West Virginia University
Guidelines for Faculty Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure
College of Applied Human Sciences

Approved by the Provost Office June 7, 2024

The College of Applied Human Sciences (CAHS) Guidelines follow the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (University Procedures) approved by the Faculty Senate on May 12, 2014, and accepted by the President on August 25, 2014. This document along with other pertinent information and documents are available at the following site: https://faculty.wvu.edu/policies-and-procedures/academic-freedom-professional-responsibility-promotion-and-tenure/faculty-evaluation-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines. The CAHS Guidelines build upon the University Procedures through the inclusion of the Faculty Professional Expectations that define key activities important to successful evaluations and the achievement of promotion and tenure.

The Review Calendar and Timelines

The review period for annual evaluation of productivity in CAHS is the academic year, from July 1 to June 30 of the following year, with reporting and feedback deadlines specified and communicated by the College. Annual productivity files are to be submitted in Digital Measures by September 1. School Committees and School Directors will complete their reviews by October 15 and 25, respectively. All promotions follow the University evaluation and review calendar, with files closing December 31. These Guidelines apply to all faculty ranks within CAHS for annual evaluation, promotion, and/or tenure purposes.

Categories of Expectation

The evaluation of faculty contributions is based on School and College level expectations and will be evaluated by peers (School and College faculty evaluation committees) and administrators (School Directors and the Dean). University procedures and policies are incorporated into this process through evaluation timelines, procedures for external evaluation, and alternative work assignments. As stated in the University Procedures Section II.B, "… each department college, and division shall refine broad criteria in areas of teaching, research, and service in ways that reflect the unit's discipline and mission." Within CAHS, at the both the school and college level, clear guidance to inform annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure rest in these categories:

1. the evidence needed to substantiate teaching, research, and service performance and its alignment to workload expectations,

2. teaching effectiveness as determined by a number of artifacts, including student evaluation, peer-review, and other supporting evidence,
3. the quantity and quality of scholarly products, published work and/or funded projects,
4. service to the program, school, college, university, and larger academic community,
5. the process of assigning of annual evaluation ratings and assessments of progress towards tenure and promotion, and
6. the distinctions between expectations for promotion to Associate Professor versus promotion to Professor.

Specific Expectations: Teaching/Learning, Research/Discovery, and Service/Engagement

Teaching/Learning (T)

Faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are often required to make *significant* contributions in teaching. For any faculty members with *significant* contractual obligations in teaching, **the College requires at a minimum, evidence of the items in the *T Categories* below:**

Category I: Instruction
T1. Demonstrable contributions to instruction
T2. Appropriate availability, effective advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of undergraduate and graduate students

Category II: Contributions to Program Health and Quality
T3. Collaborative and demonstrable contributions to course development
T4. Collaborative and demonstrable contributions to program development

Each year, faculty are expected to provide evidence of quality instruction (Category I). It is not necessary for a faculty member to make contributions in Category II each year, but over time should demonstrate significant contributions in Categories I and II. Details on each area are highlighted below; specific criteria for the evaluation of teaching should be clearly stated within each School. Guidance for reporting teaching activities in the faculty evaluation file are provided in supplementary documentation.

An important element of providing evidence of significant contributions to instruction (T1) is the completion of WVU course evaluations using the Student Perception of Instruction (SPOT) for all courses taught. SPOT is an indication of student satisfaction. However, SPOT is not the sole factor in determining significant contributions to teaching. Other factors, such as: peer evaluation and/or additional methods of evaluation of teaching, improving methods of presenting material, ability to simulate and cultivate intellectual interest, adhering to course syllabus, and developing

challenging course content, class size, undergraduate vs. graduate courses are also considered, and should be provided as evidence in the faculty evaluation file as applicable.

Effective advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of undergraduate and graduate students (T2) is critical for student success and retention. For any faculty with responsibilities in that area, they should document the type of activity they are engaged in and provide evidence of quality and quantity of interactions. Faculty are encouraged to document the progress of students towards programmatic benchmarks, particularly graduate students. Contributions to graduate thesis / dissertation committees may be included as part of expectations in teaching.

A faculty member may choose, or be assigned, to develop materials for a new course, make substantial modifications of an existing course, or enhance a course with different and novel teaching techniques (T3). For any faculty with responsibilities in that area, they should document and provide evidence of all instructional material developed with connections to supporting ongoing curriculum priorities. A faculty member may choose (or be assigned) to develop a new educational program or to significantly modify an existing one, such as a major, minor, or certificate program (T4). In these instances, faculty should list all significant contributions to the educational program development and provide supporting documentation. It is important to note that these programmatic development activities are above and beyond expectations to contribute to the maintenance of the curriculum through participation in committees or in faculty meetings. Guidance for reporting teaching/learning activities in the faculty evaluation file are provided in supplementary documentation.

Research/Discovery (R)

Tenure-track or tenured faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are typically required to make *significant* contributions in research. Because the form and outputs of scholarly activity vary across disciplines and fields, standards of excellence relative to the quantity and impact of peer reviewed and professional publications, single author, or multiple author publications, are identified at the school level and represent the standards of the disciplines in each school. A faculty member need not contribute in all areas of research to demonstrate meritorious performance in research; individual faculty members' annual Faculty Workload Plans will guide the categories in which faculty will contribute. Publications in journals and evidence of the vigorous pursuit of external funding are important to the candidate achieving promotion and/or tenure. **It is likely that faculty who have research as a *significant* contribution will present evidence of the items in the *R Categories* below:**

Category I: Publications and Presentations
    R1. Articles published in high quality, non-predatory, peer-reviewed journals
    R2. Publication of peer-reviewed books or book chapters in academic presses
    R3. Other scholarly publications, conference proceedings, or presentations

Category II: Funding

> R4. Securing and managing externally funded research grants or contracts
> R5. Funding proposals submitted

Publications and authorship

In most disciplines both single authored and multiple authored, refereed publications are expected as evidence of scholarly productivity. Expectations for the quantity and balance (R1, R2, and R3) of published products should be clearly specified by each School in alignment with their disciplines. In CAHS, this typically translates into both single and multiple authored articles published in peer-reviewed journals (R1) or the publication of single and/or multiple author peer-reviewed books or book chapters (R2). Faculty with expectations in this area of research should document published work as part of the faculty evaluation file, its quality, and its connection to ongoing programs of scholarly activity. Other scholarly publications, as well as presentations (R3), are important in the support of ongoing scholarly work and should also be documented as part of the faculty evaluation file. Guidance for reporting research/discovery activities in the faculty evaluation file are provided in supplementary documentation.

It is not necessary for a faculty member to make contributions to all the five R Categories every year. However, there should be a demonstrated trajectory of significant contributions in R Categories I and II, with a primary emphasis on evidence of R1, R2, and R4. Peer-reviewed publications in well-respected journals or venues (as defined by the discipline), and acquisition of external funds to support research are very important to being successful in achieving promotion and tenure. Specific criteria for the evaluation of research should be clearly stated within each School.

Faculty with expectations to engage in external funding activity to support research activity should provide documentation of grants received and managed (R4) and proposals for funding submitted to sponsors (R5). For projects with multiple investigators, faculty should document their responsibilities and activities, and their share of the dollar amount of the grant. **Specific expectations regarding grant activity are articulated in a faculty member's letter of appointment and/or in School-level expectations.** Guidance for reporting funding activities in the faculty evaluation file are provided in supplementary documentation.

Service/Engagement (S)

Typically, service is an area in which a faculty member must demonstrate at least *reasonable and balanced* contributions to the program, School, College, University, profession, and society. Some faculty must demonstrate *significant* contributions to service. For these faculty, significant

contributions in service involve a substantial amount of service widely recognized as valuable and reflect favorably on the individual and University; the Faculty Workload Plan will provide details regarding expectations of service.

Because our university places students first, it is critical to carefully balance Service / Engagement efforts in such a way that protects our responsibilities to students and classroom management. **Expectations for the quantity and balance of Service/Engagement efforts should be clearly specified by each School in alignment with their individual and unique program delivery needs.**

At a minimum, the college requires evidence of the following service activities:

Category I: Service to Program, School, and College

S1. Assigned or appointed programmatic service
S2. Assigned or appointed School or College service

Category II: Service to the University, professional organizations, and external organizations

S3. Serving on University-level committees
S4. Service to professional organizations/agencies
S5. Service to international, national, state, or local organizations/agencies

Annually, all CAHS faculty must provide evidence of S1. Outside of programmatic service (S1), it is not necessary for all faculty members to make contributions to all the above areas every year, but, over time, faculty with *reasonable* contributions in service should demonstrate contributions in Categories I and II. Some faculty must demonstrate *significant* contributions to service, which must involve contributions from both Category I and II each year; the Faculty Workload Plan will provide details regarding expectations of service. Specific criteria for the evaluation of service should be clearly stated within each School. Guidance for reporting service activities in the faculty evaluation file are provided in supplementary documentation.