

**DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND LINGUISTICS
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND
PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES**

Approval by the Department: 13 January 2021
Approval by the Office of the Provost: 27 July 2022

I. INTRODUCTION

This document describes the policies and criteria to be used for the purposes of annual evaluation of faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service, for evaluations of candidates for tenure and/or promotion, as well as for performance-based salary increases in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics. This document supplements, and is subordinate to, the current *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*.

The Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics' faculty evaluation process is intended to: guide faculty toward enhanced success, clarify faculty goals, inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department, include faculty in discussions and decisions, and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and/or tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics includes several components, which will be described below:

- Faculty workloads;
- The faculty evaluation file;
- Annual, cumulative pre-tenure/pre-promotion, and career evaluation;
- Standards of evaluation;
- Departmental faculty evaluation committee;

II. FACULTY WORKLOADS

The allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Appointments in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics that fall under these guidelines are normally:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty	40%	40%	20%
Non-tenure Track Teaching Faculty	80%	----	20%

Other types of appointments such as Per-Course Lecturers and Visiting Faculty are not subject to these guidelines. Any excluded faculty appointments are subject to Eberly College or University

guidelines. Faculty with split appointments will be evaluated by their primary department with input from the other department.

For workload distribution during sabbatical leaves, as well as other alternative work assignments, faculty members are referred to Section III of the Eberly College guidelines.

A. Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active tenure-track faculty¹ with 40% teaching appointments in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics is up to five courses. “Research active” in this context is defined as current graduate faculty status. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted, up to eight courses, with the minimum required research percentage at 10% with Dean and Provost Office approval. Such an adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the faculty member’s expectations for promotion. If an adjustment occurs for more than one year, a faculty member’s expectations for promotion should be determined in consultation with the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost Office. Tenure-track and tenured faculty with 20% service appointments are expected to provide reasonable contributions in service to the department, university, state, the public, and/or the profession.

B. Teaching Faculty

The normal annual teaching assignment for teaching faculty with 80% teaching appointments in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics is up to eight courses. Teaching faculty assignments normally do not include a research component, although this can be negotiated with the Department Chair and the Dean’s office. Teaching faculty with 20% service appointments are expected to provide reasonable contributions in service to the department, university, state, the public, and/or the profession.

C. Procedures and Timetable for Submitting the Workload Plan

All faculty members are required to submit their annual workload plan to the Chair of the Department on the designated date. This date will normally be by the last day of the 9-month contract of the preceding year; however, circumstances may arise when the submission date will need to be altered. Prior consultation with the Chair is recommended before submitting the workload document. The workload plan is subject to approval by the Chair and the Dean.

¹ Reference to “tenure-track” faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted. Teaching faculty titles include Teaching Instructor as well as Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor.

III. THE FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Faculty members are responsible for reporting and documenting their achievements in teaching, research, and service in their evaluation file. This requires submitting various types of productivity reports and supporting evidence of the faculty members' productivity, as explained below.

A. Productivity Reports

There are three types of productivity reports covering various periods that faculty members will be expected to submit during their career: annual, cumulative pre-tenure/pre-promotion, and career reports.

1. Annual Report

Faculty members must annually submit a report summarizing their teaching, research, and service activities completed during the academic year under review and must update their evaluation files with representative documentation of these activities. For the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, the annual review year is August 16th to August 15th. Although only materials for activities that occurred on or before August 15th may be included in the file, faculty members have until September 30th to make sure that their files are complete and to prepare their annual report. The file is closed for review after September 30th. For first-year faculty and for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion, the file is closed on December 31st. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process are added to the file after the deadline date.

2. Cumulative Pre- Tenure Report

Probationary tenure-track faculty are subject to the cumulative pre-tenure evaluation, normally two years before their critical year (i.e. the year they apply for tenure), in order to determine **the extent to which they are making clear progress toward tenure**. The faculty member undergoing the cumulative pre-tenure evaluation should provide a statement that summarizes the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, research, and service during the period under consideration. The report is due at the same time as the annual report. This date must be carefully determined for faculty bringing in years towards tenure upon hire.

3. Career Report

This is a report in which the faculty member summarizes her/his accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion and/or tenure. For the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, the career report's end date is December 31st.

B. Supporting Evidence

Faculty members are required to document their productivity in teaching, research, and service. Types of supporting evidence that should be included in the evaluation file are addressed below.

1. Teaching

In order to be evaluated in the area of teaching, faculty members are required to submit the following items for all courses taught as **minimum documentation**:

- (1) the full SEI forms (numerical data and student comments) for all courses, and
- (2) syllabi.

GTA coordinators must also include their coordinator evaluations as minimum documentation (either from LANG 690 and/or a department-internal document).

Teaching-track faculty must also include a “systematic assessment” of contributions in teaching to the program in order to be evaluated. This is a statement in which the faculty member reflects on instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives. Tenure-track faculty can also provide a “systematic assessment” to further highlight their significant contributions in teaching.

All new faculty members should receive SEI evaluations by the time of their first annual review. If not, they must provide evidence of teaching quality in lieu of numerical evaluations by including extra documentation (e.g., unofficial evaluations, comments from students, and/or peer reviews of teaching, etc.) to demonstrate their performance.

Faculty members are encouraged to avoid sole reliance on SEI ratings and syllabi to demonstrate their teaching performance. The quality of teaching can be further documented by offering optional materials from a variety of sources, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A self-evaluation of their teaching activities during the period under review;
- Instructional materials (handouts, study guides, in class visual tools, PowerPoints, etc.);
- Samples of assessed student work;
- Innovation in instruction (technology, activities, etc.);
- Course development;
- Development/revision of study abroad materials;
- Sample examinations/assignments;
- Advising or mentoring;
- Graduate exam/thesis committees;
- Participation in teaching-related workshops/seminars;
- Other evaluation instruments (unofficial evaluations, independent study/capstone evaluations, etc.);
- Peer’s/Chair’s evaluations;
- Teaching awards/recognition;
- Correspondence from current/former students;
- Other documents;
- Evidence of GTA coordinator duties, such as:

- Preparing/updating course syllabi and other materials for language courses;
- Training and supervising instructional staff (leading group and individual meetings, professional development of GTAs in lesson plan creation, assessment, classroom strategies, incorporation of technology, approval of midterm and final grades);
- Evaluating GTAs/instructors (class visits and individual discussion meetings);
- GTA orientation planning and execution.

2. Research

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the Department. Faculty must include in the file copies of all publications to be counted for the review period. Faculty members should describe the nature of the publication to which a manuscript has been submitted (e.g. book, journal, conference proceedings, encyclopedia, etc.) and the selection process involved (e.g. peer-reviewed or not).

Evidence of research might include:

a. Books. Because of the variety of fields represented, the Department recognizes a range of book-length scholarly publications, including monographs, critical editions, edited volumes, textbooks, etc. Given this range, it is important for faculty members to describe and clarify the nature of their book-length works and, if appropriate, the extent to which each deserves to be recognized as a research product.

b. Articles. Because of the diversity of the Department, there is no single list of appropriate journals, but articles should typically appear in national or international refereed journals. Some disciplines represented within the Department use the terms "State of the Art Article" or "Review Article"; such publications are considered scholarly works. While the Department also recognizes research notes of at least 2,000 words as a category of scholarship, these should typically be published in national and international refereed journals, and they do not count at the same level as scholarly articles.

c. Book Chapters. Book chapters which have been professionally assessed may count as equivalents to articles. Introductions to books, editions, anthologies, or similar works may also be considered the equivalent of one article, depending on how they are judged in terms of the criteria listed in section V.A.1.2. It is important for faculty members to describe and clarify the nature of these works and, if appropriate, the extent to which each deserves to be recognized as a research product.

d. Creative Works of an Artistic Nature. This category recognizes publication or performance of creative (artistic) work, provided that it has a direct connection with the faculty member's professional specialization. It includes genres such as novels, plays, short stories, poetry, and interpretive dramatic performance or direction. The criteria to be applied in evaluating such creative work are the same as described in section V.A.1.2., but such work may also require

professional review beyond the Department; faculty members must support the merit of their creative work with appropriate outside assessment (e.g., reviews).

e. Translations. The Department recognizes the translation of literary and non-literary works as a noteworthy contribution. Faculty members submitting translations for evaluation should include a statement clarifying how that work is appropriate to their research program and their field of study. The Department considers other types of translation, e. g. legal and commercial documents, as service.

f. Grants and Patents. The Department recognizes the preparation and submission of grants and patents that involve active research. The evaluation of a grant or a patent submission will depend on its connection to the faculty member's research agenda and the proposed outcomes of the project for which grant monies or patents are to be awarded.

3. Service

It is the faculty member's obligation to document time and effort devoted to service, including attendance and the level of activity performed. Faculty members should remember that the number of service activities is not in and of itself an indicator of quality. They can add an evaluative statement as needed to clarify their involvement in and the impact of the service activities in which they were involved. They should also include documentation describing the quantity and quality of their service activities, and if appropriate, evidence of any major or significant accomplishment.

For a detailed description of the faculty member's evaluation file, please refer to section VII 'Faculty Evaluation File' in the current *University Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and section IV of the current *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*.

IV. TYPES OF EVALUATION

Tenure-track faculty members receive three types of evaluations regarding their performance in teaching, research, and service from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair: annual, cumulative pre-tenure, and career evaluation. Teaching-track faculty receive at minimum two types of evaluations regarding their performance in teaching and service (and sometimes research), from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair: annual and career evaluations. For teaching-track faculty, two years prior to the potential promotion, either the candidate or the Chair can request a cumulative review.

For the annual evaluation, fully promoted professors (both tenure-track and teaching-track) are evaluated at minimum by the Chair of the Department and may choose to be evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee as well. For more information, see Section VII.B.1 of the Eberly College Guidelines.

A. Annual Evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair will write independent annual evaluation letters (“independent” in the sense that the Chair is in no way limited by the Committee’s evaluation).

1. Content of the Annual Evaluation Letter

The following information is included in the Committee’s and Chair’s letters:

a. Basic information. The letter reports the faculty member’s rank and title, years in rank, assignment, plus any other details that would tend to affect the way the faculty member’s record is evaluated (e.g., sabbatical leave, an approved modification of duties per BOG Faculty Rule 4.5 during the reporting period).

b. Areas of Evaluation. The letter provides a categorical rating (“excellent”, “good”, “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”) of the faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching, research (for tenure-track faculty), and service during the reporting period and summarizes evidence that justifies the rating.

c. Contextual Evaluation. The letter considers the annual performance in the context of recent annual evaluations and assesses (1) whether FEC suggestions for improvement have been addressed, and (2) whether progress towards the next promotion (or, for fully promoted faculty members, the next salary enhancement) has been made. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty member’s files.

d. Recommendation. The Committee’s letter includes the votes cast by the Committee members as well as a recommendation for or against continuation in rank. All members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting. The Chair’s letter should include a recommendation regarding continuation or non-continuation in rank as well.

B. Cumulative Pre-Tenure Evaluation

Probationary tenure-track faculty are subject to the cumulative pre-tenure evaluation normally two years before their critical year, in order to determine **the extent to which they are making clear progress toward tenure**. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are required, there will be particular emphasis on the development of an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. The cumulative pre-tenure evaluation should assess whether the faculty member is on track for the next career step (promotion, tenure, salary enhancement) and what steps, if any, are needed for improvement. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching and/or failure to achieve an independent research program by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year. Reasonable contributions in service are also required. Service includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college. Other types of service are also considered.

The Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee's and Chair's reviews for this cumulative pre-tenure evaluation are conducted following normal annual review procedures. Summative and evaluative statements are provided at the end of the annual evaluation letter for that year.

C. Career Evaluation

In a tenure-track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the faculty member's "critical year," (normally the sixth year), as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for one additional year (normally the seventh year) of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience may be offered, in the appointment letter, the option of requesting up to three (3) years of credit toward tenure. If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University must be included in the evaluation file.

Tenure-track faculty need to carefully look at the dates in the initial contract regarding bringing in years towards tenure (if offered). Those faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the time stipulated in the initial contract, may, during the fourth year of employment (by May 15th of the fourth year), request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean's approval of such request, the new critical year will be confirmed. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

Under special circumstances, faculty members may be able to extend the critical year. These special circumstances are discussed in Section VII.D.1.a of the Eberly College guidelines and Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5 Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty; Extension of the Tenure Clock.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in non-tenure-track (teaching-, service-, research-track) faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing tenure-track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a non-tenure-track promotion-eligible faculty member and the faculty member's Chair may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. A non-tenure-track faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion. Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses.

For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a

reasonable period of time. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank.

1. Contents of the Career Evaluation Letter

The following information is included in the Committee's and Chair's career evaluation letters:

a. Basic information. The letter reports the faculty member's rank and title, years in rank, assignment, plus any other details that would tend to affect the way the faculty member's record is evaluated (e.g., Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5 Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty; Extension of the Tenure Clock).

b. Summary of achievements during the period under review. The letter summarizes the faculty member's achievements in teaching, research, and service in the past six years for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, and since the previous promotion with a special emphasis on the most recent five- or six-year period for promotion to Professor. The letter also summarizes the external evaluators' assessment of the faculty member's area of significant contribution.

c. Votes and Recommendation. The Committee's letter includes the votes cast by the members of the Committee, as well as a recommendation in favor or against tenure and/or promotion. The Chair's letter provides a separate recommendation.

V. STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

A. Standards for the Annual Evaluation

The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed as Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or Unsatisfactory.

1. Annual Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

Contributions in teaching, research, and service will annually be evaluated according to the criteria described below. Faculty members must meet or exceed requirements in their initial contracts or subsequent MOUs.

1.1. Rating of Teaching Performance

In addition to the **minimum documentation** stated in Supporting Documentation above, the rating of **Excellent** in teaching normally requires SEI scores of 4.0 or above, the rating of **Good**

normally requires SEI scores of 3.5 to 3.9, and the rating of **Satisfactory** normally requires SEI scores of 3.0 to 3.4. Substantial documentation that demonstrates the quality of the faculty member's teaching may warrant a higher rating than the base levels of the SEI ratings indicate.

1.2. Rating of Research Performance

The criteria to be used for evaluating research and publication include the following (not listed in order of importance).

a. Authorship. The Department recognizes that both collaborative and individual work can result in high-quality research products. In the case of multiple authorship, the faculty member is responsible for identifying their contributions to the work(s). However, both types of authorship are valued equally.

b. Originality. Research must be original to count towards evaluations and promotion. Examples of original research include articles, creative writing, critical editions, textbooks, translations, edited volumes, public scholarship, etc. Similarly, it is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the level and scope of the outlet.

c. Place of Publication/Granting Agency. Nationally and/or internationally recognized publications or grants generally carry the most weight. It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the level and scope of the press or journal. Similarly, it is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the level and scope of the granting agency.

d. Works in Progress. The same work in progress, unless it is different chapters of a larger book project, cannot be used for credit for more than one year, no matter the percentage of research or the rating category.

e. Over 40% Research Assignment. Anyone with a research percentage of over 40% must exceed the requirements for the research ratings listed under 1.2.1 (For a research expectation of 40%) per the contract or subsequent MOU.

Based on the committee's overall evaluation of the above criteria, the following ratings will be applied to the research activity of a faculty member.

1.2.1. For a research expectation of 40%

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present at least one of the following or the equivalent:

- Acceptance or publication of a refereed and/or editorially reviewed book*;
or
- Acceptance or publication of one scholarly article in a refereed journal;
or
- Acceptance or publication of a chapter in a book or peer-reviewed conference proceedings from a national or international conference;
or
- Acceptance or publication of a second edition of a previously published book with an explanation of the type and extent of the revisions done;
or

- Acceptance or publication of an editorially reviewed book-length translation related to the field of study; or
- Award of a nationally and/or internationally recognized externally funded grant based on submission requiring active research related to the faculty member's area of expertise.

* A refereed and/or editorially reviewed scholarly book, including critical editions with a substantial scholarly apparatus, edited volumes, and textbooks, submitted for evaluation will be counted for up to three years upon acceptance or publication. Faculty would have the choice to count a maximum of one year of credit before full publication of the text by providing the final publication contract and evidence of progress. To gain credit upon publication, faculty members must provide a copy of the full accepted or published manuscript. For edited volumes, it is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the rationale for these to be counted as research (as opposed to service) and how much credit should be received (no more than three years).

For a rating of GOOD, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable research (e.g., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-peer-reviewed publication, such as a journal or magazine article, encyclopedia entry, non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings, public scholarship related to field of study, or a research note in a peer-reviewed journal; peer-reviewed articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project. PLUS one of the following:
 - Another example of demonstrable research; or
 - A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
 - An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

For a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable research (e.g., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings, a research note in a peer-reviewed journal, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication, evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project); **OR**

Any combination of two of the following (two of the same are acceptable):

- A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

1.2.2. For a 20% to 39% research expectation

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable research (e.g., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-peer-reviewed publication, such as a journal or magazine article, encyclopedia entry, non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings, blog post related to field of study, or a research note in a

peer-reviewed journal; peer-reviewed articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project)

PLUS one of the following:

- Another example of demonstrable research; or
- A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

N.B. Any item that counts as Excellent for research expectations of 40% or more will also count as Excellent for this category.

For a rating of GOOD, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable research (e.g., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings, a research note in a peer-reviewed journal, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication, evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project); **OR**

Any combination of two of the following (two of the same are acceptable):

- A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

For a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty members must present at least one of the following or the equivalent:

- Presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- Two presentations (on campus or off campus) related to the field of study, such as brown bag discussions, radio shows, guest lectures in classes, other outreach presentations, workshops, etc. or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

1.2.3. For a research expectation of less than 20%

Unless the annual letter or memorandum of understanding specifies otherwise, the following will be used to evaluate research of less than 20%.

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present one of the following:

- Demonstrable research (e.g., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings, a research note in a peer-reviewed journal, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication, evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project); **OR**

Any combination of two of the following (two of the same are acceptable):

- A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

N.B. Any item that counts as Excellent for research expectations of more than 20% will also count as Excellent for this category.

For a rating of GOOD, faculty members must present one of the following of the following or the equivalent:

- Presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- Two presentations (on campus or off campus) related to the field of study, such as brown bag discussions, radio shows, guest lectures in classes, other outreach presentations, workshops, etc. or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly or professional journal.

For a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- A presentation (on or off campus) related to the field of study.

N.B. 1. The ratings of excellent or good in themselves do not guarantee promotion and/or tenure.
2. In the event that a faculty member has more than one accepted or published work in a given year, they have the opportunity to claim credit for the remainder of the publications for the current year in the following year. Note that publications can be banked for only one year.

1.3. Rating of Service Contributions

For the purposes of evaluations, service activities are classified in the following categories.

a. To the Profession, e.g., service on committees, task forces, etc. and offices held in regional, national, and international professional organizations related to one's discipline; consulting for publishers; manuscript reviews; book evaluation not intended for publication; chairing/moderating panels at professional conferences; organizing national or international conferences and colloquia; external reviews for tenure, promotion, and academic programs. Other types of service to the profession may apply.

b. To the State and Public, e.g., work with state language teachers; translating and interpreting for public and private agencies; educational programs for the public and international exchange programs; finding tutors and translators for the public. Other types of state and public service related to the field of expertise may apply.

c. To the College and University, e.g., work on committees, councils, task forces, and other participation in the governance/administrative system of the College and University (i.e., Chair); study abroad program organization and administration; faculty advisor to College- and University-wide student organizations; translating and interpreting for units within the University; providing proficiency assessments and other consultations for units within the University. Other types of College and University service may apply.

d. To the Department, e.g., work on department-level committees, task forces, and other administrative duties, faculty advisor to honor societies, clubs, and conversation table leaders; library representative; operation of special programs (e.g. ELLI summer intensive programs or others); special event organization. Those faculty serving in an official administrative capacity (i.e., Associate Chair(s), Departmental Undergraduate Advisor(s), Language Program Coordinators, or ELLI director/co-director) will be considered as demonstrating leadership in terms of evaluation.

e. Altered contracts and leadership designation: Those faculty with altered contracts that indicate a higher percentage of service will list all of the administrative duties under service. Those faculty without altered contracts (i.e., language coordinators and potentially others) will delineate the distribution of their duties between teaching and service. For language coordinators, service activities include implementing university/college/department policies, recruiting and reviewing applications, interviewing candidates, scheduling courses, dealing with student issues/complaints, filling out immigration forms, and other such duties. All other coordinator duties will be evaluated under teaching.

Comparable service activities will be considered for evaluation. The above listing does not imply any ranking of the four categories of service, but some activities will necessarily count more than others. Activities unrelated to the mission of the University, College, or Department will not be counted as part of service. The evaluation will be based upon criteria listed below.

i. Benefit/Impact. The degree to which the service meets the needs of stakeholders, yields important benefits to the Department, College, University, Profession, or Community, has a positive outcome, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues.

ii. Leadership. Demonstrated leadership (as an individual or in the charge of the committee) and initiative in service to the Department, College, University, Profession, and/or Community.

iii. Duration. Capacity and term of service.

iv. Effort. Time and energy required by service activities.

Evaluation of service is a measure of time and energy expended as well as the quality of the contribution and its outcomes. The Department recognizes that faculty members perform a wide variety of service activities. Note that the FEC committee counts as two departmental committees.

To receive a rating of **EXCELLENT**, a faculty member will serve on the equivalent of four departmental committees. For example, a faculty member might serve on two departmental committees, one university committee, and participate in one professional service activity (i.e. article reviewing). Similarly, if leadership is demonstrated (i.e. language coordination, committee chairs), the equivalent of three departmental committees is expected for a rating of excellent. For example, a faculty member might be a coordinator, serve on two departmental committees, and participate in service to the community. Faculty who think that any one activity

should count as equivalent to more than one departmental committee (i.e. serving as a journal editor or officer in a professional committee) can provide evidence to make this argument in their annual review document.

To receive a rating of **GOOD**, a faculty member will serve on the equivalent of three departmental committees. For example, a faculty member might serve on two departmental committees and one university committee or participate in one professional service activity (i.e. article reviewing). Similarly, if leadership is demonstrated (i.e. language coordination, committee chairs), the equivalent of two departmental committees is expected for excellent. For example, a faculty member might be a coordinator and serve on two departmental committees.

To receive a rating of **SATISFACTORY**, a faculty member will effectively serve on two departmental committees.

A faculty member whose dossier shows a general lack of active participation (e.g., the faculty member does not provide evidence of assigned tasks within a committee, does not attend meetings, etc.) or shows effective participation in fewer than two departmental committees will receive a rating of **UNSATISFACTORY**.

Membership on committees may be replaced by equivalent service approved by the chair. Such equivalence should generally be specified in the contract or in the workload plan.

If the service component is different than the default 20%, documentation should be provided by the faculty regarding this difference. The FEC committee should refer to the workload form for clarification as well.

B. Standards for Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty Members

1. From Assistant to Associate Professor

In order to be recommended for tenure and/or promoted to Associate Professor, a tenure-track faculty member will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in two of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, research, and service) and reasonable contributions in the other. “Significant contributions” require a 30% effort or higher in any given category. “Reasonable contributions” are defined as equal to or lower than 20% effort in any given category. Normally, faculty will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and research, and reasonable contributions in service.

In the teaching context “significant contributions” are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure at West Virginia University. All teaching activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section V.A.1.1. of this document.

“Significant contributions” in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of the expectations of peers in a similar field recently achieving tenure in our department at WVU and at peer research universities in similar departments; peer research universities are determined by the Department, subject to approval by the Dean. Faculty applying for tenure must have received

a preponderance of *excellent or good* ratings in previous annual reviews. Within the Department a candidate for tenure must normally present a minimum of a refereed and/or editorially reviewed book published by an appropriate press or at least three articles (or the equivalent; see section III.B.2.) in appropriate national or international refereed journals. This is a minimal number to be considered for tenure but is not necessarily sufficient in itself to justify the granting of tenure. All research activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section V.A.1.2. of this document. In addition, external reviews, normally of research will be required for tenure decisions and are collected according to the procedures described in the College guidelines.

“Reasonable contributions” in service are normally those activities at or beyond the departmental level which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure at West Virginia University.

2. From Associate Professor to Professor

In order to be promoted to the Professor level, a tenure-track faculty member will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in two of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, research, and service) and reasonable contributions in the other. Normally, faculty will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and research, but once tenure has been achieved, the criteria for subsequent promotion can be modified to establish a different pair of areas of significant contribution. Such a change should be requested primarily to assist the Department or College in carrying out its mission; a change of areas should not be considered solely because of a faculty member's lack of achievement in one area or the faculty member's recent accomplishments in another. Such a modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, Chairperson of the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee, the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost, and must be stipulated in subsequent letters of agreement. In the event the change involves replacing research with service, the document must identify both the types and quantity of service expected and the ways in which that service will be measured; in addition, reasonable contributions in research must be defined, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, in the agreement. A period of at least two years must elapse after the approval of the change of areas before the faculty member can be considered for promotion using the new areas of significant contribution. If such a request is granted, external reviews of service will be expected. Faculty members are reminded that successful teaching is an expectation of all members of the Department who are assigned to teach, and as a criterion for promotion to professor, significant contributions must be made in teaching.

In the teaching context “significant contributions” are the same as described in the previous section: From Assistant to Associate Professor.

“Significant contributions” in research means performance that meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving promotion to Professor at WVU and at peer research universities; peer research universities are determined by the Department, subject to approval by the Dean. Within the Department, a candidate for promotion to full professor must normally present, beyond the work used to achieve the previous promotion, a minimum of a book published by an appropriate press or five articles (or the equivalent; see section III.B.2.) in appropriate national or

international refereed journals. This is a minimal number to be considered for promotion but is not necessarily sufficient in itself to justify promotion. This work should be done since last promotion, within a relatively recent period of time, and within the context of an ongoing and cohesive research agenda. As mentioned above, for promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on the work done in the most recent five- or six-year period.

“Reasonable contributions” in research means performance which demonstrates the faculty member's ongoing participation in scholarly activities. Such activities should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

All research activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section V.A.1.2. of this document. In addition, external reviews of research will be required for promotion decisions for faculty for whom research is an area of significant contribution; see section XII. of the University guidelines and section VIII. of the College guidelines.

“Significant contributions” in service are normally those activities which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to Professor at West Virginia University and who have service as an area of significant contribution. Faculty should refer to the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* for guidance for promotion based on service. It should be noted that for promotion based on service, service activities will go far beyond the kinds of service which are expected in order for one to achieve good university citizenship. Exceptions to this practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the University, profession, or on a national or international level. Such exceptions should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

“Reasonable contributions” in service are normally those activities at or beyond the departmental level which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to Professor at West Virginia University.

All service activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section V.A.1.3 of this document; in addition, external reviews of service will be required for faculty members for whom service is an area of significant contribution; see section XII. of the University guidelines and section VIII. of the College guidelines.

C. Standards for Promotion of Teaching Faculty Members

1. From Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate to Professor

Teaching-track faculty standing for promotion from Assistant to Associate and from Associate to Professor are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and reasonable contributions in service. As mentioned above, the file is expected to show evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contributions to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and

initiatives (see above for complete list). For more information about the requirements for promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor, see Section VII.D.2 of the Eberly College guidelines.

In the teaching context “significant contributions” are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to Teaching Associate Professor or Teaching Professor at West Virginia University. Teaching-track faculty standing for promotion from Associate to Professor are required to have external reviews of their teaching. All teaching activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section V.A.1.1. of this document.

“Reasonable contributions” in service are the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Faculty Evaluation Committee in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics is elected by and from the full-time tenure-track and teaching-track faculty of the Department. It shall be comprised of the following full-time faculty members: three (3) tenured; two (2) untenured, specifically, one (1) pre-tenure faculty and one (1) member of the teaching-line faculty (chosen from among Teaching Instructors, Teaching Assistant Professors, Teaching Associate Professors, or Teaching Professors). If at any time there is not an eligible pre-tenure faculty member in the department, that position will be filled by a teaching-track faculty member.

Terms of service: Tenured faculty members and teaching-track faculty are elected to serve for two years; pre-tenure faculty are elected to serve for one year. No member of the committee shall be elected to succeed themselves for a period of two years. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing their evaluation file. If a faculty member steps off the committee before the two-year term is over (for sabbatical, promotion, approved leave, etc.), they will be eligible to be elected again the following year.

The chair of the FEC is selected by the FEC committee. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on the FEC.

For circumstances in which faculty members should recuse themselves from the committee, see section V.B. ‘Recusal’ of the Eberly College guidelines. On the possibility of remote electronic participation, see Section V.D. of the Eberly College guidelines.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential.

VII. PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY GUIDELINES

Annual evaluations will be used when considering performance-based salary recommendations. The department will follow the yearly guidelines provided by the Eberly Dean to determine

performance-based salary increases. When annual review ratings are used to determine salary increases, the formula below should be used.

Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but does not indicate merit. The performance-based salary guidelines typically include consideration of meritorious performance.

The department's Performance-Based Salary Policy uses the descriptor values stipulated by the College. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating, e.g.,

40% teaching = 40×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 100
40% research = 40×4.0 (rating of "Excellent") = 160
20% service = 20×1.0 (rating of "Satisfactory") = 20
Merit Score = 280

80% teaching = 80×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 200
20% service = 20×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 50
Merit Score = 250

If the Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations.

VIII. MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair of the Department. The Committee and the Chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the Faculty. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.