committee (CRC), administrators at various levels, and finally, by the Chancellor and sent to the Board of Trustees. In the spring, the SON Director conducts the AFE, a review of individual faculty performance over the most recent year of service.

The School of Nursing has a two-track system for faculty appointment and promotion: the traditional tenure track for the educator/scholar, and a non-tenure track for the educator/practitioner. These different tracks allow for the diversity of expertise needed within the SON. Both tracks provide vital contributions to the advancement of nursing as a discipline and a profession, and are essential to the School's ability to provide high quality professional nursing education in a cost-effective and efficient manner. In addition to the criteria outlined below, see also Appendix A for further information regarding the educator/practitioner track.

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

A. Requirements:

1. Minimum of an earned Masters Degree in Nursing or related health field and hold, or have made satisfactory progress towards, a doctoral degree in nursing or related field.
2. Eligible to be considered for tenure within the university.
3. Meet the criteria related to teaching, scholarship, and service. Consistent with Ernest Boyer's (1990) model, types of scholarship appropriate for the educator/scholar track include the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching and learning. Guidelines for the dissemination and evaluation of scholarship are provided in later portions of this document.

B. Professional Preparation and Experience

1. Nursing faculty must be prepared in the areas for which they will assume teaching responsibilities. Additionally, each nurse faculty member employed after December 31, 1983, shall have two calendar years or the equivalent of full-time clinical experience as a registered nurse. Each nurse faculty member must hold a current unrestricted license to practice as a registered nurse in North Carolina and obtain and maintain professional practice liability insurance. Each nursing faculty member of a health related field must hold a current unrestricted license, as well as a current unrestricted license to practice in North Carolina if applicable to teaching duties. Each faculty with clinical site duties shall present evidence of Td and/or Tdap within the past 10 years, and a completed Hepatitis B immunizations series or immunity titer or declination, annual TB test, and current CPR certification. One academic year of full-time teaching experience in a nursing program is required before a faculty can be named Instructor of Record for a major clinical nursing course. Advanced Practice Registered Nurse faculty (e.g. Nurse Practitioner and Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist faculty) who teach in a graduate track must have and maintain national certification in their area of specialty. By December 31, 2010 faculty who teach in the pre-licensure track must also have documented preparation in teaching and learning principles for adult education including curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation (see North Carolina Board of Nursing [NCBON] *Administrative Code* Section 21 NCAC 36.0318 Faculty). In addition, all SON faculty are expected to document ongoing preparation and/or development in the areas of teaching and learning principles.

2. Higher education teaching experience

- a. For appointment, reappointment, or promotion, the minimal departmental requirements are the same as those stated in the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.
- b. For tenure, the maximum number of years of continuous full-time probationary service shall be six years except as provided by the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.
- c. For candidates without doctoral degrees who are first time faculty appointment candidates, a minimum of three years clinical experience and at least one year of clinical teaching are required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Part time and/or adjunct teaching for at least one year may be considered in lieu of clinical teaching.

Educator/Practitioner Track - Criteria for Appointment and Reappointment

A. Requirements

1. Minimum of an earned Masters Degree in a specialty area of nursing practice or related health field;
2. Eligible for appointments/promotions as outlined in University policies; and
3. Meet criteria related to teaching, scholarship, and service and practice. Types of scholarship appropriate for the educator/practitioner track include the scholarship of integration, application, and teaching and learning. The scholarship of discovery may also be appropriate but is not required. Guidelines for the dissemination and evaluation of scholarship are provided in later portions of this document.

B. Professional Preparation and Experience

1. Same as requirements listed in Section I. B. 1.
2. Higher education teaching experience
 - a. For appointment, reappointment, or promotion, the minimal SON requirements are the same as those stated in the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.
 - b. For candidates without doctoral degrees who are first time faculty appointment candidates, a minimum of three years clinical experience and at least one year of clinical teaching are required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Part time and/or adjunct teaching for at least one year may be considered in lieu of clinical teaching.

Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct (part-time) faculty are defined as those who hold a minimum of a master's degree in nursing or related health field and are appointed for semester or one-year terms primarily as part-time clinical instructors. Adjunct faculty must meet the requirements and professional preparation and experience criteria as noted in Sections I.A and I.B.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 7 dimensions:

Teaching is evaluated based on the *Seven Dimensions of Teaching*, **content expertise, instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, course management skills, evaluation of students, faculty/student relationships, and the facilitation of student learning**. Performance should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion. Teaching will normally constitute 50% of AFE/TPR. Evaluation of teaching will be based on the following key expectations and examples/behaviors provided under each dimension. Examples under each dimension in *italics* are minimal expectations of all faculty.

Key Expectations:

- Makes significant contributions to course offerings.
- Uses resources to improve teaching as suggested by peers and students.
- Continues to build on a reputation as a superior teacher.

The following are examples that meet the criteria for teaching behaviors, but should not be interpreted as all inclusive.

Content Expertise

Follows syllabus outline and assigned textbook

Incorporates recent findings

Contributes to content review

Assists with WCU nursing courses outside assignment

Delivers invited/guest lectures outside SON

Maintains own practice as appropriate

Obtains/maintains certification as appropriate

Instructional Delivery

Engages students in learning

Illustrates from own practice (protecting patient identity)

Applies didactic to clinical

Selects methods appropriate to content

Uses technology in the classroom effectively

Utilizes course management systems or learning management systems effectively for course delivery

Uses Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE)/other resources to develop new strategies

Explores/develops new clinical sites

Participates in peer review and/or mentoring

Instructional Design

Participates in syllabus revisions

Proposes/develops new teaching resources/tools

Proposes/develops new courses for traditional and/or distance delivery

Course Management

Collaborates with teaching team

Makes effective use of teaching time

Handles classroom/online/clinical dynamics effectively

Becomes Instructor of Record (usually after first year)

Incorporates student feedback into revisions

Collaborates on textbook/media selection

Demonstrates best-practices in online courses

Evaluation of Students

Gives constructive feedback in a timely manner

Documents using approved evaluation tools

Writes/modifies effective test items

Faculty/Student Relations

Displays positive attitudes

Keeps office hours or appointments

Shows respect for students and for diversity

Participates in academic advising

Mentors student learning projects/research

Supervises independent study/practicum

Facilitation of Learning

Provides reliable resources

Maintains high academic standards

Adheres to scope of practice for self and students

Synthesizes curriculum/conceptual threads as a whole in the facilitation of classroom/online/clinical learning, course and program development

Develops, promotes, and/or assists with service learning opportunities

Submits learning resource grants

Implements learning resource grant

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence (See p. 5 of original)**
 - a) **Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the 7 dimensions of effective teaching. (4.05A)**
 - b) **Peer review of teaching materials -- including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. Alternate evidence includes contents of faculty portfolio. (4.05B2b)** See Appendix B.1.
 - c) **Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. (4.3.1.1)**
Refer to Appendix B.2 for peer review documents for traditional classroom teaching and Appendix B.3 for peer review of online courses.
 - d) **Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument (4.05A).** Required of all course sections from the prior year taught by untenured faculty and two course sections for tenured faculty.

3. General comments –

- a) **Evaluation of Teaching** – Evaluation of teaching will include data from three sources: student assessment of instruction, colleagues’ reviews of teaching (classroom/online observation and/or reviews of teaching materials), and instructor’s self-report and evaluation.
- b) **Professional Development** – Faculty will model professional development by meeting and maintaining the NCBN and Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) requirements for faculty, as well as the SON teaching criteria. Faculty who are not nurses will meet & maintain continued competency requirements for their discipline.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. **WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 4 types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.**
 - 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.**

Faculty should demonstrate regular productivity in one or more types of scholarship noted above. Performance by full time faculty should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion. Scholarship will normally constitute 10-40% of AFE/TPR. Evaluation of scholarship will be based on the following key expectations and behaviors provided under each type of scholarship (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002).

Key Expectations:

- Consistently promotes current evidence-based practice
- Displays professional behaviors in the categories of scholarly activities, unpublished scholarly activities or publications that meet needs relevant to the discipline
- Engages students in contributions to nursing knowledge

Definitions (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002):

- Scholarly activities – the use of disciplinary knowledge and skill
- Scholarship – the production of unpublished scholarly activities* and publications

*Unpublished scholarly activities meet the definition of scholarship if they appear in a publicly observable form; in other words, it must be public, subject to **external** critical review, and in a form allowing the use and exchange by other members of the discipline (Shulman & Hutchings, 1998). Unpublished scholarly activities can take the form of a paper, poster, an audio or videotape presentation, written report, or Web site (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002).

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review –

The following are examples that meet the criteria for scholarly behaviors, but should not be interpreted as all inclusive. Faculty should document whether their scholarly activities are peer reviewed, invited, peer evaluated, or anonymous peer review or evaluation. Faculty should also note if publications were subject to an editorial board or other editorial review.

Scholarship of Discovery**Scholarly Activities**

- Writes research grant and/or manages successful research grant
- Serves as external Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI for research study
- Engages in doctoral or post-doctoral research activity
- Engages in clinical research activity

Unpublished Scholarly Activities

- A paper or poster developed and presented by the author that adds to the body of nursing knowledge
- A paper or poster presented, reporting the findings of research to disseminate new knowledge
- A report on research findings to a granting agency or licensing board

Publications

- A book chapter, book, or refereed journal article describing a new theory developed by the author
- A book chapter, book, or refereed journal article reporting knowledge gained through research

Scholarship of Integration

Scholarly Activities

Serves as a peer-reviewer for a journal in the discipline or area of practice

Serves as a peer-reviewer for a book in the discipline or area of practice

Serves as a peer-reviewer for grant applications in the discipline

Collaborates with interdisciplinary colleague(s) to design and/or deliver a course

Unpublished Scholarly Activities

Provides talk on a current disciplinary topic to a local radio or television station, service organization, business organization, or nonacademic professional organization, high school, community college, or professional group(s)

A paper or poster presented on a current disciplinary topic

Publications

A review of literature or integrated review on a disciplinary topic

An article or book chapter on the application of a discipline or discipline-related theory, research method, or clinical practice issue

A critical book review published in a professional journal

A textbook in discipline published

An edited book in discipline published

Scholarship of Application

Scholarly Activities

Study conducted to solve a departmental problem or formulate departmental or institutional policy

Testifies or consults as expert witness

Provides off-campus consulting services related to discipline

Obtains/maintains national certification in area of the faculty's area of practice

Unpublished Scholarly Activities

Develops a new intervention or process for dealing with a problem related to nursing practice

Writes external grants and/or manages funded grants

Conducts a study for a local organization or government agency related to the discipline

Conducts a study to solve a community problem related to the discipline

Develops continuing education content and/or programs

Function as a clinical leader in the practice area by developing continuing education content and/or programs

Delivers/implements continuing education content and/or programs

Function as a clinical leader in the practice area by delivering/implementing clinical continuing education content and/or programs

Documentation of continuing education activities in the practice area

Maintenance of mandatory clinical competencies, required by the host health care agency/association/licensing body, of equivalently licensed professionals

Function as a clinical leader in the practice area by participating with clinically focused health care agency committees and planning groups.

Function as a clinical leader in the practice area by participating with

clinically focused professional organizations through serving on committees, planning groups and/or by holding officer level position(s).

Publications

An article or technical report that outlines a new research problem identified through application of nursing knowledge

An article that applies nursing knowledge or skills to a clinical practice problem

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Scholarly Activities

Chairs student research projects or theses

Serves as member of student research projects or theses

Develops a new course with related syllabus and teaching materials

Develops new media to deliver course or course material

Introduces the result(s) of scholarship (discovery) into teaching content or methods to a course

Unpublished Scholarly Activities

Formal presentation of a new teaching/learning technique to peers

Development of a significant collection of resource materials for a course

Experimentation with new teaching or testing methods – altering until it is successful

Creation of a strategy or approach to help students and/or faculty think critically or conceptually

Publications

Publication on the use of a new teaching strategy or approach, or testing method to help students think critically or conceptually

Publication on a new teaching or testing method and the alterations that made it successful

3. General comments –

a) Grant proposals and awards – All faculty are expected to provide information at the time of the AFE regarding grants and awards regarding initial writing, submission, funding (amount, agency) and implementation (timeline for completion).

b) Professional development - All faculty are expected to participate in professional development in the area of Scholarship in keeping with the criteria outlined above and consistent with their interest(s), background and experience.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service- Evaluation is based on service to the school, college, university, profession, and community. Performance of service should be cumulative and expanding for tenure and promotion. The AFE/CRD should reflect yearly growth in service within a 10 to 40% range. Evaluation of service will be based on the following key expectations and examples/behaviors provided under each type of service. All full-time faculty will be evaluated in all areas of service. Examples in *italics* are minimal expectations of service/citizenship for all faculty.

a) Institutional service – All full-time faculty are expected to participate in service activities at the university, college and/or school level.

- b) **Community engagement** – The SON values faculty activities in community-based service; all full-time faculty are expected to participate in such activity.
- c) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** – Expertise in the discipline and leadership is an expectation of faculty, including the area of service.
- d) **Advising** – Advising is an integral component of the higher education system; this includes faculty-student interaction and is an opportunity for professional development (this activity is expected of all full-time faculty members, see II.A.1. above). Each faculty member should submit a description detailing the number of advisees, the type of advising and the outcome of the advising session.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence –

The following are examples that meet the criteria for service behaviors, but should not be interpreted as all inclusive.

Minimum Expectations – Citizen of School, Profession, & Community

Member of teaching team

Member of one school committee

Engages in recruitment activities (formal and informal)

Attends one commencement a year

Attends school/college/university events

Member of professional association(s)

Engages in continuing competence as defined by NCBON or other professional/licensing agency/organization

Represents WCU to external group(s)

Models role of health care educator

School Service

Faculty liaison with clinical agency

Helps mentor faculty

Participates in projects/accreditation

Chairs committee as needed

Participates in searches for new faculty and/or staff

Creates and conducts other recruitment activity

Creates/revises recruitment tools

Mentors student organizations

Directs teaching team

Participates in extra committees (ad hoc), task force, etc.

Faculty course load exceeds normal annual course load

College Service

Serves on college committee

Chairs college committee as needed

Collaborates with other disciplines

Receives honors/awards for service

University Service

Serves as Faculty Senator

Serves on university committee as qualified

Chairs university committee as needed

Receives honors/awards for service

Professional Service

Active in professional associations(s)

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

Community Service

Active as health professional in community
Engages in health-promotion activities or service through community agencies
Participates in health agency activities
Provides consultation on health issues to community or professional organizations
Provides leadership in community organizations
Seeks/applies community learning grants
Receives honors/awards for contributions

3. General comments –

a) Key Questions:

- 1) Has this person made significant contributions to the school, college, university, profession, and/or community that have grown in scope?
- 2) Has this person successfully assumed leadership roles in an expanding arena?

b) Professional development – All full-time faculty are expected to participate in professional development in the area of Service in keeping with the criteria outlined above and consistent with their interest(s), background and experience.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview – Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the Director shall complete an annual faculty evaluation (AFE) of all full- and part-time nursing faculty members each spring semester. See Appendix B for a description of the process and forms used to provide evaluative data and procedures required of both faculty and the SON Director.

2. Composition of review committee – The annual faculty review will be conducted by the Director of the SON. See Appendix B for a description of the process and forms used to provide evaluative data and procedures required of both faculty and the SON Director.

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 seven teaching dimensions of teaching (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. Each Spring during the AFE process, each faculty member will prepare a brief

written report evaluating their performance in each of the seven dimensions for that academic year. The examples/behaviors noted in **Teaching Criteria** section of this document should be used as a guide.

- b) Copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.** Colleagues' reviews of selected teaching materials will be performed annually by SON faculty and/or teaching teams. Items reviewed may include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc. This review of teaching materials is required of all full-time faculty. This evaluative data to be included in the faculty AFE file. See documentation in Appendix B
- c) Direct observation of classroom teaching (if required).** All full-time faculty must be evaluated once each year by direct observation of classroom teaching or evaluation of online teaching. Observation of classroom teaching should be conducted by a peer selected by the faculty member. The peer should be familiar with the content or specialty being taught and use the SON's Instrument for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness. The SON will accept evaluation of teaching in the online environment by a peer assessment using the Online Course Assessment Tool (OCAT) (tool available from the FCTE and the SON Faculty Handbook). This evaluative data to be included in the faculty AFE file. See documentation in Appendix B.
- d) Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI).** Instructor evaluations are required of all course sections taught by all (including part-time) faculty. All SON faculty are required to report SAIs for two courses taught during each academic year. Tenured faculty who undergone post-tenure review (PTR) and received a negative outcome may be required to report SAIs more frequently. This evaluative data is to be included in the faculty AFE file. See documentation in Appendix B.

2) Scholarship and Creative Activity – provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that expectations outlined in Section II.B and Section IV.A.2 have been achieved at the “meets expectation” level. This includes one scholarly behavior/activity from the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and, in addition, one behavior/activity for scholarly behavior from another area of Scholarship from the criteria listed in Section II.B.

3) Service - provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that expectations outlined in Section II.C and Section IV.A.3 have been achieved at the “meets expectations” level. This includes meeting all italicized (minimal) criteria in Section II.C criteria.

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document – see Appendix B.

- c. Evaluation of part-time instructors (4.05 F)** – Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the Director shall complete an evaluation of all part-time nursing faculty members each spring semester. Part-time nursing faculty will be evaluated for their effectiveness as teachers based on italicized AFE criteria in Section II. A (Teaching), student evaluations, course syllabi and objectives. See Appendix B.

- d. **Evaluation of non-tenure track (fixed term) instructors (4.05 F)** – Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the Director shall complete an evaluation of all non-tenure track (fixed term) nursing faculty members each spring semester. Non-tenure track (fixed term) faculty will be evaluated for their effectiveness as teachers based on italicized AFE criteria in Section II. A (Teaching), student evaluations, course syllabi and objectives. In conjunction with the Director, in addition to the teaching domain, each faculty member will decide the additional focus for the following academic year from Service or Scholarship. See Appendix B.

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

1. **Overview** – For reappointment, faculty must meet expectations as outlined in Section IV.B related to the criteria for Teaching (IV.B.1), Scholarship (IV.B.2) and Service (IV.B.3). In order to be recommended for tenure the tenure-track faculty member must provide evidence of consistently exceeding expectations in all three mission areas (see AFE SON criteria Sections II.A and II.C and the *WCU Faculty Handbook*) for all probationary years prior to seeking tenure. See also IV.C below for the criteria for Teaching (IV.C.1), Scholarship (IV.C.2) and Service (IV.C.3).
2. **Composition of review committee (4.07D.1)** – The SON Collegial Review Committee (CRC) will be composed of the Director (non-voting) and all tenured faculty in the SON. If the resultant committee is composed of less than three tenured faculty (exclusive of the director), the Provost, in consultation with the director and the dean, will select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three tenured faculty.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.** Each year, faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must provide evidence in a dossier. The dossier should reflect their record of teaching, scholarship, and service activities that meet departmental criteria outlined in this document. The specific contents and format of the dossier are outlined by the Provost annually. Specific roles, responsibilities, and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are described in Section 4.0 of the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.

C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. **Overview** – The faculty member’s performance for post-tenure review will be judged satisfactory if he or she has met expectations in all categories in the School’s AFE in each of the previous four years.
2. **Composition of Review committee** – When tenured faculty become eligible for consideration, the School CRC will also serve as the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. See Appendix C, items #1-3.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – See Appendix C.

Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the School of Nursing (SON) –

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) (4.05)

1. Teaching –

-Exceeds Expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that faculty has met all *italicized* (minimal) criteria and in addition, meets five additional criteria)

-Meets Expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that faculty has met all *italicized* (minimal) criteria)

*-Does Not Meet Expectations – Unsatisfactory** (does not provide documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ above is met)

If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).

2. Scholarship –

-Exceeds Expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ below are met; in addition, must provide documentation or evidence demonstrating two or more additional activities in scholarly behavior)

-Meets Expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating one activity for scholarly behavior from the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; in addition, must provide documentation or evidence demonstrating one activity for scholarly behavior from another area of Scholarship)

*-Does Not Meet Expectations – Unsatisfactory** (does not provide documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ above is met)

If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).

3. Service –

-Exceeds Expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ below are met; in addition, must provide documentation or evidence demonstrating two or more additional activities in service behavior)

-Meets Expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that faculty has met all *italicized* (minimal) criteria)

*-Does Not Meet Expectations – Unsatisfactory** (does not provide documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ above is met)

If a faculty member does not meet expectations the rating will be “unsatisfactory” and the specific area(s) will be noted with specific actions outlined to address the area(s).

4. General comments – see also Appendix B.

B. Reappointment (4.06) – In order to be recommended for reappointment the tenure-track faculty must achieve the following in the three mission areas each year:

- 1. Teaching** - Exceeds expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that faculty has met all *italicized* (minimal) criteria and in addition meets five additional criteria per year)
- 2. Scholarship** – Exceeds expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ are met; in addition, must provide documentation or evidence demonstrating two or more additional activities in scholarly behavior)
- 3. Service** - Exceeds expectations (provides documentation or evidence demonstrating that the criteria for ‘Meets Expectations’ are met; in addition, must provide documentation or evidence demonstrating two or more additional activities in service behavior)
- 4. General comments** – Each year, faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must provide evidence in a dossier. The dossier should reflect their record of teaching, scholarship, and service activities that meet departmental criteria outlined in this document. The specific contents and format of the dossier are outlined by the Provost annually. Specific roles, responsibilities, and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are described in Section 4.0 of the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.

C. Tenure (4.07) - All faculty must meet expectations as outlined in the above criteria for Teaching, Scholarship and Service (Section Two). In order to be recommended for tenure the tenure-track faculty member must provide evidence of consistently exceeding expectations in all three mission areas (see above AFE SON criteria and the *WCU Faculty Handbook*) for all probationary years prior to seeking tenure.

- 1. Teaching** - Exceeds expectations as outlined above and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least one additional criterion from four of the seven dimensions of the Teaching Model categories (instructional delivery, instructional design, course management, evaluation of students, faculty/student relationships, and facilitation of learning).
- 2. Scholarship** - Exceeds expectations as outlined above and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least one additional criterion from two of the four categories (discovery, integration, application, and teaching).
- 3. Service** – Exceeds expectations as outlined above and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least one additional criteria from four of the five Service/Engagement Model categories (school, college, university, professional, and community service).
- 4. General comments** – As per college by-laws and the *WCU Faculty Handbook*, all tenure-track faculty are expected to be aware of how and when collegial review at the college level is conducted.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07) In order to be recommended for promotion to associate professor the faculty member must hold a doctorate in nursing or related field, complete at

least five years of teaching experience at the college level at the rank of assistant professor and achieve the following in the three mission areas for the prior three academic years:

1. Teaching – Exceeds expectations as outlined in Section IV.A.1 and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least one additional criterion from four of the seven dimensions of teaching categories (instructional delivery, instructional design, course management, evaluation of students, faculty/student relationships, and facilitation of learning).

2. Scholarship – Exceeds expectations as outlined in Section IV.A.2 and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least one additional criterion from two of the four Scholarship Model categories (discovery, integration, application, and teaching).

3. Service – Exceeds expectations as outlined in Section IV.A.3 and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least one additional criterion from four of the five Service/Engagement Model categories (school, college, university, professional, and community service).

4. General comments – Each year, faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must provide evidence in a dossier. The dossier should reflect their record of teaching, scholarship, and service activities that meet departmental criteria outlined in this document. The specific contents and format of the dossier are outlined by the Provost annually. Specific roles, responsibilities, and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are described in Section 4.0 of the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07) In order to be recommended for promotion to full professor the faculty member must hold a doctorate in nursing or related field, complete at least ten years of teaching at the college level including five years at the rank of associate professor, and achieve the following in the three mission areas for the prior five academic years:

1. Teaching - Exceeds expectations as outlined in Section IV.A.1 and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least two additional criteria from four of the seven dimensions of the teaching categories (instructional delivery, instructional design, course management, evaluation of students, faculty/student relationships, and facilitation of learning).

2. Scholarship - Exceeds expectations as outlined in Section IV.A.2 and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least three additional criteria from two of the four Boyer Scholarship Model categories (discovery, integration, application, and teaching).

3. Service – Exceeds expectations as outlined in Section IV.A.3 and provides documentation/evidence of meeting at least two additional criteria from four of the five Service/Engagement Model categories (school, college, university, professional, and community service).

4. General comments – Each year, faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion must provide evidence in a dossier. The dossier should reflect their record of teaching, scholarship, and service activities that meet departmental criteria outlined in this

document. The specific contents and format of the dossier are outlined by the Provost annually. Specific roles, responsibilities, and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are described in Section 4.0 of the *WCU Faculty Handbook*.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching - In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review the faculty member must meet expectations in as outlined in Section IV.A.1 and Section IV.A in the School's AFE in each of the previous four years.

2. Scholarship – In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review the faculty member must meet expectations in as outlined in Section IV.2 and Section IV.B in the School's AFE in each of the previous four years.

3. Service – In order to be deemed satisfactory for Post Tenure Review the faculty member must meet expectations in as outlined in Section IV.A.3 and Section IV.C in the School's AFE in each of the previous four years.

4. General comments – The faculty member's performance for post-tenure review will be judged satisfactory if he or she has demonstrated satisfactory performance in all categories in the School's AFE in each of the previous four years.

The faculty member's performance for post-tenure review will be judged unsatisfactory if either of the following two results are recorded in any of the four AFE's submitted to the CRC for review:

- a) The candidate received a rating of unsatisfactory (did not meet expectations) in any category on one or more of the four AFE's submitted for review, AND
- b) The candidate did not demonstrate, in the year following any unsatisfactory rating, sufficient improvement to receive a satisfactory rating in the same category or categories previously rated unsatisfactory, OR
- c) The candidate receives a rating of unsatisfactory (did not meet expectations) in any category on the AFE immediately preceding the year of post-tenure review.

Outcomes and due process for an unsatisfactory review:

1. If the CRC judges a faculty member's performance to be unsatisfactory, the committee will provide suggestions for improvement in the area(s) judged to be unsatisfactory.
2. Within one month following the review, the faculty member and School head will develop a three-year plan for improvement, subject to approval by the dean. The plan will clearly outline the criteria for acceptable performance and the consequences for not achieving satisfactory performance by the end of the three-year period. These consequences may affect pay increases, professional rank, and/or employment status.
3. Due process and the right of appeal shall be guaranteed as defined in the "Tenure Policies and Regulations of Western Carolina University," located in the *Western Carolina University Handbook*.

Appendices

Appendix A

Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion for Educator/Practitioner Track

1. Faculty Appointment for Educator/Practitioner - Practitioner/educator faculty may hold the following academic titles: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor.
2. Initial appointment to the Practitioner/Educator track will, in most cases, be at the Assistant Professor rank.
3. Assistant Professor is the first professorial rank. Individuals achieving this rank should have demonstrated advanced clinical skills, documented teaching competency, and clear evidence of beginning clinical scholarship. Requirements are outlined in Section I of this document.
4. Non-tenure track faculty are eligible for promotion to a higher rank according to University and Department guidelines.
5. Academic title is determined by the established criteria for that rank as delineated in the *WCU Faculty Handbook* and the School of Nursing Position Statement in the *Nursing Faculty Handbook*.
6. Criteria for each rank are described under broad categories and are intended to serve as guidelines. To be initially appointed or promoted to a rank higher than Assistant Professor, the criteria for the preceding rank should be met as well as criteria for the rank being sought.
7. Faculty currently employed on tenure track lines that hold a master's degree as their highest degree may continue on their tenure track; any new faculty who do not have a doctorate or satisfactory progress towards a doctorate will be appointed only to the non-tenure track or as adjunct faculty (effective fall 2008).
8. Faculty employed in a non-tenure track position may, upon completion or satisfactory progress towards completion of a doctorate and/or availability of a tenure track position, apply for vacant tenure track positions for which they may be qualified.
9. Faculty in tenure track positions who do not earn tenure may not be reappointed to a non-tenure track position.
10. The mix of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty will be determined by the Director of the School of Nursing and the Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences.
11. Full-time faculty appointed to the non-tenure track are considered fully affiliated faculty.
12. Criteria for Evaluation, Appointment, and/or Promotion – see Sections I-IV of this document.
13. Faculty with exceeds expectations on their AFEs and at least two years of service at WCU upon application (letter of request) may be offered reappointment with two year contracts at the discretion of the Director, following positive peer-review and the AFE. Faculty with exceeds expectations on their AFEs and at least four years of service at WCU upon application (letter of request) may be offered reappointment with contracts up to three years at the discretion of the

Director, following positive peer-review and the AFE. Renewal of two to three year contracts may be offered at the discretion of the Director, following positive peer-review and AFE. Contracts must be approved by the Dean and Provost.

Appendix B

Process for Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE)

1. Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the Director shall complete an evaluation of all full- and part-time nursing faculty members each spring semester.
2. Each full-time nursing faculty member in the school will be evaluated on criteria noted in Section II of this document.
3. Part-time nursing faculty will be evaluated for their effectiveness as teachers based on selected AFE criteria in Section II, student evaluations forms, course syllabi and objectives.
4. Annually all full-time faculty, during the academic year, a colleagues' review of selected teaching materials will be performed by curriculum-level and/or teaching teams. Items reviewed may include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc. The results of these reviews should be submitted by the faculty member to the Director with their AFE file on or before a date determined by the Director each year. See Appendix B.1 for an SON document to be used for data collection for this purpose.
5. All full-time faculty must be evaluated once each year by direct peer observation of classroom teaching or evaluation of online teaching. Observation of classroom teaching should be conducted by a peer selected by the faculty member. The peer should be familiar with the content or specialty being taught and use the SON's Instrument for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness. The SON will accept evaluation of teaching in the online environment by a peer assessment using the WCU Online Course Assessment Tool (OCAT) available from the WCU Faculty Center and the *Nursing Faculty Handbook*. A copy of the evaluative data document(s) should be submitted by the faculty member to the Director with their AFE file on or before a date determined by the Director each year. See Appendices B. 2 and B. 3 for documents to be used for Direct Observation of Classroom Teaching and the WCU OCAT.
6. Student Assessment of Instructor (SAI) will be performed according to university guidelines for all courses taught each semester. The faculty member will receive copies of this assessment from the university. Copies of this WCU evaluative data is to be included in the faculty member's AFE file that is given to the Director on or before a date determined by the Director each year.
7. On or before a date determined by the Director each year, all full-time tenure-track faculty members will submit to the Director a file documenting their performance related to teaching, scholarship, and service, and an updated CV. Evidence related to teaching will include data from three sources: student assessment of instruction, peer evaluation, and instructor's self-report and evaluation (see Section II of this document).

Supplemental to the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the Director shall complete an evaluation of all non-tenure track (fixed term) nursing faculty members each spring semester. All fixed-term faculty members will submit to the Director a file documenting their performance and an updated CV. Non-tenure track (fixed term) faculty will be evaluated for their effectiveness as teachers based on italicized AFE criteria in Section II. A (Teaching), student evaluations, course syllabi, and objectives. In conjunction with the Director, in addition to the

teaching domain, each faculty member will decide the additional focus for the following academic year from Service or Scholarship. See Appendix B.

8. The Director will prepare a written summary of evaluation using data supplied by the faculty member, the FAC, and the criteria noted in Section II of this document.
9. At the conclusion of the evaluation process each year, the Director will consult with each member of the faculty to review the results of his/her evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance. The written summary of evaluation will be shared with the faculty member. As a minimal requirement, the faculty member should sign the summary to indicate receipt, but will be provided the added opportunity of replying to indicate written acceptance of findings or of providing a written rebuttal to be attached to the Director's summary.
10. A copy of AFE summary results prepared by the Director will be submitted to the Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences, following the completion of the spring semester.

CRD developed 09-12-08;

Revised 11-05-09

Appendix B.1

Colleagues' Reviews of Teaching Materials

Colleagues' reviews of selected teaching materials will be performed annually by SON faculty and/or teaching teams. Items reviewed may include course syllabi, examinations, quizzes, reading lists, assignments, study guides, handouts, slides and media, computer programs, etc. This review of teaching materials is required of all full-time faculty. This evaluative data to be included in the faculty AFE file. After the review is conducted, a conference between the faculty member and the reviewer will take place and results documented on this form.

Faculty Name: _____

Course Number and Name: _____

Term: _____ Academic Year: _____

Reviewer: _____

Review Date: _____

Directions: Rate the teaching materials on each item. Place a check in the blank space after each statement that most nearly expresses your view.

Agree

Disagree

1. Teaching materials support the course/class objectives contained in the syllabus and/or Learner Packet.
2. Teaching materials are current and relevant to the topic.
3. Teaching materials are organized and reflect curriculum-level complexity.
4. Teaching materials reflect the environment in which content is delivered (e.g. classroom, lab, online, clinical/performance, hybrid, seminar/workshop).

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

**AFE/Promotion and Tenure
Documentation and Peer Review of Professional Service and Outreach
The College of Health and Human Sciences
School of Nursing**

PURPOSE

To facilitate the emergence of an outreach agenda as an institutional priority at Western Carolina University that recognizes outreach as having importance and scholarly challenge comparable to other mission dimensions, the School of Nursing faculty are encouraged to document outreach efforts using the portfolio. The portfolio should highlight exemplary outreach activities that demonstrate acquisition development and maintenance of the faculty member's expertise- consistent with one's position at the university, the unit mission, and the needs and desires of external constituents – and the application and advancement of that expertise with appropriate stakeholders.

PORTFOLIO CONTENTS

The portfolio should include most of the following elements:

- Objectives and Participants: a basic description of the activity including the purpose, intended goals, participants and stakeholders.
- Content: the setting, available resources, constraints on resources and time, political considerations, the individual's expense, and the relation of the project to one's own scholarly program
- Scholarly Foundation and Methodology: the choice of goals and methods, and the literature base and working hypothesis directing those choices
- Critical Reflection: the evolution of the activity including ongoing monitoring, reflection, adaptations, and adjustments; clarifying the individual contributions of the scholar
- Outcomes, Impacts and Products: impacts on various stakeholders including what the faculty member has learned
- Dissemination Plan: plan for distributing results of project to the community, university and profession

Portfolio Assessment

Portfolios should be assessed by faculty peers using the following criteria (evaluation form attached:

- Depth of the expertise and preparation
- Appropriateness of chosen goals and methods
- Effectiveness of communication
- Quality of reflection
- Impact of the project
- Originality and innovation

Adopted in part from Michigan State University Points of Distinction

Appendix B.2

Observation of Classroom Teaching – Guide for the Evaluation Tool

Content & Methodology Process

1. The classroom presentation/content was consistent with the Learner Packet
 - Introduce prepared material for the experience.
 - Present material for learning experience consistent with designated content.
 - Provide for continuity from previous learning
2. The faculty person appeared prepared for the class.
 - Distribute materials to students in advance unless contained within syllabus (If appropriate, share supplemental materials with observer prior to presentation. Observer evaluates materials for usefulness in expanding class content and providing information not available in assigned readings)
 - Initiate and dismiss learning experiences on time; provide adequate break time
 - Use a variety of creative approaches and strategies when teaching, including appropriate AV materials.
3. Important concepts were clearly presented.
 - Present materials in an organized sequence.
 - Present relevant concepts, content, theories, and research logically for discussion.
 - Clarify each concept/theory as needed.
 - Speak clearly, at an appropriate rate and volume.
 - Eliminate distractions in the environment.
 - Display confidence in own teaching abilities.
 - Use appropriate illustrations and explanations to amplify theoretical concepts.
 - Demonstrate relationship(s) between theory and nursing practice.
4. Faculty person summarized and/or emphasized major points in lecture or discussion.
 - Emphasize major points during lecture.
 - Summarize overall content at the end of presentation.

Learning Environment

1. Clear expectations were given when students did not understand material presented.
 - Facilitate discussion and feedback
 - Incorporate feedback to assess students' understanding of presentation
2. Challenging questions or problems were raised for discussion.
 - Pose questions requiring more than a "yes" or "no" answer.
3. Students' participation was solicited
 - Respect the individuality of students and confidentiality of their relationships.
 - Invite students to share knowledge and experiences.
 - Give positive reinforcement or feedback to students.
 - Provide assistance when students have difficulty in understanding content or responding to questions.
4. An environment conducive to learning was created.
 - Encourage discussion and diverse viewpoints.
5. Students asked questions freely.
 - Direct discussion to stimulate student participation
 - Provide opportunity for students to ask questions.

Observation of Classroom Teaching – Evaluation Tool

Name: _____ Course: _____

Term: _____ Academic Year: _____

Observer: _____ Date: _____

Directions: Rate the faculty person on each item. Place a check in the blank space after each statement, the letter that most nearly expresses your view.

	Agree	Do Not Agree	Observed	Not
1. There is agreement between the objectives contained within the Learner Packet and the information presented in class.	—	—	—	—
2. The classroom presentation was consistent with the Learner Packet.	—	—	—	—
3. The faculty person appeared prepared for class.	—	—	—	—
4. Important concepts were clearly presented.	—	—	—	—
5. Clear explanations were given when students did not understand material presented.	—	—	—	—
6. The faculty person raised challenging questions or problems for discussion.	—	—	—	—
7. The faculty person solicited students' participation.	—	—	—	—
8. The faculty person creates an environment conducive to learning.	—	—	—	—
9. Students asked questions freely.	—	—	—	—
10. The faculty summarized and/or emphasized major points during lecture or discussion.	—	—	—	—

Date of conference related to observation: _____

Comments by Faculty person (observed) and signature:

Comments by Observer and signature:

Appendix B.3

WCU COULTER FACULTY CENTER eLEARNING FACULTY FELLOWS ONLINE COURSE ASSESSMENT TOOL (OCAT)

Purpose:

The eLearning Faculty Fellows and staff of the Coulter Faculty Center (EL-FF CFC) have developed this tool and confidential peer assessment process to provide faculty with constructive peer feedback on the design and instruction of online courses. Expected benefits are:

- Constructive feedback regarding teaching effectiveness
- Instructional improvement
- Faculty development
- Opportunities for peer support

Overview of tool:

- Process Data page
- There are seven sections
 - The first 5 sections relate to assessment of course design and teaching
 - The last 2 sections relate to summary narratives and instructor responses
- The first 5 sections relating to course & instructor assessment are:
 1. Course Overview & Organization
 2. Learner Objectives & Competencies
 3. Resources & Materials
 4. Learner Interaction
 5. Learner Assessment
- The last 2 sections consist of:
 6. Peer Assessor Commentary
 7. Instructor Response

Steps for using this tool to perform observation of online teaching by peer review:

1. Peer assessor meets with the course instructor before beginning the assessment(s)
2. Peer assessor completes sections 1 – 6
3. Peer assessor meets with instructor; section 7 is completed by instructor and any modifications of entries are finalized by assessor
4. The final completed document will be sent to the faculty member

Authors (2006):

WCU CFC Faculty Fellows: Claire DeCristofaro, John LeBaron, Dixie McGinty, Mary Teslow
WCU CFC & EO Staff: Robert Crow, Bronwen Sheffield, Kevin Sisson

WCU OCAT PROCESS DATA**PROCESS DATA TO BE INCLUDED:**

1.	Instructor being assessed (Name, Rank, Department)	
2.	Course being assessed (Course Code, Section, Term)	
3.	Peer Assessor (Name, Rank, Department)	
4.	Format of online course (e.g. WebCT-CE, WebCat-Vista, Other)	
5.	Number of students enrolled at time of assessment (if any)	
6.	Is course currently active, completed, or in development	
7.	Date of assessment completed	

Pre-assessment questions, peer assessor to instructor:

1. What is the delivery method of this course: F2F, totally online, hybrid?
2. How many students are enrolled (if active) or is course completed/in development?
3. Is this an elective or core course?
4. Are any external tools used (e.g. Ultimate Survey, Elluminate, other online resource tools)? And, if so, are they linked from within the course?
5. Is this course part of a course of study (program)? If so, where in the course of study is it placed? And, if so, is the same student cohort "traveling" with this professor?
6. Is this course part of a fully online program? If so, have the students already had experience of online courses within the online program?
7. Was there a separate orientation to the online course environment and course organization/navigation? Was this held online or F2F? Was an orientation done for other related student needs (e.g. library, IT services, Writing Center)?
8. Do you use e-mail as a substantial method of contacting or engaging your students throughout the online course?

PERFORMANCE LEVELS:

Evident:	Element apparent on review	
Not evident:	Element not apparent on review	Assessor will address in post-interview and record in section commentary
Not Applicable:	Not relevant to the course	Assessor will address in post-interview and record in section commentary

<u>1. COURSE OVERVIEW & ORGANIZATION</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
<u>A. Elements of course design</u>				
1.	Navigational instructions make the organization of the course easy to understand and are transparent at the beginning of course			
2.	Course introduction that includes guidance on the structure of the course is provided			
3.	Course design demonstrates user-friendly presentation style			
4.	Minimum student technology competencies/skills for the course are stated, if applicable			
5.	Course-specific technology requirements are stated, if applicable			
6.	Course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered			
7.	Description and method of accessing the institution's academic resources (e.g. library, Writing Center) is provided			
8.	Description and method of accessing the institution's student support services and resources (e.g. student portal) is provided			
9.	<i>Course design item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below).</i>			
<u>B. Elements of teaching</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
The instructor:				
1.	provides an introduction and includes credentials related to this course			
2.	provides the opportunity for student introduction			
3.	provides opportunity to practice and master the technologies needed for the course			
4.	assures that learners are ready to undertake assigned tasks			
5.	suggests amount of time expected to accomplish learning activities			
6.	states the broader scholarly/practical context for learning objectives/goals			
7.	<i>Instructional item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below)</i>			

2. <u>LEARNER OBJECTIVES & COMPETENCIES</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
A. <u>Elements of course design</u>				
Learning objectives/goals:				
1.	are stated for each unit/module			
2.	are clear and easy to understand			
3.	describe outcomes that are assessable			
4.	address content mastery			
5.	address critical thinking skills			
6.	<i>Course design item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below).</i>			

B. <u>Elements of teaching</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
The instructor:				
1.	provides information to students on how to meet the learning objectives/goals			
2.	explains how to meet the learning objectives/goals in a manner that is clear and easy to understand			
3.	fosters integration with prior learning			
4.	<i>Instructional item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below)</i>			

3. <u>RESOURCES & MATERIALS</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
A. <u>Elements of course design</u>				
Resources/materials:				
1.	address learning objectives/goals (e.g. course reference materials, glossaries, library resources, relevant web resources, discipline-specific resources)			
2.	are appropriately authenticated and cited			
3.	are current and/or timely			
4.	are prepared by qualified sources			
5.	are presented in a format appropriate to the online environment			
6.	are easily accessible to the student			
7.	state the purpose related to the course (e.g. core material, supplemental, historical, required/optional)			
8.	have active links to non-institutional (external) electronic resources			
9.	include the use of electronic library scholarly resources			
10.	address diverse learning styles (e.g. multimedia, text chats, voice chats, animation, performance activities, simulations)			
11.	address diverse learner readiness levels (e.g. remedial and/or enrichment materials)			
12.	<i>Course design item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below).</i>			

B. <u>Elements of teaching</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
The instructor:				
1.	demonstrates knowledge of discipline			
2.	incorporates strategies that promote the progressive learner construction of knowledge (e.g. use of unit/modules that are thematically connected and have a logical progression)			
3.	provides opportunities for students to contribute to course resources			
4.	<i>Instructional item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below)</i>			

4. <u>LEARNER INTERACTION</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
A. <u>Elements of course design</u>				
1.	The course design prompts the instructor to be present, active, and engaged with the students (e.g. provide tools necessary)			
2.	Netiquette instructions/recommendations provided regarding emails & discussion postings			
3.	Guidelines for collaboration are defined			
4.	Guidelines for communication/accountability are defined			
5.	Guidelines for privacy are defined (e.g. instructors/students will not repurpose/redistribute student work or communications without permission)			
6.	<i>Course design item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below).</i>			

B. <u>Elements of teaching</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
The instructor:				
1.	is aware of student progress (e.g. assigned tasks) and any barriers to progression			
2.	fosters interaction among constituencies inside and outside the course as appropriate (e.g. student-student, student-instructor, and with external persons or agencies)			
3.	embeds learning activities (student-content interaction) that promote the achievement of stated objectives and learning outcomes.			
4.	selects communication strategies to communicate appropriately with the class as a whole, student groups, and individuals			
5.	promotes independent and/or shared student research, if applicable			
6.	provides content-based interaction as needed			
7.	provides timely responses to student queries			
8.	offers announcements tailored to the progress of the class			
9.	models a communication style that demonstrates a positive tone			
10.	<i>Instructional item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below)</i>			

5. <u>LEARNER ASSESSMENT</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
A. <u>Elements of course design</u>				
1.	Assessments are frequent enough to provide formative feedback			
2.	Rubrics are provided to define assessment criteria, if applicable			
3.	Methods of submitting assignments are appropriate to the online learning environment			
4.	<i>Course design item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below).</i>			

B. <u>Elements of teaching</u>		Evident	Not Evident	N/A
The instructor:				
1.	clearly describes assignments (student discussion, participation, and projects)			
2.	provides formative assessment/progress feedback (e.g. feedback that guides the student about academic performance before the end of the course)			
3.	provides summative assessment feedback (e.g. substantive instructor feedback on academic performance)			
4.	provides timely assessment feedback			
5.	<i>Instructional item(s) emerging from peer discussion not included in the list above (type in box below)</i>			

6. <u>PEER ASSESSOR COMMENTARY:</u>	
1.	Additional comments regarding the strengths of this course and teaching: (type in box below)
2.	Additional comments regarding recommendations for improvement: (type in box below)

7. <u>INSTRUCTOR RESPONSE:</u>	
1.	Instructor response to results of this assessment: (type in box below)
2.	Suggestions for revising the peer assessment process: (type in box below)

Appendix C

Process for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

Process

1. When tenured faculty become eligible for consideration, the School Collegial Review Committee (CRC) will so serve as the review committee. The Director will be a non-voting member.
2. If there are not three tenured faculty from the School (exclusive of the Director) available to serve on the CRC, the matter must be referred to the Provost. The Provost will consult with tenured faculty of the department and the dean of the college and select tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of three tenured faculty for the school.
3. Tenured faculty undergoing review will be excluded from service on the CRC for that year.
4. The review will be based on the AFE for each of the previous four years and current curriculum vitae.
5. Faculty for whom PTR is a requirement will be reviewed in the fifth academic year following:
 - a. Award of tenure or promotion, or
 - b. Prior post-tenure review, or
 - c. Return to faculty status following administrative leave
6. The CRC will submit a written report of its findings to the Director.
7. The Director will provide the faculty member with a copy of the written report.
8. Within two weeks of receiving the report, the faculty member will schedule a meeting with the Director to discuss the results. The faculty member may submit a written response at this time.

Criteria

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

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

Outcomes

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

Appeals and Due Process

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

References

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braxton, J. M. & Del Favero, M. (2002). Evaluating scholarship performance: Traditional and emergent assessment templates. In C. Colbeck (Ed.) *Evaluating faculty performance*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 114. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2002). *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, No. 2. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Approved by:

_____	_____
Department Head	Date
_____	_____
Dean	Date
_____	_____
Provost	Date