



Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Policy

Department Performance Appraisal System (DPAS)

Abstract

This document provides the policy, process and procedures for faculty evaluation, continuance, tenure and promotion review for the School of Leadership and Professional Studies

School of Leadership and Professional Studies
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Western Kentucky University

Adopted: April 28, 2023

Revised: April 26, 2024

Table of Contents

Preamble.....	page 2
Utilization of the Department Performance Appraisal System.....	page 2
Considerations Outside of the DPAS in Applying for Tenure and Promotion.....	page 3
Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.....	page 3
Using DPAS for the Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation.....	page 4
Using the DPAS for Pre-Tenure Faculty Evaluation and Continuance.....	page 5
Using the DPAS for Pedagogical Track Faculty.....	page 5
Using the DPAS for Continuing Instructors.....	page 5
Department Performance Appraisal System, 16 Dimensions of Performance.....	page 7
Rating Scale.....	page 7
Teaching Ratings and Definitions.....	page 8
Research and Scholarly Activities Ratings and Definitions.....	page 11
Service Ratings and Definitions.....	page 13
Professionalism Ratings and Definitions.....	page 15
Appendix 1: Suggested Artifacts.....	page 17
Appendix 2: College Template for Annual Evaluations.....	page 19

**School of Leadership and Professional Studies
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Policy
Department Performance Appraisal System (DPAS)
Adopted: April 28, 2023**

PREAMBLE

Note: The School of Leadership and Professional Studies Department Performance Appraisal System (DPAS) can be found on pages 6 – 15. The list of exemplars/evidence for each dimension can be found on pages 16-17. This preamble (pages 2 – 5) details considerations involved in the employment of the DPAS. These should be carefully reviewed and adhered to by those the DPAS is intended to assess (i.e., faculty) as well as those responsible for faculty assessment (i.e., director/department chair, continuance committee and tenure/promotion committee).

1. Utilization of the Department Performance Appraisal System.

- A. This Department Performance Appraisal System (DPAS) is used for the purpose of 1) tenure and promotion and 2) annual review of faculty (i.e., pre-tenure and post-tenure evaluation) and 3) continuance review (for pre-tenured faculty). Information about the usage of the DPAS for these purposes is found in items 3 – 7 below. *Professional judgment* is required when using the DPAS for all three processes.
- B. The DPAS addresses four overarching areas of performance – teaching, research (for traditional tenure-track faculty), service and professionalism, covering 16 dimensions of performance (see page 5, et seq.). Each dimension outlines minimum expectations for each performance rating within each dimension (see pages 5-14). In addition, the department will maintain an updated list of exemplars/evidence/artifacts illustrating the target rating of proficient and additional evidence for a rating of distinguished. The list will be maintained as an addendum to be reviewed and updated annually by the director/department chair, continuance committee and/or tenure/promotion committee based on the review of portfolios each year and thus not included as part of the policy. The articulated exemplars/evidence/artifacts *are not intended to be an exhaustive list*; nor is it required for faculty to include each articulated exemplar/evidence/artifact for each dimension unless explicitly stated in this policy. Rather, the list is intended to reflect the kinds of activities and artifacts which *could* be used by a faculty member performing at various levels. It is likely faculty will engage in appropriate and meaningful activities not specified in the included list of exemplars. Faculty are welcomed and expected to include such instances in submitted materials. For this reason, the list of exemplars/evidence/artifacts will be updated annually following the evaluation, continuance and/or promotion and tenure processes by the director/department chair and committee members.
- C. Professional judgment (typically of the department chair, continuance committee

and promotion and tenure committee) will be required to determine the rating of performance which best illustrates those exemplars included by faculty in submitted materials for a given dimension.

- D. Providing a single exemplar/artifact for a dimension under a given rating level of performance does not necessarily mean the individual has attained that rating level of performance, although it may be sufficient for some dimensions.

2. Considerations outside of the DPAS in applying for tenure and promotion.

Candidates for promotion and tenure *must* adhere to all relevant policies set forth in the current WKU Faculty Handbook. The official handbook is continually posted at <http://wku.edu/academicaffairs/>.

Faculty members developing a portfolio for promotion and/or tenure should also carefully review and *must* conform to the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences policy and procedures.

3. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

For department recommendation for promotion from assistant to associate professor

Faculty need to attain the following rating levels of performance on each dimension in each category to be recommended for promotion. These levels reflect the *minimum* requirements necessary for promotion from assistant to associate professor and do not necessarily guarantee promotion.

Teaching – Proficient or higher in six of eight dimensions; no rating of needs improvement or unacceptable. Must be proficient in the dimensions of professional growth and professionalism. SITE evaluations will be considered as specified under the teaching dimensions.

Research and Scholarly Activities – (traditional tenure-track faculty only) Proficient or higher in two of three dimensions; no rating of needs improvement or unacceptable. The minimum publication requirement is, with externally-funded grant activity, two (2) peer-reviewed publications for the probationary period as either primary or secondary author or, without grant activity, three (3) peer-reviewed publications for the probationary period as either primary or secondary author. Note: Extra consideration will be given to solo authorship on a case-by-case basis. The minimum threshold for external grants is \$500,000.

Service – Proficient or higher in all three dimensions

Professionalism – Proficient or higher in all five dimensions

For department recommendation for promotion from associate to full professor

Faculty need to attain the following levels of performance on each dimension in each

category since the last promotion to be considered for promotion to full professor. These levels reflect the *minimum* requirements necessary for promotion from associate to full professor and do not necessarily guarantee promotion.

Teaching – Proficient in four of eight dimensions; distinguished in four of eight dimensions; SITE evaluations will be considered as specified under the teaching effectiveness dimensions.

Research and Scholarly Activities – (traditional tenure track faculty only) Proficient in one dimension; distinguished in two dimensions. The minimum publication requirement is an average of one peer-reviewed publication every two years since promotion to associate professor and/or one (1) externally funded grant. For publications, at least one must designate the candidate as first author and another must designate the candidate as first or second author. The minimum threshold for external grants is \$1,000,000.

Service – Proficient in one dimension; distinguished in two dimensions.

Professionalism – Proficient in the following dimensions: respect, integrity, and professional engagement; distinguished in the following dimensions: conscientiousness and professional responsibilities.

Professor (full) is the highest rank to be attained by faculty and should consistently demonstrate a record of sustained performance.

Criteria for department recommendation for tenure

An important component of the promotion and tenure process is “time in rank” serving the department, college, and university. The faculty member should demonstrate they are able to maintain the level of performance required for a given rank for an appropriate period of time before putting themselves up for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who has met the standards, according to the decision of the department promotion committee or department tenure committee, will be recommended by the appropriate committee to the department chair for promotion and/or tenure, and that recommendation will be forwarded to the dean. Only a faculty member who has met the standards, according to the *professional judgment* of the department chair, may be recommended by the department chair to the dean for promotion and/or tenure.

Tenure-track faculty who have not yet been granted tenure are expected to work toward meeting the standards for tenure until tenure is granted and for promotion from assistant to associate professor until that rank is achieved. The criteria for tenure are the same as for promotion to associate professor. Promotion to associate professor and tenure may be pursued separately. If pursued separately, a faculty member may go up early for promotion per the WKU Faculty Handbook; tenure typically requires at least five years of service in rank. See the WKU Faculty Handbook for more information regarding early promotion and tenure.

4. Using the DPAS for Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation

This system was designed to facilitate the evaluation of post-tenured faculty who are pursuing more specialized professional interests while at the same time meeting department, college, and university obligations. Thus, there are some dimensions of performance where at least a minimum level of engagement is required of all faculty. These are:

Teaching – Proficient or higher in six of eight dimensions; no rating of needs improvement or unacceptable

Research and Scholarly Activities – (traditional tenure track faculty only) Proficient or higher in two of three dimensions; no rating of needs improvement or unacceptable

Service – Proficient in all three dimensions

Professionalism - Proficient in all five dimensions

For the purposes of the post-tenure evaluation process, a rating of *Needs Improvement* suggests performance below department expectations for a tenured faculty member and may be subject to a performance improvement plan as provided in the current edition of the faculty handbook.

5. Using the DPAS for Pre-Tenure Faculty Evaluation and Continuance

Faculty who are not yet tenured will be evaluated on an annual basis using the same system used for post-tenure evaluation. That is, they will be expected to perform up to the stated level of performance in required dimensions; they may participate at higher than the minimum required performance in mandatory dimensions and/or participate at appropriate levels in any of the other dimensions to fulfill their performance obligation. Thus, on an annual basis, the performance of pre-tenured faculty may operate in a “compensatory” fashion, differentially emphasizing teaching, research, and service. However, across the evaluation and continuance period for the tenure or promotion decision, the **cumulative performance** must meet the stated standards for tenure or promotion. For the purposes of this process, the rating Needs Improvement will be interpreted as progressing or emerging to provide positive support for inexperienced pre-tenured faculty.

6. Using the DPAS for Pedagogical Track Faculty

Pedagogical faculty are full-time, tenure-eligible faculty members engaged primarily in instructional activities. Pedagogical faculty have the same responsibilities as any other tenure-eligible faculty as defined by the faculty handbook and college/department policies except for those rights and responsibilities directly related to research activities. Pedagogical faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis using the same system used for tenure-track evaluation minus any research expectations with a workload that reflects a full teaching load (i.e., no reduction for research).

7. Using the DPAS for Continuing Instructors

Continuing instructors should use the same system modified to meet the work expectations for instructors described in the faculty handbook. Expectations for each

instructor should be clearly identified at the beginning of the appraisal period. These expectations should include specifically identifying the dimensions of performance in which the instructor is expected to engage as well as the level of performance required in each of these dimensions to meet the department standard of acceptable performance.

**School of Leadership and Professional Studies
Department Performance Appraisal System
16 Dimensions of Performance**

Teaching

- Rigor and Relevance
- Clarity of Design: Organization
- Clarity of Design: Expectations
- Clarity of Design: Assessments
- Connecting
- Pedagogy/Andragogy

Research and Scholarly Activities

- Publications
- Presentations
- Other Scholarship and Creative Activities

Service

- University Engagement
- Student Advisement and Assistance

Professionalism

- Respect
- Integrity
- Conscientiousness
- Professional Responsibilities
- Professional Engagement

Rating Scale

1- Unsatisfactory – functions consistently below the expected standard of performance for a faculty member

2- Baseline (*Progressing for junior faculty only*) – functions inconsistently below the expected standard of performance for a faculty member

3- Skilled – functions consistently at the expected standard of performance for a faculty member

4- Distinguished – functions consistently above the standard expected for a faculty member

Teaching

Faculty time and effort invested in teaching should reflect 60% for traditional tenure track faculty and 80% for instructional and pedagogical faculty lines unless otherwise specified in their letter of appointment or faculty workload contract. Proficient faculty provide evidence of the following: (a) appropriately rigorous and relevant course and learning tasks, (b) clarity of design in course organization, expectations, and assessments, (c) multiple and intentional efforts to connect with all students, and (d) appropriate teaching approaches and high-impact practices to engage and support the success of all students. Faculty members and/or programs will define comprehensiveness, depth, and rigor.

Relevant SITE items: (department chair will review mean values as they compare to department, college, and university means as well patterns within student comments).

Recommended:

-Provide relevant SITE comments to support exemplars when possible.

Category	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Baseline	3 Skilled	4 Distinguished
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides limited or inconsistent evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence for Proficient and a record of...</i>
Rigor and Relevance	<p>the comprehensiveness and depth of course content, AND/OR</p> <p>the rigor of the learning tasks, AND/OR</p> <p>content and materials conveying respect for student diversity, relevance, and cultural responsiveness.</p>	<p>the comprehensiveness and depth of course content, AND/OR</p> <p>the rigor of the learning tasks, AND/OR</p> <p>content and materials conveying respect for student diversity, relevance, and cultural responsiveness.</p>	<p>the comprehensiveness and depth of course content, AND</p> <p>learning tasks appropriately challenging for the developmental level of the students taught by the instructor across courses, AND</p> <p>course content and materials relevant to individual students, culturally responsive, and respectful of student diversity.</p>	<p>redesigning or developing new course(s) reflecting deep and comprehensive content, AND</p> <p>redesigning or developing courses with learning tasks appropriately challenging for the courses, AND</p> <p>redesigning or developing course content reflecting (a) input from students, (b) current knowledge in the field, (c) variety of perspectives, and (d) student interests.</p>
Category	1	2	3	4

	Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Skilled	Distinguished
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides limited or inconsistent evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence for Proficient and a record of...</i>
Clarity of Design–Organization	<p>meaningful organization of course learning promoting student success within each course as well as the program; AND/OR</p> <p>course objectives aligning with content and learning tasks.</p>	<p>meaningful organization of course learning promoting student success within each course as well as the program; AND/OR</p> <p>course objectives aligning with content and learning tasks.</p>	<p>meaningful organization of course learning to promote student success within each course as well as the program; AND</p> <p>course objectives aligning with content and learning tasks.</p>	<p>redesigning or developing new course(s) that are (1) meaningfully organized within the course as well as the larger program to promote student success; and (2) include course objectives aligned with state and national standards.</p>
Clarity of Design–Expectations	clearly conveying expectations for student success to students.	clearly conveying expectations for student success to students.	clearly conveying to the class and individual students what they need to know and be able to do to be successful in the course and on course assignments.	seeking input from students and using previous performance to anticipate student needs and/or using innovative strategies for students to know what they need to do to be successful in the course.
Clarity of Design–Assessments	course assessments aligning with objectives in the course and appropriately measuring student learning.	course assessments aligning with objectives in the course and appropriately measuring student learning.	course assessments aligning with objectives in the course and appropriately measuring student learning formatively and summatively.	developing and administering high-quality, appropriate, and innovative assessments to promote student mastery of subject matter.
Connecting	valuing student learning, persistence, and retention.	valuing student learning, persistence, and retention.	multiple efforts and touchpoints demonstrating they value student learning, persistence, and retention, including integrating feedback into the learning cycle and fostering student agency.	substantial and innovative efforts and touchpoints demonstrating they value student learning, persistence, and retention.
	supporting a positive learning environment in the classroom.	supporting a positive learning environment; they may support a positive learning environment in the classroom but not outside the classroom.	behavior and communications reflecting support for student success both in and out of the classroom at all educational touchpoints.	providing exemplary communication efforts through a variety of methods; making extraordinary efforts to provide assistance and

				create a positive learning environment conducive to student success.
	efforts to make connections with and for all students, particularly marginalized groups.	seeking and creating opportunities to connect to all students regardless of their identity or cultural background, particularly marginalized groups.	developing and adhering to processes or protocols to connect with all students and ensuring they are not stepping back from serving some groups.	making innovative or extraordinary approaches to support marginalized groups.
Pedagogy/ Andragogy	research-based or high-impact pedagogical/andragogical practices promoting student engagement and success.	research-based or high-impact pedagogical/andragogical practices promoting student engagement and success.	research-based or high-impact pedagogical/andragogical practices promoting student engagement and success, AND seeking input from students on these practices to guide future practice.	sharing successful high-impact practices with other faculty members, AND/OR designing or redesigning a component course module or program component that intentionally integrates research-based or high-impact practices.

Research and Scholarly Activities

Faculty on the traditional tenure track should provide evidence of participation in research to account for approximately 20% of their workload unless otherwise specified in their letter of appointment or faculty workload contract. Pedagogical faculty may choose to submit artifacts related to research, but research should not be used as a criterion for their evaluation, tenure, or promotion. Proficient faculty provide evidence of conducting and disseminating research aligned to a research agenda through (a) juried publications, (b) juried presentations, and (c) other scholarship and creative activities including the procurement of external grants. Faculty should advance their research agenda each year toward meeting research goals for tenure and promotion. Publications should include juried manuscripts supported by non-juried publications and creative activities that augment, extend, disseminate, or catalyze research. Creative activities include activities connected with research that do not fall under the other categories. Juried presentations may be virtual or on-site. Travel for presenting is not required. An awarded external grant would be the equivalent of a publication.

Juried publications are peer-reviewed journals. Journals should be of high quality, reputation, and importance in the discipline. Non-juried publications include, but are not limited to, the following: Invited articles, books, book chapters, etc., where publication is guaranteed and not rigorously reviewed through a peer process. For this reason, non-juried publications will be reviewed in the “Other Scholarship and Creative Activities” dimension.

Recommended:

-Note the date accepted for articles in press & explicitly state whether you want to count it as a publication for this annual faculty evaluation cycle.

-Note the date submitted for articles under review.

Category	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Baseline	3 Skilled	4 Distinguished
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides limited or inconsistent evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence for Proficient as well as provides a record of...</i>
Publications	progress toward required juried publication(s) as a primary, secondary, or tertiary author advancing a coherent research agenda.	satisfactory progress toward required juried publication(s) as a primary, secondary, or tertiary author advancing a coherent research agenda.	satisfactory progress toward required juried publication(s) as a primary or secondary author advancing a coherent research agenda.	pattern of submission, and acceptance of publication of articles in academic journals as part of a coherent research agenda demonstrating expertise and impact in the field.

Category	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Baseline	3 Skilled	4 Distinguished
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides limited or inconsistent evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence for Proficient as well as provides a record of...</i>
Juried Presentations	progress toward required juried presentations advancing a coherent research agenda.	satisfactory progress toward required juried presentations advancing a coherent research agenda.	satisfactory progress toward required juried presentations advancing a coherent research agenda.	a pattern of submission, acceptance and presentations at regional, national, or international conferences advancing a coherent research agenda and situating the faculty member as an expert in the field.
Other Scholarship and Creative Activities	progress toward required creative activities supporting a coherent research agenda.	satisfactory progress toward required creative activities supporting a coherent research agenda.	satisfactory progress toward required creative activities supporting a coherent research agenda.	creative activities supporting a coherent research agenda and situating the faculty member as an expert in the field.

Service

The faculty members should demonstrate sufficient service to account for approximately 20% of the time unless otherwise specified in their letter of appointment or faculty workload contract. Proficient faculty provide evidence of the following: (a) sustained service as a liaison between the department and college and university committees by representing **departmental interests** in their service; (b) sustained service advancing the profession and/or the university's mission; (c) proactive student advising; (d) participation in activities or programs building a sense of community in the program, department, college and/or university; and (e) development of students who are practitioner-scholars.

Category	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Baseline	3 Skilled	4 Distinguished
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides limited or inconsistent evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence for Proficient as well as provides an ongoing record of...</i>
University Engagement	meeting assigned commitments at the university, college, or departmental level.	meeting assigned commitments at the university, college, or departmental level.	meeting assigned commitments and seeking opportunities to serve at the department, college, and/or university level by attending meetings regularly, completing assigned work tasks, and representing department interests. This includes acting as a liaison between the department and the college and/or university by (a) representing the interests of the program and department and (b) updating the department in college or university concerns or items of interest when appropriate.	(1) serving on committees beyond the department role and meeting commitments; (2) representing the interests of the department at the college or university level; and (3) serving in leadership roles at the department, college, or university level.
Category	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Baseline	3 Skilled	4 Distinguished
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides limited or inconsistent evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence for Proficient as well as provides an ongoing record of...</i>

<p>Student Advisement & Assistance</p>	<p>promoting retention and/or student success in the following ways:</p> <p>being regularly available to advise and assist students and/or providing appropriate advice; AND/OR</p> <p>participating in programs/activities that create a sense of community among incoming, current, or graduated students; AND/OR</p> <p>supporting student success in the program and encouraging student persistence, retention, and degree completion</p>	<p>promoting retention and/student success in the following ways:</p> <p>maintaining availability to advise and assist students in compliance with university, college, and/or department procedures; AND/OR</p> <p>participating in programs/activities that create a sense of community among incoming, current, or graduated students; AND/OR</p> <p>supporting students as scholars/experts but the scope is limited and does not prepare students to be successful in the overall program consumption of research</p>	<p>promoting retention and/student success in the following ways:</p> <p>proactively advising and assisting students in compliance with university, college, and/or department procedures; AND</p> <p>participating in multiple programs/activities that create a sense of community among incoming, current, or graduated students; AND</p> <p>supporting student development as scholars/experts in the field and their success within the program and university</p>	<p>promoting retention and/student success in the following way(s):</p> <p>creating, organizing, leading, or making high level contributions to (a) processes for advising and assisting students and/or (b) the development of resources and/or processes for advising and assisting students; OR</p> <p>creating, organizing, leading, or making high level contributions to programs/activities that create a sense of community among incoming, current, or graduated students; OR</p> <p>creating, organizing, leading, or making high level contributions to programs/activities that support student development as scholars/experts in the field</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Professionalism

Professionalism is composed of beliefs, values, and norms that situate members of a group with valued skills and knowledge to control their own work environment while conducting themselves in a responsible way that promotes the effective functioning of the department, the university, and society in general. Developing faculty members in this category are consistently professional, demonstrating respect for students and colleagues, attending professional meetings as required, using office space to facilitate meeting professional responsibilities (WKU Faculty Handbook), and maintaining professional growth through research or creative activity. Proficient faculty in this category meet and exceed the above-described professional responsibilities by purposefully helping others when needed, purposefully encouraging the free exchange of ideas between colleagues and students (WKU Faculty Handbook), protecting academic freedom in all venues, and encouraging and assisting with the transfer of knowledge from the university community to society in general (WKU Faculty Handbook).

Category	1 Unacceptable	3 Proficient
	<i>The faculty member fails to provide sufficient evidence of...</i>	<i>The faculty member provides sufficient evidence of...</i>
Respect	maintaining respectful and supportive relationships with colleagues in the workplace and considering cultural differences, AND contributing to a positive working environment in the department, college, and/or university by helping others when needed	maintaining respectful and supportive relationships with colleagues in the workplace and considering cultural differences, AND contributing to a positive working environment in the department, college, and/or university by helping others when needed
Integrity	promoting and demonstrating ethical behavior that includes abiding by Kentucky law and university rules and regulations (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 11).	promoting and demonstrating ethical behavior that includes abiding by Kentucky law and university rules and regulations (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 11).
Conscientiousness	taking on a fair share of the workload in the department, college, and/or university.	taking on a fair share of the workload in the department, college, and/or university.
Professional Responsibilities	participating in at least one graduation ceremony per academic year and some of the recognition ceremonies, selection of personnel functions, or other invited official functions, AND responding to emails (and other communication) passed among faculty for input and response, AND engaging in activities portraying other faculty members, the department, college, and/or university in a positive light, AND actively participating in departmental tasks including attending meetings, actively participating in them, providing input, and engaging in collaborative problem solving on departmental issues, AND holding office hours that allow for sufficiently meeting professional responsibilities such as meeting with and advising students (WKU Faculty Handbook p. 9), AND	participating in at least one graduation ceremony per academic year and some of the recognition ceremonies, selection of personnel functions, or other invited official functions, AND responding to emails (and other communication) passed among faculty for input and response, AND engaging in activities portraying other faculty members, the department, college, and/or university in a positive light, AND actively participating in departmental tasks including attending meetings, actively participating in them, providing input, and engaging in collaborative problem solving on departmental issues, AND holding office hours that allow for sufficiently meeting professional responsibilities such as meeting with and advising students (WKU Faculty Handbook p. 9), AND

	avoiding personal obligations that interfere with the ability to fulfill professional responsibilities (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 9).	avoiding personal obligations that interfere with the ability to fulfill professional responsibilities (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 9).
Professional Engagement	<p>maintaining membership and active engagement in professional organizations (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 12), staying current in the field, and applying learning in the field to teaching practices, AND</p> <p>encouraging and assisting with the transfer of knowledge from the university community to society in general (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 17), AND</p> <p>taking the initiative in identifying and meeting own professional growth needs (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 12), AND</p> <p>serving in participatory roles in activities outside the university that advance the profession or contribute to the university's mission.</p>	<p>maintaining membership and active engagement in professional organizations (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 12), staying current in the field, and applying learning in the field to teaching practices,</p> <p>encouraging and assisting with the transfer of knowledge from the university community to society in general (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 17), AND</p> <p>taking the initiative in identifying and meeting own professional growth needs (WKU Faculty Handbook, p. 12), AND</p> <p>serving in participatory roles in activities outside the university that advance the profession or contribute to the university's mission.</p>

Appendix 1. Suggested Artifacts

Below are possible artifacts to guide you in developing your portfolio. You may find other artifacts than those identified below better demonstrate your performance level for the standard. While you will need sufficient evidence to demonstrate you engage in the practices on a regular basis, you may not need to include every suggested artifact. Document artifacts should be linked as PDFs to the narrative. Images from Blackboard or other web resources should be linked as JPG screenshots. Multimedia resources can be linked, but, if audio or visual clips, should be used focusing on relevant evidence or directions provided with time stamps for viewers (i.e., 4:10 to 5:03).

List will be updated annually with specific artifacts that meet the standards.

Teaching

- SITE comments supporting exemplars
- Syllabi for each course
- Assessment exemplars demonstrating rigor, relevance, and clarity
- Course content exemplars demonstrating rigor, relevance, clarity, and scaffolding
- Course activity exemplars demonstrating rigor, relevance, clarity, connecting, effective pedagogy/andragogy
- Communication to students (emails, comments, announcements)
- Communication from students
- Instructor-initiated course or meeting evaluations (surveys, plus/deltas)
- Course or program proposals or revisions
- Awards

Research

- IRB applications
- Revision notifications
- Acceptance notifications for presentations and papers
- Agenda or program pages with presentation and description clearly identified
- Invitations to present
- Proofs or final publications of peer-reviewed papers
- Grant applications
- Grant award notifications
- Grant progress reports
- Awards

Service

- Minutes
- Emails
- Agenda
- Handouts

- Social media posts
- Photographs
- Videos
- TopNet screenshots
- Awards

Professionalism

- Emails, letters, or other correspondence
- Awards

May 10, 2024: Revisions to this faculty-approved document were made with direction from Provost Fischer and Dean Murphy. Revisions were emailed to SLPS faculty prior to the May 10th, 2024, departmental meeting. Revisions were discussed at the meeting, and faculty voted (17 yes, 1 abstention) to revise the levels of performance headings in the document to align with those of the university.

Appendix 2. College Template for Annual Evaluations

DRAFT 3--WKU/College Template for College Annual Evaluations of Faculty

(updated 3/29/24)

Name		800#	
Department		Review Period	

II.X. Faculty Evaluation - Each faculty member in the traditional, pedagogical, clinical and instructor tracks is evaluated by the department chair/director on the bases of effectiveness as a teacher; research/creative activities (traditional track faculty only); University and public service; and professionalism according to the standards and guidelines established by WKU, each college and department.

To evaluate teaching, research/creative activity, and service, WKU uses the following labels, defined more specifically by the colleges and department.

Distinguished: *indicates a truly exceptional level of performance*

Skilled: *indicates a level of strong performance*

Baseline: *indicates a level of just meeting expectations*

Unsatisfactory: *indicates a level of not meeting basic expectations*

Teaching
<p>Teaching should be fundamentally grounded in demonstrable learning outcomes supported through delivery, planning, and assessment. Each candidate must present a record of effectiveness in teaching as specified by set departmental guidelines and reflected in field-appropriate learning outcomes. Specified departmental guidelines are found on the College of Education & Behavioral Sciences website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinguished rating indicates the candidate functions consistently and over time, above the expected standard of performance. • Skilled rating indicates the candidate functions consistently at the expected standard of performance established for faculty. • Baseline rating indicates that the candidate functions inconsistently at or below the expected standard of performance established for faculty. • Unsatisfactory rating indicates that the candidate provides no evidence and/or functions consistently below the expected standard of performance established for faculty.
Chair/ Director Comment/Evaluation/Suggestions
<i>Textbox for comments</i>

--

Distinguished	Skilled	Baseline	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
---------------	---------	----------	----------------	----------------

Scholarship/Creative Activity
<p>Scholarship and creative activity are evaluated on the performance dimensions which may include publications, presentations, research activity, grant activity and/or creative activities. Each candidate must present a record of activity as specified by departmental guidelines. Specified departmental guidelines are found on the College of Education & Behavioral Sciences website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinguished rating indicates the candidate functions consistently and over time, above the expected standard of performance. • Skilled rating indicates the candidate functions consistently at the expected standard of performance established for faculty. • Baseline rating indicates that the candidate functions inconsistently at or below the expected standard of performance established for faculty. <p>Unsatisfactory rating indicates that the candidate provides no evidence and/or functions consistently below the expected standard of performance established for faculty.</p>
Chair/ Director Comment/Evaluation/Suggestions
<i>Textbox for comments</i>

Distinguished	Skilled	Baseline	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
---------------	---------	----------	----------------	----------------

Service
<p>Service is defined as the extent of involvement and responsibility to the department, college, university, and professional community that supports and maintains the effective functioning of the department, college, university, and profession. Each candidate must present a record of activity as specified by departmental guidelines. Specified departmental guidelines are found on the College of Education & Behavioral Sciences website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinguished rating indicates the candidate functions consistently and over time, above the expected standard of performance. • Skilled rating indicates the candidate functions consistently at the expected standard of performance established for faculty. • Baseline rating indicates that the candidate functions inconsistently at or below the expected standard of performance established for faculty. Unsatisfactory rating

indicates that the candidate provides no evidence and/or functions consistently below the expected standard of performance established for faculty.
Chair/ Director Comment/Evaluation/Suggestions
<i>Textbox for comments</i>

Distinguished	Skilled	Baseline	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
---------------	---------	----------	----------------	----------------

Professionalism
A faculty member behaves professionally by adhering to department, college, University and professional organization standards. Professional behavior includes timely completion of departmental, college and University tasks; ethical conduct in matters of instruction, research and finances; and the maintenance of civil and respectful relationships with students and colleagues.
Standards to which faculty are expected to adhere are more specifically identified here:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WKU Faculty Handbook Section II.D., Professional Conduct; 2. WKU Standards of Conduct, Policy 4.8; 3. WKU departmental/college standards, as adopted through shared governance; and 4. Professional organization standards, if applicable.
Chair/ Director Comment/Evaluation/Suggestions
<i>Textbox for comments</i>

Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
--------------	----------------

Other Comments (including continuing professional development and individual goals)
<i>College descriptive information about this area with references to any external explanations/clarifications</i>
Chair/Director Comment/Evaluation/Plans for improvement
<i>Textbox for comments</i>

Post-tenure Review

<p><i>The post-tenure review process at WKU is built upon the annual evaluation process. The department chair/director should explicitly address the post-tenure review goals of commending and recognizing superior performance, encouraging and facilitating improvement whenever necessary, maximizing opportunities for continuing professional development, and advancing attainment of institutional goals. (Faculty Handbook, VI.B)</i></p>
Chair/Director Comment/Evaluation/Plans for improvement
<i>Textbox for comments</i>

Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	N/A (untenured)
--------------	----------------	-----------------