



Policies of the PCAL Faculty Awards Committee

2/28/2016

For several years, the PCAL Faculty Awards Committee has discussed the utility of adding a few guidelines in an effort to ensure procedural fairness. Our ultimate aim is to empower all nominees to present their information in a manner that ensures every packet will be considered. Candidates are encouraged to see their departmental representative to the committee as a mentor and seek the advice of that person if additional instruction is needed or a review of the packet is desired prior to final submission.

General

- Candidates are asked to compile evidence to support their case from the last 5 years of service. To be clear, only evidence from the time the candidate was at WKU will be considered.
- Such evidence should be compiled in the form of a narrative, persuasive argument. While the university provides suggestions of data points useful in making such an argument for each category, the PCAL committee provides additional direction below for the teaching, research & creativity, and student advisement categories.
- Candidates should submit material in a single PDF file numbering 35 pages or less (excluding the CV). Packets constructed via online sites (e.g., WordPress) are not in compliance with this request and will not be considered.
- Candidates may include embedded links within the PDF that take committee members to video, audio, or technological materials (in such cases as the nominee is webmaster for an organization, for example), but the actual "text" contained within those links will not be evaluated as we feel that doing so potentially extends the submission beyond the university's 35-page limit.
- If a candidate is nominated more than once in a single category during a given year, the nomination forms/letters (required by university guidelines to be included in the packet) will be counted as one page.

Guidelines for Particular Categories

Teaching

- Candidates are expected to provide materials regarding all courses taught during the review period.
- Specifically, we expect to see
 - The number of students taught during the review period.
 - All SITE evaluations¹, in unaltered form, compiled together in a single PDF. This information should be submitted separate from the main PDF, which is limited to 35 pages. To be clear, the pages in the SITE PDF will **not** count as part of the 35-page maximum allowed each candidate.

¹ The committee understands that many instructors in the arts don't teach sections large enough to generate SITE results. A short note acknowledging that the SITE structure is not inclusive of such scholar's teaching performance is a fine way to address that circumstance.



- A tabular/graphic summary (i.e., bar or pie chart or line graph) for each course. These summaries will display average responses on a given item as well as the number of students taught in that particular section. An Excel “template” will be provided each candidate in order to facilitate this specific request. NOTE: SITE items have changed slightly over time. The “fifth year” summary on the template reflects the most recent changes.
- However, quantitative evaluations from students are only one useful data point. Therefore, candidates are expected to include data in the form of some of the following pieces of evidence:
 - Narrative comments made by students on teaching evaluations or through solicited or unsolicited letters, emails, or notes.
 - A narrative from a colleague who has observed the nominee's teaching.
 - Discussion of the rigor of course instruction (include a syllabus and specifically discuss "course alignment").
 - Discussion of the success of students under the tutelage of the instructor.
 - Discussion of course development over time.

Research/Creative Activity

- This category best illustrates the considerable diversity of the college's departments. As such, we strongly encourage the candidate to “consider the audience” by recognizing that evaluators are less familiar with the “weight” or significance of a particular accomplishment than your colleagues who have evaluated your work in the past.
- As candidates describe their publication/creative records, we request they discuss the level, status, prestige, and weight of their contributions. One thing they should address is whether and to what extent the work is locally, regionally, nationally, or globally impactful/recognized.
- Letters of support from experts and colleagues in the field attesting to the significance of the research/creative activity are helpful.

Student Advising

- Candidates in this category should acknowledge the number of students advised and in what capacity (e.g., academic advisor, student organization advisor).
- We would also like to know if the candidate is the sole advisor for their department/program/organization or whether they share that responsibility with colleagues.
- The candidate should make clear, very early in the documentation, the type of compensation they receive for student advising (i.e., course load reduction, alternative release, none).
- Evidence of effective advising may include letters of recognition from students and other supporting material.

Service

- Candidates in this category should highlight their public service record at multiple levels including-- local, regional, national and global.
- Letters of support from community members, leaders and constituents attesting to the significance and impact of the service activities are helpful.



Timeline

- The committee is called for an initial meeting at the end of the Fall semester to
 - 1) elect a chairperson,
 - 2) review the currency of these guidelines,
 - 3) review the overall process, and
 - 4) ascertain that the final documents are provided on the PCAL website and provided to the nominees before they compile their materials
- In early spring, the Dean's office uploads packets to the Award Committee's Blackboard site and the committee is notified.
- Prior to the spring meeting, members should review each application and email a "top three" list for each of category to the committee chair in an effort to narrow the field for the final discussion. At the spring meeting, the chair will present the vote distribution (highlighting the top three in each category) and a final discussion will take place². After this discussion, each committee member in attendance will submit final votes from which the winners will be determined. Note: only committee members present at the final meeting will cast ballots electing the winners.
- If a vote in any category results in a tie, the committee will have an additional round of deliberation and a second vote. If the result is still a tie, the tied result will be forwarded to the dean, and he will serve as the tiebreaker.
- The chair will present the winners to the dean, along with a brief narrative highlighting aspects of the packet that the committee emphasized during deliberation.
- After considering the information from the committee, the dean will announce the college winners.

² A Quorum of 7 members must be present at the second face-to-face meeting.