



**New Faculty Orientation 2017
Promotion and Tenure Workshop Committee**

Jennifer W. Means, Chair
jmeans@wcupa.edu

Evaluators

A. Department Evaluation Committee

- Policy may be different for each department
- This group may be selected for you
- You may end up choosing members yourself
- Members must be tenured and not currently seeking promotion
- You may end up selecting folks outside of your department
- Must conduct 2 observations each semester
- This committee can change through the 5 years
- The chair of this committee writes your annual report

B. Department Recommendation Committee

- Selected at least 15 days prior to due date of materials
- This may also be selected for you
- These members do not need to be the same as your department evaluation committee
- This committee will write a review and recommendation when you apply for tenure and/or promotion
- Reviews all materials and submits written recommendations
- The applicant has the right to appear before the department recommendation committee, know the committee's recommendation, and be provided with the reasons for the recommendation before the committee submits its recommendation to TeP.
- Tenure applicants may not respond to the department chair/department committee recommendations for tenure immediately. They may write a 2-page written clarification to these recommendations and submit to TeP during the optional interview, which is then added to the applicant's file.

C. Department Chairperson

- The chair cannot serve on your department evaluation or recommendation committee
- Completes one annual observation
- Completes annual report
- Writes separate recommendations for tenure and promotion
- The applicant has the right to appear before the department chair, know the chair's recommendation, and be provided with the reasons for the recommendation before a chair submits the recommendation to TeP.

D. College Dean

- Annual reviews (5) for renewal recommendation
- Promotion recommendation
- Holds all original signed documents

E. TeP Committee

- Tenured members representing all colleges on campus; including non-classroom
- TeP members may not also play other roles in the evaluation process for a tenure applicant. Department chairs or department committee members who are also TeP members may not participate in the TeP discussion or vote on that tenure applicant.
- TeP's scoring process for tenure is for each member to privately rate each evaluation area (teaching/professional responsibility, scholarly growth, service) as meets/does not meet professional standards (first vote). Then a second private vote to recommend/not recommend for tenure is done. The decision to recommend for tenure is based only on the second vote, a majority of votes is needed for TeP to recommend tenure to the President. The results of the first vote are retained by the TeP chair for 1 year and may be shared with the candidate only if the candidate requests to see them (they are not automatically in the letter from TeP).

- If TeP recommends against tenure when both department chair and committee have recommended tenure, TeP must provide written rationale and the applicant may submit a written clarification to the President before the President makes a final decision.
- TeP's scoring process for promotion is for each member to privately rate each candidate's evaluation area (teaching/professional responsibility, scholarly growth, service) based on the rank the candidate is seeking. Scores are submitted anonymously and the median score is used.
- The applicant may submit an optional written statement to TeP addressing the department committee's or department chair's promotion recommendation (but not the tenure recommendation)
- Interviews with TeP are explicitly made optional but are encouraged.

Critical Documents

A. Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)

- Consistent for all PSSHE

B. Local Policy

- Found on the Provosts website
- Tenure Policy June, 2011 (revised 2017 but not yet posted to website)
- Promotion Policy May, 2017

C. Statement of Expectations

- Developed by department chair
- May change depending on your responsibilities so review this annually
- Include version of your SOE through your tenure and speak to each in your narratives
- Weights remain 50% Teaching, 35% Scholarship, 15% service
 - These may be changed after tenure
- Should include statements for each area including AWA
- Should include advising if expected to do advise students

D. Department Teacher-Scholar Model (DTSM)

- Developed, dated, and approved by all faculty in the department
- Includes a purpose, department overview, teaching/professional responsibilities description, scholarship description, service description.
- Identifies the values of teacher scholar activities within the discipline(s) of the department
- Covers all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service
- Must be consistent with the CBA
- Used by TeP to understand the discipline and expectations of the department
- Use all versions that you functioned under during your tenure and address them in your narratives

Criteria for Tenure by Rank

Taken from the WCU Tenure Policy (2011) with notations from the WCU Promotion Policy (2017).

Instructor [this rank is described only in the tenure policy]

Instructors must demonstrate substantive contributions to the West Chester University academic community. The Instructor's first priority is to teach assigned courses and/or execute assigned duties within their defined area of expertise. Teaching and advising effectiveness or competence in the primary assignment for their defined area of expertise must be established commensurate with experience. Instructors demonstrate that they continue to build their teaching ability through attending professional development workshops (or other experiences) and producing tangible outcomes of such opportunities. Instructors must demonstrate that they are keeping current with their area of expertise through attending conferences, participation in educational opportunities including short courses, workshops, continuing education, graduate coursework, or other means appropriate to their discipline. They must demonstrate an increasing degree of participation in professional venues by active participation as a presenter, respondent, panelist, consultant, or other featured role. Instructors must demonstrate to their department that they can be relied on to contribute to the functioning of the department. Their work should be competent and professional.

Assistant Professor

Assistant Professors must demonstrate that they have the potential for a successful career in academia. Teaching and advising effectiveness or competence in the primary assignment must be established commensurate with experience. The Assistant Professor teaches assigned courses or performs assigned duties, shows sound professional judgment, performs advising duties (if assigned), and performs professional responsibilities in a competent manner. Assistant Professors must demonstrate that they are beginning to build the foundation for a record of continued scholarship, research, or other creative activities.-Tangible scholarly products such as refereed publications; regional or national conference presentations, exhibits, or performances; and/or successful internal or external grant awards must be part of this foundation. Assistant Professors are expected to perform service primarily at the departmental level in a competent and professional manner, though service at other levels (college or university) may be appropriate.

Associate Professor

Associate Professors must demonstrate that they have established the foundation for a successful career. The Associate Professor must demonstrate the ability to go beyond teaching effectively or performing the primary assignment in a competent fashion by demonstrating improvements in their primary responsibilities. This may be evidenced through the introduction of new materials, techniques, or programs; student mentorship; or excellence in advising (if applicable). There should be no evidence of significant weakness or areas of repeated concern in the performance of teaching or primary assignment. Associate Professors must show a record of scholarship, research, or other creative activity evidenced by steady growth and productivity including scholarly, peer-reviewed products, and an established presence within his/her discipline. The record must demonstrate enough continuity, of sufficient quality, to suggest increased or at least continued productivity in the future. Associate Professors must demonstrate that they can be relied on for critical service activities at the department, College, and University levels.

Full Professor

Full Professors must demonstrate continuous and substantial contributions to the University and their discipline through time. Full Professors must demonstrate a sustained and solid commitment to teaching and advising (if applicable) or the performance of the primary assignment. They should have assumed a leadership role in program improvement and/or improving the delivery of education to students. Again, there should be no evidence of significant weakness or areas of repeated concern in the performance of teaching or primary assignment. They can be relied on to provide guidance for junior faculty and help to improve the overall quality of teaching at the institution. Full Professors should have a steady and significant record of productive scholarship or creative activity including peer-reviewed works and displayed leadership within his/her discipline via such activities as service on committees of professional organizations; providing reviews for scholarly journals, granting agencies, or creative works; and/or invitations for speaking engagements. In exceptional cases, a long-term, substantial contribution in service to the university or the discipline may be recognized as partial replacement for a significant body of peer-reviewed work. Full Professors must have assumed a leadership role and/or made exceptional contribution in some area of service at the University level.

Considering the Categories: Teaching/Prof Responsibility, Scholarly Growth, Service

Teaching/Professional Responsibility

“This category encompasses a faculty member's primary assignment and shall constitute the main criteria on which promotion decisions are based. In most instances, evaluation in this area consists of effective teaching and advising, administrative assignments, and professional responsibilities. Teaching is defined as the interaction that occurs between a faculty member and a student during which the student has the opportunity to learn, the student is enabled to learn, and/or the student is motivated to learn. Administrative assignments include elected department posts and temporary assignments in administrative offices that carry release time, and administrative positions that constitute a faculty member's primary assignment as specified in the Statement of Expectations. Professional responsibilities are those secondary tasks/duties that are part of the primary assignment and support and enhance department, division, or university operation and goals.” From WCU local promotion policy 2010 version.

- Refer to the areas of evaluation in the policies; Delivery, design, expertise, and management.
- Includes advising.
- Professional development activities that make you a better teacher or advisor fit into this category. These activities are stronger achievements when they produce a tangible outcome, particularly when improvement to your teaching/advising can be documented.
- Professional Responsibility refers to your non-teaching load associated with an Alternate Work Assignment (AWA). Achievements associated with AWAs are difficult for TEP to evaluate because there are probably few other portfolios with similar achievements for members to look to as a model. Therefore, your arguments become a critical lens for evaluation. Be sure to address all 4 areas as outlined in the tenure policy (p.12) and promotion policy (p. 10). These include; planning/organization, direction/operation, control/management, communication.
- Alternate work assignments may be considered as appropriate under scholarship or service if they are not primarily administrative/contribute to the operation of the university.

Scholarly Growth

“Scholarly activity is valued in that it enhances the educational experience, enlivens the intellectual climate on campus, provides external funding to support the educational mission of the institution, and provides opportunities for students, especially undergraduates, to participate in scholarly research. Scholarship is defined as the discovery, application, and/or advancement of knowledge through research, creative accomplishment, or professional endeavor and sharing the results of those activities. Scholarship should be designed to enhance the educational experience within the discipline and/or the faculty member's teaching/professional responsibilities. Scholarship also includes professional growth and recognition.” WCU local promotion policy 2010 version.

- Refer to the areas in the policies: application of knowledge through research, creative accomplishment or professional endeavor, sharing information, professional growth and recognition, and teacher-scholar activities.
- Activities that build or demonstrate your reputation as a scholar. The CBA provides a fairly lengthy list. The most common (and traditional) activity that is documented here is a creative product such as a publication, convention paper or performance, musical score, invention, etc.
- Published textbooks are a measure of scholarly growth, but teaching packets produced in-house may be stretching this (i.e. reputation is more difficult to achieve with such products). Many teaching materials may be a better fit in the teaching/professional responsibility category.
- Grant-writing activities fit in this category. These take an enormous amount of time even when they are not funded and thus can be reported as contributing to your growth.
- Professional development activities that build your scholarship fit here (short courses at conventions on methodology or theory, completing your Ph.D. or other certifications).
- Some service in your discipline may be evidence of recognition as a scholar in your field and thus fit under scholarly growth. For example reviewing manuscripts for a journal, elected positions in a discipline association, awards.
- Consulting can sometimes be included in scholarly growth because it is evidence of recognition and reputation. Similarly consulting products (workbooks, copyrighted workshops, etc.) may be evidence of scholarly growth. The difficulty becomes that if the consulting is fully paid it technically constitutes a second job and thus may not

be seen as fulfilling your responsibilities as a WCU employee. Seek the guidance of the Chair of TeP and others for how to fit such activities into your portfolio.

Service

“Service is defined as voluntary activities that contribute to the profession, the university, and/or the community.”
WCU local promotion policy 2010 version

- Refer to the areas in the policies: faculty service, professional service, and community service.
- Service includes unpaid (or token payment) contributions to your department, college, university, community or discipline. Normally this work is administrative, primarily committee work, but could also involve event planning, staffing tables at open houses, advising student clubs, etc.
- Volunteer work to the community in your area of academic expertise fits here. For example, an unpaid speaking engagement on your area of expertise at the Lion’s Club would fit, coaching little league baseball would not fit (unless you’re in Kinesiology). An accounting professor helping low income people file taxes for minimal payment could be considered service. A management professor conducting an HR evaluation for a local non-profit could be included. See note on “consulting” under scholarly growth.

TENURE & PROMOTION
Document Types
Annotated items base on the local agreement Table of Contents

The listed information below is based on the WCU local promotion policy and listed in the order they should be uploaded to the online TeP system. Annotations are based on conversations with administrators and union representatives. This table is based on those going up for tenure and promotion at the same time. Note that some items indicate they are necessary for tenure only or promotion only.

These items will be uploaded as pdf documents to the online submission program in **two sections** and in the order in which they are presented below. These lists are also found in the online submission manual.

1. The <u>Upload Evaluation/Observation/Supplemental Document</u> section. These documents are uploaded in the order below and grouped by year from oldest to newest.	
Department committee annual evaluations by year	If any are missing, you may explain this in your narrative.
Peer observations by year	Two for each semester. If any are missing, you may explain this in your narrative.
Chair annual evaluation by year	If any are missing, you may explain this in your narrative.
Chair observations by year	If any are missing, you may explain this in your narrative.
Dean annual evaluations by year	5 th year will be submitted by the Dean if applying for T and P
SRIS by year	Need at least 5 for promotion. The side with the standard deviations is required. Do not include the golden rod student comments
Supplemental materials	Be sure to label all documents as referenced in your narratives. For items that cannot be uploaded, see below under <i>Supplemental Referenced Items</i>
2. The <u>Complete Tenure/Promotion Application</u> section - note that the tenure and promotion application forms are no longer needed since the application is now online. Can edit the documents until the candidate's deadline.	
President's Notice of Tenure Eligibility	For tenure only
Candidate's Response to President's Notice of Tenure Eligibility	For tenure only
Curriculum Vitae	May not exceed 10 pages and no less than a 10pt font. May include activities prior to working at WCU. You should put activities completed since arriving at WCU (or since your last promotion) in bold.
Relevant Statement(s) of Expectations	Include all dated SoEs during your tenure in one document. For <u>promotion</u> , if your weights have changes, those will be indicated in your SoE.
Department Teacher-Scholar Model(s) (DTSM)	If your DTSM was revised during your tenure or since your last promotion, you should include the both versions. You may then address how you met both of them.
Job Description(s) for Alternative Workload (if any)	If you had an AWA, you need to include a full description of your assignment. It should be reflective of your statement of expectations address the areas outlined of the

	tenure (p.12) and promotion (p. 10) policies.
Narrative Summary of Accomplishments (Effectively Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities)	Cannot exceed 6 pages and nothing less than a 10 pt font.
Evidence(s) of Performance	Cannot exceed 10 pages with nothing less than a 10 pt font. Entirely up to you what you want to include. Suggested items include; syllabi, teaching materials, evidence of advising effectiveness, annual reports or excerpts of reports generated through AWA, statement(s) from immediate supervisor(s) not involved in the evaluation or recommendation of the applicant.
Narrative Summary of Accomplishments (Continuing Scholarly Growth)	Cannot exceed 5 pages with nothing less than a 10pt. font.
Narrative Summary of Accomplishments (Service)	Cannot exceed 5 pages with nothing less than a 10pt. font.
Supplemental Referenced Items	These references are uploaded under the <i>Supplemental Portfolio</i> tab. Select this only if you are submitting hard copy materials that cannot be upload electronically in section 1. Be sure to use reference numbers or labels that correspond to the designated references in your narratives.



West Chester University Student Rating of Instructor Survey

Course: _____ Section: _____ SRIS No: _____ - _____

West Chester University seeks your input in the evaluation of your instructor. Please answer the following questions as they apply to the instructor under evaluation. Try to put aside your reaction to the course itself and focus on the quality of instruction provided by this instructor. Please completely darken one circle corresponding to the single best response for each question. The instructor will not have access to any individual responses, only the class results as a whole, and those only *after* the course is complete and the grades posted. Your participation is important to help us make West Chester a better university.

- | | <i>Outstanding</i> | | | <i>Poor</i> | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1. Please rate the quality of teaching provided by this instructor. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>For each item below, indicate the level of your agreement or disagreement with the statement. Please answer questions as they apply to the professional performance of the instructor under evaluation.</i> | | | | | | |
| | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | | | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | | |
| | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The instructor clearly presented course requirements and grading procedures. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. The instructor interacted in a positive manner with students. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. The instructor responded to student questions in a way that encouraged me to learn. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. The instructor met classes at the assigned days and times. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. The instructor met the course objectives published in the course description or syllabus. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. The instructor returned graded tests and assignments in a timely manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. The instructor was prepared for class. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. The instructor made good use of class time. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. The instructor maintained an environment in which students were comfortable asking questions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. The instructor facilitated learning by maintaining an atmosphere of civility. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. The instructor clearly explained concepts and techniques. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. The instructor allocated an appropriate amount of time to each topic. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please continue on the other side.



West Chester University Student Rating of Instructor Survey

- | | <i>Strongly
Agree</i> | | | | | <i>Strongly
Disagree</i> |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. The instructor was available during posted office hours.
<i>(Please leave this item blank if you have never been to the instructor's office hours.)</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15. The instructor organized this class in a way that helped me to learn the material. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16. The instructor provided useful feedback on tests and assignments. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. The instructor explained concepts using real-world examples, analogies, or circumstances relevant to students' lives. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 18. The instructor evaluated students fairly. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

The demographic questions in the following section are being asked for *statistical purposes only*. Results will *not* be reported to the instructor or academic department and will only be used in the Office of Institutional Research in aggregate to test the survey instrument.

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

For each statement, please completely darken the circle of only ONE response option.

19. Primary reason for taking this course:
- | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Major/minor requirement | <input type="radio"/> General education requirement | <input type="radio"/> Elective |
| <input type="radio"/> Interest only | <input type="radio"/> Fit my schedule | |
20. Expected grade in this course: A to A- B+ to B- C+ to C- D+ to D- F
21. Class standing (Choose ONE only):
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Undergraduate: | <input type="radio"/> First-Year | <input type="radio"/> Sophomore | <input type="radio"/> Junior | <input type="radio"/> Senior | <input type="radio"/> Non-Degree |
| Graduate: | <input type="radio"/> Master's Degree Program | <input type="radio"/> Non-Degree (Including Certificate Programs) | | | |
22. Gender: Female Male Transgender
23. Race or ethnicity:
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> American Indian or Alaskan Native | <input type="radio"/> Asian |
| <input type="radio"/> Black or African American | <input type="radio"/> Latino/Hispanic, any race |
| <input type="radio"/> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | <input type="radio"/> White |
| <input type="radio"/> Two or more races | |
24. Is English your native language? Yes No
25. Age group: Less than 25 years 25 years or older

Thank you for your participation!

Salmon Salmon



West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Department Evaluation Committee's Performance
Review and Faculty Evaluation Form

Faculty Member _____ Date of Review _____

Department _____ Semester(s) Reviewed _____

Date of Appointment to Department: _____

Date of Appointment to University: _____

Type of Evaluation: (check where applicable)

- Post 5th year evaluation
- Probationary 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th
- Temporary
- Regular Part Time
- Promotion Year 1 or 2
- Interim

Rank/Title: _____

Highest Degree Earned: _____

Description of Primary assignment (attach job description or letter of understanding written at appointment, if applicable).

Description of Secondary assignment, if applicable (indicate if included in job description).

EVALUATION: "The Committee's evaluation shall be based on student evaluations, peer evaluations, an updated copy of the Faculty member's vita, any other pertinent data that the Faculty member wishes to submit and any other data which the department evaluation committee may deem pertinent", [Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article XII, C, 1, b].

Each of the three specific evaluation areas to be covered should be handled in two ways: (1) Selecting one of the four categories describing the evaluatee's performance. Each of the categories is intended to serve a carefully defined function, discussed below. (2) Including a thorough narrative explanation justifying the selection. Mere selection of an objective description does not constitute evaluation and is unacceptable. Evidence must be cited in support of judgments. Use additional space as needed.

Does Not Meet Professional Standards. This description should be reserved for rare cases where an individual is mismatched with his job or is simply incompetent.

Improvement Needed. This comment should be used frequently and without hesitation. It means simply that there appear to be aspects of the evaluatee's performance which could be improved. It should only rarely, and then in obvious cases, be considered pejorative. For example, beginning faculty or experienced persons taking on new assignments, should frequently be expected to need improvement in their performance.

Meets Professional Standards. This designation will probably be used to describe a majority of the cases that are considered. It is specifically intended as a means of avoiding narrow "grading" of personnel. Qualitative differences should emerge from the narrative explanation section of the evaluation.

Distinguished. This description should almost never be used. It should be reserved as a means of recognizing unequivocally superior performance.

1. EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND FULFILLMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Does Not Meet Professional Standards Improvement Needed Meets Professional Standards Distinguished

Explanation: [Indicated, when applicable, by such items as student evaluations, peer evaluations, classroom visitations, quality of syllabi, quality of student advisement, willingness to accept departmental work assignments, timely execution of work assignments, etc., (See Collective Bargaining Agreement XII, B, 1)].

2. CONTINUING SCHOLARLY WORK

Does Not Meet Professional Standards Improvement Needed Meets Professional Standards Distinguished

Explanation: [Indicated, when applicable, by such items as development of experimental programs, papers delivered at national and regional meetings of professional societies, regional and national awards, etc., (see Collective Bargaining Agreement XII, B, 2)].

3. SERVICE: CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY

Does Not Meet Professional Standards Improvement Needed Meets Professional Standards Distinguished

Explanation: [Indicated, when applicable, by such items as quality of participation in programs, department, college, and university committees; APSCUF activity contributing to the governance of the university; development of new course(s) or program(s); etc. (see Collective Bargaining Agreement XII, B, 3)].

4. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Does Not Meet Professional Standards Improvement Needed Meets Professional Standards Distinguished

(Refer to preceding sections where specific strengths and weaknesses are detailed as a basis for the chairperson's recommendation to the appropriate dean or manager.)

[Large empty rectangular box for notes or comments]

Name _____

Date: _____ Signature: _____

FACULTY MEMBER: Please check one of the following:

- I accept this evaluation report.
- I disagree with this report. My signature merely indicated that I have read the report and have had the opportunity to attach a personal statement to it.
- I disagree with this report and will attach a personal statement within one week of the date of my signature.

Date: _____ Signature: _____
Faculty Member

cc: Chairperson
Faculty Member

Salmon Salmon

Blue Blue



West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Checklist for Performance Review
of a Probationary Faculty Member
CLASSROOM FACULTY

*This informal information specifies the items the TeP Committee reviews in each file.
Incomplete files will be returned to the applicant.*

Faculty Member: _____
Department: _____
Semester(s) Reviewed: _____
Probationary 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th (circle one)
Date of Review: _____

In accordance with Article XII of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, a performance review for the above named faculty member is presented as follows:

- 1 FACULTY MEMBER received an explanation of the evaluation procedure from the Evaluation Committee prior to the start of the review process.
- 2 FACULTY MEMBER provided an updated vita to department committee.
- 3 Updated copy of vita is attached.
- 4 Student Rating of Instructor Survey (SRIS) for the FACULTY MEMBER were completed in all classes in the spring and fall semesters covered by this review.
- 5 Summary of SRIS (Student Rating of Instructor Survey) in all classes in each semester is attached
- 6 FACULTY MEMBER was observed by the Evaluation Committee at least twice in each semester evaluated.
- 7 FACULTY MEMBER was observed at least once per academic year by the Department Chairperson.
- 8 Prior to putting the observation into writing, there was a discussion of each visit between the observer and the FACULTY MEMBER.
- 9 The written observation report was given to the FACULTY MEMBER.
- 10 FACULTY MEMBER had the opportunity for written comment relative to each observation.
- 11 FACULTY MEMBER signed each observation report.
- 12 Each observation report is attached.
- 13 Evaluation Committee's reports, including recommendation regarding renewal or nonrenewal, was prepared and is attached.
- 14 Evaluation Committee provided the FACULTY MEMBER a reasonable opportunity to discuss its report.
- 15 Evaluation Committee provided the FACULTY MEMBER and Department Chairperson with a copy of its report.
- 16 The Evaluation Committee submitted its report--along with the supportive materials enumerated in CBA Article XII--to the appropriate dean or manager.

- 17 Department Chairperson's independent report, including recommendation regarding renewal or non-renewal, was prepared and is attached.
- 18 The Department Chairperson provided the FACULTY MEMBER a reasonable opportunity to discuss the Chairperson's report.
- 19 The Department Chairperson provided the FACULTY MEMBER and Evaluation Committee with a copy of the Chairperson's report.
- 20 The Chairperson submitted his/her report to the appropriate dean or manager.
- 21 A current SoE and updated SoE for the next evaluation cycle are attached.
- 22 The Departmental Teacher/Scholar is attached.

FACULTY MEMBER:

Name: _____ Date _____

Signature: _____ Date _____

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON:

Name: _____ Date _____

Signature: _____ Date _____

EVALUATION COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON:

Name: _____ Date _____

Signature: _____ Date _____

Blue Blue

Gold Gold



West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Checklist For Performance Review
of a Tenured Faculty Member
NON-CLASSROOM FACULTY

Faculty Member: _____

Department: _____

Semester(s) Reviewed: _____

Date of Review: _____

Is this Evaluation a regularly scheduled five-year review?

Yes No

Is this Evaluation being completed as part of the promotion process?

Yes No

Is this an Interim Evaluation?

Yes No

In accordance with Article XII of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, a performance review for the above named faculty member is presented as follows:

- 1 FACULTY MEMBER received an explanation of the evaluation procedure from the Evaluation Committee prior to the start of the review process.
- 2 FACULTY MEMBER provided an updated vita to department committee.
- 3 Updated copy of vita is attached.
- 4 Evaluation Committee's report was prepared and is attached.
- 5 Evaluation Committee provided the FACULTY MEMBER a reasonable opportunity to discuss its report.
- 6 Evaluation Committee provided the FACULTY MEMBER and Department Chairperson with a copy of its report.
- 7 The Evaluation Committee submitted its report -- along with the supportive materials enumerated in CBA Article XII -- to the appropriate dean or manager.
- 8 Department Chairperson's independent report was prepared and is attached.
- 9 The Department Chairperson provided the FACULTY MEMBER a reasonable opportunity to discuss the Chairperson's report.
- 10 The Department Chairperson provided the FACULTY MEMBER and Evaluation Committee with a copy of the Chairperson's report.
- 11 The Chairperson submitted his/her report to the appropriate dean or manager
- 12 A current SoE and updated SoE for the next evaluation cycle are attached.
- 13 The Departmental Teacher/Scholar Model is attached.

FACULTY MEMBER:

Name _____

Date _____

Signature: _____

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON:

Name _____

Date _____

Signature: _____

Date _____

EVALUATION COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON:

Name _____

Date _____

Signature: _____

Date _____

Gold Gold