

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
West Virginia University

**Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure
and Performance-Based Raises**

Approved by SOCA Faculty: May 6, 2026
Approved by Provost's Office: July 13, 2026

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	The Faculty Appointment Letter	2
3.	Faculty Workloads.....	2
3.1	Faculty Workloads for Different Positions	3
4.	The Faculty Evaluation File.....	3
4.1	Productivity Reports	4
4.2	Supporting Evidence for Faculty Evaluation.....	6
5.	TYPES OF EVALUATION	13
5.1.	Annual Evaluation	13
5.2.	Cumulative Pre-Promotion Evaluation.....	14
5.3.	Career Evaluation	14
6.	STANDARDS OF EVALUATION	17
6.1	Standards for the Annual Evaluation	17
6.2	Standards for Promotion of Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Service Faculty Members.....	25
7.	Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation.....	37
8.	Performance-Based Salary Policy.....	37
9.	Faculty Evaluation Committee	38
10.	Procedure for modification of this document.....	39

1. Introduction

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology's Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure and Performance-Based Raises supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place at the department (or center/program) level, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate on the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty performance documentation processes, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. The Department's policies are intended to conform to those of the Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is board, university, college, department.

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, faculty workloads (annual workload document), the faculty evaluation file, and annual

performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track, and promotion-eligible Service, Teaching, tenure-track/tenured and Research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. (Note: Unless otherwise noted, “tenure-track” refers to tenured as well as faculty on the tenure-track at the assistant level.)

2. The Faculty Appointment Letter

The faculty appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service.

For Tenure-Track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Designated research-intensive appointments may vary such that (for example) the position includes 30% teaching, 50% research, and 20% service. Research-intensive appointments in the department are rare, but could be considered, for example, for a faculty member who has two or more large grants for which they serve as principal investigator or major co-investigator and is expected to publish at rate 1.25 times higher (or more) than tenure-track faculty with 40/40/20 appointments.

For Teaching faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 80% teaching and 20% service. Service faculty have a primary assignment in service, ranging from 60-80%. The normal annual teaching assignment ranges from two to four courses, making it an area of reasonable (20%) to significant (30-40%) contribution. Teaching and Service faculty appointments may also include a research component up to 10%.

Tenure-track, Teaching, and Service faculty may seek reallocation of a portion of their teaching, research or service, contingent on the needs of the program, such that they reallocate on an annual basis a portion of their workload dedicated to teaching/research/service. Such reallocations are uncommon prior to tenure. Processes pertaining to reallocation of workload are articulated in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology Workload Document Policy Guidelines.

3. 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 Sociology and Anthropology that fall under these guidelines normally stipulate the following:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty	40%	40%	20%
Teaching Faculty	80%	0-10%	10-20%
Service	20-40%	0-10%	60-80%

Other types of appointments such as adjuncts and Visiting Faculty are not subject to these guidelines.

Annual faculty workload assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and Chair. They provide an opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Service-track faculty, Research-track faculty, Teaching-track faculty, and Tenure-track faculty participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Workload plans are submitted to the Chair of the Department each April 1st and all faculty must have a one-on-one meeting with the chair to discuss their workload before May 1st. At the beginning of May,

these are sent to Eberly for revisions and approval. Workload documents reflect department needs, as well as faculty interests – they must both be taken into account, but the Chair has final say in determining the faculty member's workload plan. The agreed upon workload goes into the faculty file and drives the evaluation process.

For workload distribution during sabbatical or professional leaves, as well as other alternative work assignments, faculty members will find guidance in Section III of the Eberly College guidelines. Any faculty on leave or reassignment have an appropriately adjusted workload that is taken into account during the annual evaluation. Documentation of this reassignment or leave must be in the evaluation file. Board of Governors Rule 4.5 Modifications of Duties normally do not affect one's workload percentages.

3.1 Faculty Workloads for Different Positions

As noted above and outlined in the department's Workload Policy Document, tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate a significant contribution in teaching that typically equates to 40% effort. Teaching-track (nontenure-track) faculty are expected to demonstrate a significant contribution in teaching that typically equates to 80% effort. Service-track (nontenure-track) faculty are expected to demonstrate either a reasonable or a significant contribution in teaching that equates to 20-40% effort. Other nontenure-track faculty teaching assignments may vary depending on their workload assignment.

Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty

"Research active" in this context is defined by the department's workload policy document. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted, up to six courses. Such an adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the faculty member's expectations for promotion. 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.

Teaching Faculty

The normal annual teaching assignment for teaching faculty with 80% teaching appointments in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology is 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.

Service Faculty

The normal annual teaching assignment for service faculty with 60-80% service appointments in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology is 2-4 courses. Service faculty assignments normally do not include a research component, although this can be negotiated with the Department Chair and the Dean's office.

4. The Faculty Evaluation File

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*. 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.

4.1 Productivity Reports

Faculty file materials must be uploaded to and organized in WVU's digital evaluation file. As of the date of these guidelines, the faculty file is housed in Watermark Faculty Success, also known as "Digital Measures," but these guidelines apply to any future system WVU may use to service the digital evaluation file.

Documents uploaded administratively to the digital evaluation file are: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, workload plans, and subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; and (d) other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include.

The teaching, research, and service portions of the digital evaluation file include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology recognizes that the distinction between teaching and research, research and service, service and teaching are not always clear. Letters of appointment, workload documents, and/or the faculty member's narrative should be used to clarify where such "efforts" in question should be placed. Nevertheless, in the case of any doubt, the FEC and Chair ultimately maintain the authority to determine where effort should be counted.

Once an item is entered into the digital evaluation file, it may not be removed after it has been reviewed. The digital evaluation file may be accessed and viewed by the faculty evaluation committee during the review period only. The Department Chair and Administrative Assistant maintain electronic access year-round. These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

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

4.1.1. Annual Reports

Faculty members must annually submit a report summarizing their teaching, research, and service activities completed during the academic year under review, using the template established by the Department, and must update their evaluation files in WVU's digital evaluation file. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is required. Faculty are responsible for providing the information required for assessment of faculty performance.

Annual reports are due by close of business (4:45 pm EST) the day after Labor Day (Tuesday following the first Monday in September) in electronic format through WVU's digital evaluation file. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process are added to the file after the deadline date, although faculty can immediately add materials to the digital evaluation file for the subsequent year of review. It is the faculty member's responsibility to keep their file up-to-date. The annual productivity period begins August 15 and ends August 14 the following year.

Faculty in their first year are required to submit their first report by December 31st as part of a first-year review mandated by the university.

Cumulative Pre-Promotion and Tenure (or Pre-Promotion) Report

Probationary tenure-track are subject to the cumulative pre-promotion evaluation, normally two years before their critical year (i.e. the year they bid for tenure), in order to determine the extent to which they are making clear progress toward tenure and/or promotion. [Note that in typical cases, the pre-promotion evaluation will be done in the faculty member's 4th year, and that the bid for tenure (and/or promotion) will be in the 6th year.]. The faculty member undergoing the cumulative pre-promotion evaluation should provide a statement that summarizes their 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. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, and service and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the pre-promotion cumulative review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract at that time. Non-tenure track and tenured and promoted faculty seeking discretionary promotion may also request a pre-promotion review, although this is fully voluntary.

4.1.2. Career Report

This is a report in which the faculty member summarizes their accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion and/or tenure. The career report start date is the hire date or January 1 in the year of last promotion, whichever is later. In the case where credit toward promotion and/or tenure is offered and accepted, the career report start date will be before the WVU hire date. The career report end date is December 31st for SOCA.

4.1.3. Tenure-Track Promotion Timeline

By March 1, candidates seeking promotion where research is an area of significant contribution notify the Chair in writing of their desire to be considered for discretionary promotion or of intent to be considered for tenure in the critical year.

By April 1, candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure should prepare a brief description of their areas of scholarly emphasis and methodologies to aid the Faculty Evaluation Committee in creating a list of external reviewers.

By April 15, prior to the start of the faculty member's critical year or elective promotion year, the Chair of the Department will ask the Faculty Evaluation Committee to prepare and submit a list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of the applicant's scholarship. At the same time, the applicant will be asked to prepare a similar list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of their scholarship, and to submit the list to the Chair.

By May 15, the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the candidate seeking promotion will each provide the Department Chair a list of eight names, as detailed below.

By June 7, the candidate seeking promotion will view the Faculty Evaluation Committee's list of proposed reviewers and comment on each as they feel necessary.

By the end of June, the Chair will consult with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences to draw up a list of reviewers and gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.

By September 15, the candidate's packet of materials must be submitted via WVU's digital evaluation file.

By October 1, the candidate's packet of the materials will be sent to external reviewers.

By December 1, external reviews will be due.

By December 31, the candidate submits their career report.

4.2 Supporting Evidence for Faculty Evaluation

Faculty members are required to document their productivity in all areas (teaching, research, and/or service) for which they have a workload percentage. Types of supporting evidence that should be included in the evaluation file are addressed below.

4.2.1. Teaching

In evaluating teaching and instruction, the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair shall follow the guidelines below. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes and 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.

A brief contextual narrative of one's teaching philosophy, major pedagogical overhauls, new course preparations and any drastic change in standard student evaluation scores is mandatory. All faculty members are encouraged to use a teaching portfolio approach in the presentation of their teaching activities. Such portfolios might include written comments based on class visitation by faculty peers or others, as well as relevant teaching materials including assignment guidelines (e.g., for research papers), examples of graded and graded student work (with personal identification removed), and written comments from students about the value of instructional activities. The detail in the portfolio should be proportionate to the faculty member's teaching assignment (e.g., someone with 80% teaching assignment should have a very thorough teaching portfolio whereas someone with a 20% assignment might have a briefer portfolio). At least one peer evaluation of teaching is required prior to any pre-promotion cumulative review.

Faculty members are responsible for documenting time and effort devoted to teaching. Evaluation in the area of teaching requires submission of the following items for all courses (and/or course equivalents) taught as **minimum documentation**: (1) the full university-issued student evaluation reports (numerical data and student comments) for all courses, and (2) course syllabi. Exceptions to providing full student evaluation reports for courses which are not regular courses must be noted and justified; exceptions might include independent study, research hours, staff listings, or orientation courses. Graduate courses and courses with enrollment lower than 5 students may be evaluated using an open-ended mechanism of the instructor's choosing. The annual report must include the student evaluation forms for the Fall, Spring, and Summer semester courses for the academic year under review, unless exceptions are justified. The full unedited report must be included in its entirety. Faculty are responsible for ensuring that the reports are in their digital evaluation file and must upload their reports manually if the reports are not centrally uploaded. The absence of evaluations will ordinarily result in an "unsatisfactory" rating in teaching for the relevant year. Faculty may, however, explain special circumstances leading to missing student evaluation data for a particular course. Faculty members should normally avoid relying solely on student evaluation ratings and syllabi to demonstrate their teaching performance. The quality of teaching should be further documented in WVU's digital evaluation file by offering optional materials as appendices from a variety of sources.

Faculty members who are in their first semester at WVU should receive student evaluations by the time

of their first annual review. However, due to the timing of semesters and student evaluation report processing (and deadlines set at the college level for submission of 1st year faculty reviews), this is not always possible. When student evaluation scores are not yet available, faculty members must specifically address in their narratives evidence of teaching quality in lieu of numerical evaluations, which may include unofficial evaluations, comments from students, and/or peer reviews of teaching, etc. to demonstrate their performance.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology values teaching contributions that help enact the land grant mission of the University. Faculty engaged in teaching that helps to advance WVU's land grant missions are encouraged to document these contributions in WVU's digital evaluation file.

Public and community-engaged teaching takes many forms, including formal and informal knowledge generating activities, and transmitting, sharing, and/or applying knowledge for the benefit of external audiences. For additional examples, see section 3.A. of the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*. Appropriate documentation of public and community-engaged teaching may include, for example, the development/implementation of curricula involving students off-campus and/or for study abroad with community engagement components; pre-college courses for K-12 youth; occupational short courses and certificates; educational media; not-for-credit workshops and classes; translating written materials for general public audiences; educational media interviews; and self-directed, managed learning in various contexts including museums, libraries, gardens, community centers, shelters, and prisons. Faculty may also document and highlight in written narratives multi/trans/interdisciplinary teaching if applicable.

Documented evidence of teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Community outreach/engagement that involves teaching
- A self-evaluation of teaching activities during the period under review;
- Participation in teaching-related workshops/seminars;
- Participation in professional conferences for teaching and pedagogy;
- Instructional materials (e.g., student guidance regarding research, visualization tools, etc.);
- Samples of assessed student work;
- Innovation in instruction (technology, activities, etc.);
- Course development;
- Curriculum development for major(s), minor(s), areas of emphasis
- Development/revision of study abroad materials;
- Sample examinations/assignments;
- Advising or mentoring;
- Teaching overload courses
- Graduate exam/thesis committees;
- Other evaluation instruments (unofficial evaluations, independent study/capstone evaluations, etc.);
- Peer's/Chair's evaluations of teaching;
- Teaching awards/recognition;
- Correspondence from current/former students;
- Evidence of GTA coordinator duties, such as:
 - Preparing/updating course syllabi and other materials;
 - Training and supervising (including leading group and individual meetings) the 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.

4.2.2. Research

Faculty members have the right and are responsible for documenting time and effort devoted to 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. It is expected that faculty will include in the file copies of all publications to be counted for the review period.

Faculty members must describe the nature of the publication to which a manuscript has been submitted (e.g. book, journal, conference proceedings, encyclopedia, etc.), the selection process involved (e.g. peer-reviewed or not), their level of contribution to the research/scholarship/creative work and any evidence of impact/quality of the publication (e.g., paper received an award from a professional association, manuscript published by a leading academic press, article published in leading disciplinary/interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary journal/journal, impact factor of journal, etc.). Faculty may choose to count publications as early as when it is unequivocally accepted or as late as when it appears in print. It cannot be counted before unequivocal acceptance and it cannot be counted later than the review period in which it appears in print.

Unequivocal acceptance can be indicated via email from an editor or a screenshot of the online submission program indicating unequivocal acceptance for publication. Documentation of one's research must include a research statement indicating contributions to any collaborative work and how one's work fits into a cohesive research agenda. A faculty member's research statement should always be framed with external reviewers in mind, but at the same time should limit unnecessary jargon to facilitate review across disciplinary boundaries. Documentation of presentations may be in the form of acceptance notifications or program page with author and paper information. Grant proposal submissions should be documented with the Project Summary (or equivalent) and the cover sheet from the Office of Sponsored Programs. Books can be documented with the title page and front matter, which includes all pertinent book details and publication information.

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology, as an interdisciplinary academic unit, recognizes and explicitly values research that takes many different forms, as described below, and that may appear, for example, in path-breaking new journals and on new digital platforms, and may take the form of publicly engaged scholarship and/or the scholarship of teaching, as well as more traditional forms of scholarship that appear in disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary journals. Book reviews, conference presentations, documentation of extensive, extended periods of intensive data collection and analysis, such as laboratory or fieldwork, may also be included and considered as part of the research portfolio.

Faculty members are therefore encouraged to use annual/pre-promotion/and career narratives to articulate for evaluators the significance of their research.

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology values research contributions that helps enact the land grant mission of the University. Faculty engaged in research that helps to advance WVU's land grant mission are encouraged to document these contributions in WVU's digital evaluation file.

Public and community-engaged research and creative scholarship is characterized by creative intellectual work conducted in collaboration with and/or for the benefit of community partners. This work is based on a high level of professional expertise that is likely to inform and foster further scholarly activity. It may include but is not limited to community-based, participatory research, applied research, contractual

research, demonstration projects, needs and assets assessments, and program evaluations; collaboratively created, produced, or performed film, theater, music, performance, sculpture, writing, spoken works, multi-media projects, and exhibitions; copyrights, patents, licenses for commercial use; innovation and entrepreneurship activities; university-managed or supported businesses ventures (business parks or incubators); new business ventures and start-ups; inventions; and social entrepreneurship.

Because of the nature of the enterprise, the forms of public scholarship evolve regularly and change more rapidly than do more traditional forms of scholarship (i.e., monographs, journal articles, and edited collections). Public scholarship is expansive in nature and includes, but is not limited to, print and digital forms of individual and collective scholarship, published in venues that reach broad audiences, such as media articles, op-eds, podcasts, websites and apps, and exhibits in public spaces. Public scholarship work may rely heavily on review and evaluation that involves community partners and other stakeholders outside of conventional academic or scholarly structures; this review should be regarded as meaningfully as is traditional peer review.

While some community-engaged research and creative scholarship may blur traditional distinctions between instruction, research/creative work, outreach/extension, and service activities, its significance must be validated through peer reviews by relevant internal and external communities, including community partners, or by adoption of creative products, protocol, or practices in the work of other peers in the field. This work may involve generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences (i.e., the community) in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. A faculty member's competence, achievements, and quality of excellence in community-engaged research/creative activity must be documented by evidence in the file.

Partial evidence of appropriate community engaged faculty research may include but is not limited to:

1. Clear academic and community change goals, including a final deliverable that will directly, positively contribute to the communities involved.
2. Appropriate use of scholarship to guide and inform community-engagement activities.
3. Scholarly rigor and community engagement at all stages of each project.
4. Evidence of impact on the field, university (i.e., student learning, faculty scholarly outcomes, etc.), and relevant communities.
5. Effective dissemination and presentation to community audiences.
6. Consistently ethical behavior.
7. Peer reviews.

Collaboration with faculty and graduate students is encouraged and faculty are expected to identify their contributions to such work and such can be used in review for promotion and/or tenure. At the same time, a research portfolio is strengthened when it includes some work and type of publications that show the competence and ability of the individual faculty member and separate contributions as a scholar. While both single and multiple authored work can be evaluated for promotion and tenure, it is wise counsel, particularly to Assistant Professors, that their work include single authored research as well as publications in which they are the first author. Authorship order must be reported on all publications.

While some products of research activity are obvious – like publications, posters, and submitted grant proposals – not all research activity is easily communicated within a research file. The faculty member should present a range of evidence types that help to convey the full scope of the research activity.

One consideration is the evidence type. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like posters or published manuscripts, are explicit illustrations of

research findings. Other evidence, like unfunded grant reviews, IRB protocols, or agendas of grant writing workshops, help to show a research project or researcher's development. Finally, some file materials, like the research narrative, performance review, or a scholar's research index or impact factor, provide some context for the research activity. One key to a successful research file is that it balances a range of evidence types.

Documented evidence of research may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **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. Ordinarily a peer-reviewed book is the equivalent of 2-6 peer-reviewed publications, with a lower publication equivalency attributed to shorter, secondary or tertiary-authored books, and an increasing publication equivalency for longer, first- or solo-authored books. Generally, books will be given credit for a period of three years for the purposes of performance-based pay. Edited volumes can be credited as a single peer-reviewed journal article (unless the editor also wrote multiple chapters, in which case the chapters are also considered as publications). Books must have page proofs (for tenure) or be in print (for discretionary promotion).
- **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. Faculty may publish works in journals described as "cutting edge" (e.g., representing emerging fields of study), publish review articles, invited articles, published edited volumes, etc.; such publications are considered scholarly works.
- **Book Chapters.** Book chapters which have been peer-reviewed 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 whether they are peer-reviewed. 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 (in accordance with the Department's P&T and Workload Guidelines).
- **Creative Works.** This category recognizes publication or performance of creative works, provided that it has a direct connection with the faculty member's professional specialization. This may include creating, curating, or editing literature, music, theater, visual art, or performances. The criteria to be applied in evaluating such creative work are the same as described in the above sections (under "articles" and "book chapters").
- **Publicly-Engaged Scholarship.** The department recognizes various forms of publicly-engaged scholarship as noteworthy contributions (e.g., scholarship involving participatory action research at local, state, regional levels, etc.). Faculty members submitting publicly-engaged scholarship for evaluation should include a statement clarifying how that work is appropriate to their research program and their field of study. These statements may also describe the level of impact that forms of publicly-engaged scholarship has on participants/stakeholders.
- **Grants.** The department recognizes the preparation and submission of grants that involve active research. The evaluation of a grant, contract, 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 funds are to be awarded. Awarded peer-reviewed externally-funded federal or equivalent grants/contracts may count as

equivalent to articles.

The complexities of what counts as research in an interdisciplinary department are primarily worked out in letters of appointment and workload documents. However, normally, Sociology and Criminology faculty engage in research/scholarship in the areas of books, book chapters, articles, publicly-engaged scholarship, and grants/contracts. The nature of scholarship outside of these areas should be justified and clarified by Sociologists and Criminologists regarding the extent to which they deserve to be recognized as research products per their letters of appointment and workload documents.

4.2.3. Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, college, university, or profession. Service should thus be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, profession, or community. Faculty must submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology understands "service" as comprised of two related components. (1) "Citizenship" denotes the contributions arising out of shared governance and the operation of academic degree programs. These include such activities as attending faculty meetings, serving on committees within the academic unit, participating in reviews of faculty performance, participating in searches for new faculty, participating in the assessment of departmental programs, and participating in special departmental events (e.g., retreats, presentations by visiting scholars). (2) Application of Expertise refers to activities that draw on a faculty member's specialized professional knowledge. These include such efforts as reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, serving on committees in professional associations, holding offices in professional associations and editing professional journals. Likewise, pursuant to the land-grant mission of WVU, applications of expertise refer to a broad range of activities that make specialized knowledge available to broader publics (e.g., local communities or the State as a whole), policy making groups (e.g., the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Services, cultural resource management groups, urban planners) and service agencies (e.g., the Rape and Domestic Violence Information Center).

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology, as an interdisciplinary academic unit, recognizes and explicitly values service that takes many different forms, including contributions to the effective operation of the University, college, school, department, or program as well as service that contributes to the land grant mission of the University, such as service to the community. These include chairing committees and actively serving on committees. Note that being listed on a committee without actually contributing to the effective functioning and productivity of the committee does not constitute 'active service' or 'contributions in service'. Faculty must actively participate in the life of their academic unit. Examples of active participation can include but are not limited to attending faculty meetings; service on committees; mentoring of students and junior faculty, whether through formal or informal channels; facilitating relevant professional development opportunities, such as organizing reading groups; student and faculty recruitment; coordinating program-level assessment of learning and program improvement processes; mentoring alumni, undergraduate and graduate students in professional development; overseeing specialized accreditation requirements; leading substantial curricular revision; and assuming leadership roles in the various activities listed above.

The Department of Sociology & Anthropology values service contributions that help enact the land grant mission of the University. Faculty engaged in service that helps to advance this mission are encouraged to document these contributions in WVU's digital evaluation file.

Service contributions to the land grant mission of the University can take a variety of forms including contributions to recruiting, outreach, engagement, advising, retaining, and graduating students from historically under-represented groups and programming related to these activities. For additional examples, see section 3.C. of the WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (2014-15).

Public and community-engaged service and practice are the use of University expertise to address specific issues identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. This work may include but is not limited to technical assistance, consulting, policy analysis, expert testimony, legal advice, clinical practice, diagnostic services, human and animal patient care, and advisory boards and other scholarly service to community organizations.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology understands “service” as comprised of citizenship and application of expertise. Citizenship need not be documented but lack of regular participation will be noted in chair reviews.

Faculty members are responsible for documenting time and effort devoted to application of expertise (i.e., service outside of the department), 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. Faculty should add evaluative statements 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.

Documenting service contributions outside of the department includes providing a brief, written explanation of the type of service, how it contributes to the university/college/school/department/program, the faculty member’s role in and actual level of contribution to the service activities, and the outcomes of service activities. Faculty must not overstate their level of contribution or suggest credit for others’ work.

Documented evidence of service may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Letters (or emails) of appointment to a committee, advisory board, etc., or election to a professional society position
- College or Program policy changes (e.g., the policy document with highlighted edits to the original policy)
- Letters (or emails) from community members showing significant engagement with the community and region
- Lists of programs or initiatives bridging faculty member’s interactions on campus and off campus.
- Documents showing evidence of change in practice, protocols, review of documents or curriculum, etc.
- Publications in local, regional or national news outlets related to service roles
- Lists of partnerships with employers (e.g., for student internships or student class projects)
- Lists of consultancies to community groups and organizations
- Evidence of contributions to the effective operation of the University, including contributions to the department, school or college. Include lists of committee memberships, positions held, time served, and accomplishments.
- List of administrative positions held, time served and brief explanation of your contribution to the advancement of the school, unit, department, program, etc.

- Lists of faculty mentoring activities (list by year, the faculty, students, alumni, or community members mentored, and types of mentoring provided)
- List of significant contributions to local, national, or international communities, service to professional societies, etc. that have not been listed elsewhere).
- Adoption of improved practices by institutional or groups resulting from research-based or practice-based programming (e.g., as outlined in organizational newsletters, operating procedures, etc.)
- Use of effective methods to disseminate research- or practice-based information to institutional, stakeholder, or client groups.
- Participation in the design and/or execution of applied or evaluative research (if not documented as part of the faculty member's research or teaching)
- Meeting minutes (if they provide evidence of active service not already documented)

5. TYPES OF EVALUATION

Tenure-track and tenured, teaching-track, and service-track faculty members receive three types of evaluation regarding their performance in teaching, research, and service from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair: annual, cumulative pre-promotion, and career evaluation. For the annual evaluation, fully promoted professors 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.

5.1. Annual Evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair write independent annual evaluation letters (i.e., the Chair is not limited by the FEC's evaluation). Materials will be evaluated independently by the FEC and the Department Chair. The FEC will submit all teaching faculty evaluations by September 30th, all Assistant Professors by October 31st, all Associate Professors by November 30th, any Professors who request to be evaluated by the committee and the Department Chair by December 31st, and faculty in their first year of appointment by January 15th. The Department Chair's evaluations will be added to theirs and submitted to Eberly by the requisite deadline outlined in the Eberly Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (which is also when the faculty are informed of their evaluation).

5.1.1. Contents of the Annual Evaluation Letter (written by the FEC and independently, by the Chair)

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., memorandum of understanding that modifies the faculty member's workload distribution, sabbatical leave, a parental work assignment during the reporting period).

Areas of Evaluation. The letter provides a categorical rating ("excellent", "good", "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory") of the faculty member's accomplishments for all areas for which there is a workload percentage during the reporting period and summarizes evidence that justifies the rating.

Contextual Evaluation. The letter considers the annual performance in the context of recent annual evaluations and assesses (1) whether FEC or Chair 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 and Chair's conclusions are to be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty member's files.

Recommendation. The Committee's letter includes the votes cast by the Committee members as well as a recommendation for or against continuation in rank. The recommendation is normally continuation in rank (termination is recommended by voting against continuation). 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 must include a recommendation regarding retention as well.

5.2. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Evaluation

Probationary tenure-track faculty are subject to the cumulative pre-promotion evaluation normally two years before their critical year, in order to determine the extent to which they are making clear progress toward tenure and/or promotion. 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 expected for tenure-track faculty, there will be particular emphasis on the development of an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment.

A cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is optional for all other types of faculty. For all faculty, the cumulative pre-promotion 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. In the case of tenure-track faculty, to demonstrate clear progress in teaching and/or failure to achieve an independent research/teaching/service program by the time of the pre-promotion cumulative review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year. For tenure track and teaching-track faculty, typically, reasonable contributions in service are also required. For service-track faculty, typically, reasonable contributions in teaching are also required.

The Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee's and Chair's reviews for this cumulative pre-promotion 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.

5.3. 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 the seventh year of employment.

Tenure-track faculty with qualifying experience (as outlined in their appointment letter) may be offered the option of requesting up to three years of credit toward tenure. If credit toward tenure is offered in the appointment letter and the faculty elects to claim it, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University must be included in the digital evaluation file. Tenure-track faculty need to carefully look at the dates in their initial appointment letter regarding bringing in years towards promotion and/or tenure (if offered) and should seek clarification from the department Chair if necessary regarding the "critical year" in which they submit materials to be reviewed for promotion/tenure.

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. This provision also applies to non-tenure track faculty who wish to advance the year of their first discretionary promotion review however, the non-tenure track faculty member is not issued a terminal contract. Rather, if they are not successful, they must sit out two years before applying again.

In a teaching appointment, faculty may choose to apply for promotion, and if successful, promotion is awarded by the end of the year after the faculty member's materials have been reviewed. Teaching faculty normally apply for their first promotion in the sixth year, as indicated in their letter of appointment, unless advanced as described in the preceding paragraph.

Teaching-track faculty with qualifying experience may be offered, in the appointment letter, the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward discretionary promotion. If credit toward promotion is offered and the faculty elects to claim it, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University must be included in the digital evaluation file. Teaching-track faculty need to carefully look at the dates in their initial appointment letter regarding bringing in years towards promotion (if offered) and should seek clarification from the department Chair if necessary regarding the year in which they submit materials to be reviewed for promotion.

In a service-track appointment, faculty may choose to apply for promotion, and if successful, promotion is awarded by the end of the year after the faculty member's materials have been reviewed. Service-track Faculty normally apply in the sixth year, as indicated in their letter of appointment. Service faculty with qualifying experience may be offered, in the appointment letter, the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward promotion. If credit toward promotion is offered and the faculty elects to claim it, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University must be included in the digital evaluation file. Service-track faculty need to carefully look at the dates in their initial appointment letter regarding bringing in years towards promotion (if offered) and should seek clarification from the department Chair if necessary regarding the year in which they submit materials to be reviewed for promotion.

Under special circumstances, faculty members may be able to extend the critical year. These special circumstances are defined in WVU 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 teaching-track or service-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 teaching or service promotion-eligible faculty member and their Chair may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. A teaching-track or service-track faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least two full years 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 overall productivity meets the requirements outlined in this document. It is not uncommon for a reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a "continuous program" of scholarship and achieved a regional/national/international reputation (which is often, but not exclusively, demonstrated by their publication record). Evidence of a faculty member's regional/national/international reputation can be established by external reviews.

External Reviews. As stated in the University Guidelines (sections XII and XIII), when research is an area of significant contribution, the evaluation file must contain external evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered when evaluating such faculty members. Outside reviewers should be experts in the relevant research area for each candidate. That is, evaluators of research should be able to judge the significance of presses and journals in which candidates have published. Teaching and service faculty do not require external reviews.

Qualifications for External Reviewers. The minimum qualifications to serve as an external evaluator require that the individual so identified hold at least the academic rank to which the applicant aspires, from the list of approved peer institutions. Normally reviewers will share a disciplinary or interdisciplinary background. In special cases, individuals from beyond the list of approved peer institutions, individuals who do not hold an academic appointment, or individuals who do not share a disciplinary or interdisciplinary background may be consulted if their areas of expertise are widely recognized in the profession and a strong case can be made for their ability to evaluate the work of an applicant for tenure and/or promotion, but these rare cases are always subject to special approval. To gain approval, the candidate for promotion makes an appeal to the chair who reviews and sends to the Dean upon approval. The Dean's Office determines whether the external reviewer can be used.

Assembling the Lists of Reviewers. Both the faculty applicant seeking promotion and the Faculty Evaluation Committee will assemble lists of potential external reviewers, consisting of a minimum of six names each (see Eberly Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Section IX). Both the applicant and FEC lists should include the following information about the individuals listed: Name; Rank; Current affiliation; and as much contact information, including addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses, as can be readily obtained. A brief description of the proposed reviewer's scholarly profile should also be provided. The applicant's list, furthermore, should include a statement concerning the applicant's professional and/or personal relationship (or the lack of any such relationship) with the reviewer.

By the first week in June, the applicant will view the Faculty Evaluation Committee's list of proposed reviewers and comment on each, specifically stating if they have any association with the reviewer. These comments will be recorded, the record signed and dated by the applicant. These comments should be taken into account when selecting the final list of reviewers, and when the external reviews are read by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair. The applicant will prepare a packet of materials for review according to instructions below.

By the end of June, in consultation with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, the Chair will draw up a list of reviewers, gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.

Packet for External Reviewers. By October 1, candidates seeking promotion should have ready their packet of materials to be sent to external reviewers. The Department will send these materials to reviewers the same week.

The packet for review must contain only materials that contribute to the record for the current review. Materials considered in a previous review or proscribed for consideration in the letter of agreement must not be included in the packet. An inventory of the materials offered for review should be included as well as a narrative about those materials. The applicant must provide an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae for the packet. Where it may be necessary to submit book-length studies for the review, the applicant must provide sufficient copies (usually six) for reviewer's packets at their and/or the Department's expense. The return of any materials submitted to reviewers should not be anticipated.

Materials for the packet for review must be supplied to the Chair by September 15. In rare circumstances, candidates may be granted additional time up until September 30.

Contents of the Career Evaluation Letter (written by the FEC and independently, by the Chair)

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., a Rule 4.5 extension of the tenure clock, a parental work assignment).

Summary of achievements during the period under review. The letter summarizes the faculty member's achievements in teaching/research/service in the appropriate review period. If applicable, the letter also summarizes the external evaluators' assessment of the faculty member's research.

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 as applicable. The Chair's letter provides a separate recommendation.

6. STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

6.1 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.

6.1.1. 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 are responsible for documenting their achievements in teaching, research, and service, including publicly-engaged scholarship (to the extent that these areas of contribution are specified in their position description).

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at West

Virginia University. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time faculty members, provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, serve as an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and document support of recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. The primary purpose of these annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the role and mission of the university. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary, however, in accordance with the type of appointment, rank, and, where appropriate, tenure status.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance and must be both formative and summative. The review is not limited to events of the one-year period under review, but rather it is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, and, if positive, as a basis for any available performance-based salary adjustment. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity for developmental changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the university. For tenured faculty, changes to the areas of significant contribution must be negotiated prior to the review year in which promotion will be requested and approved by the Dean and Provost. See university guidelines for specific applications for varied appointment, rank, and status types.

6.1.2. Evaluation of Teaching

Excellence in teaching requires professionalism in teaching scheduled courses, documentation of teaching effectiveness, reflective practices, course improvement, and/or advising effectiveness.

Annual teaching files rated as Excellent will contain multiple types of evidence of teaching effort and effectiveness that include information provided by the instructors themselves, peers, and/or students. In addition to fulfilling all the duties associated with teaching assigned courses and demonstrating professionalism and competency in these endeavors, for an instructor's teaching to be rated as

Satisfactory:

- For each course, an instructor must submit supporting documentation including:
 - The course's syllabus, including required and appropriate elements to the level of instruction
 - Results from the university-required student feedback instrument for the course
- When applicable based on one's workload assignment, an instructor must submit supporting documentation of advising including:
 - The number of undergraduate and graduate students advised
 - The results from the department's advising survey
- When an instructor was rated unsatisfactory and directed in the previous year's annual evaluation to construct a plan in order to positively enhance their performance in the classroom and/or their advising practices, they must submit evidence of changes and their successful implementation.

Failure to submit all the materials required for a rating of Satisfactory will result in an instructor's teaching being rated as Unsatisfactory.

To receive a meritorious rating for teaching, an instructor must submit the material required to earn a rating of Satisfactory and earn enough points based on submitting documentation of teaching effectiveness, reflective practice, course improvement, and/or advising effectiveness.

Ratings will be based on the following scale, which depends on the number of courses or course equivalents in an instructor's approved workload plan. (e.g., for an instructor teaching four courses in a

calendar year who submits all materials required to earn a rating of Satisfactory, earning from 0 to 7 points would result in a rating of Satisfactory, earning from 8 to 11 points would result in a rating of Good, and earning at least 12 points would result in a rating of Excellent.)

Good: 2 points per course equivalent

Excellent: 3 or more points per course equivalent

To earn points, evidence and documentation may be submitted for multiple courses or course equivalents. Instructors are not required or expected to earn points for each course each year if they are teaching multiple sections of the same course in the same format, but instructors should aim to assess the quality of all of their courses and improve their courses over the course of their teaching careers. Faculty teaching overload or summer courses beyond their established workload are expected to provide the minimal documentation expected of all courses (syllabi and student evaluations), but these courses will not be a part of the FEC or chair annual evaluation process, and they will not be eligible for points accrual for the purpose of annual reporting and evaluation.

Points can be earned in the following ways, with the maximum points that can be earned per year noted where applicable:

Teaching effectiveness:

Section III A of the West Virginia University Promotion and Tenure guidelines and section 4.2.1 of this SOCA document outline the desired qualities and expectations associated with teaching effectiveness. Below is the Department of Sociology and Anthropology point system associated with the documentation of teaching effectiveness.

<u>Points</u>	<u>Description</u>
2 points	Documentation of in-class peer-evaluation of teaching, for both the reviewer and the receiver of the review, if the receiver includes a reflection on the peer evaluation. Maximum of 4 points per year.
1 point per year	Statement on pedagogical approach (teaching philosophy)
1 point per year (TT and Service); 1 per course (Teaching):	Examples of instructional materials and/or exams/quizzes
1 point per year (TT and Service); 1 per semester (Teaching):	Unofficial evaluation instruments
1 point per year (TT and Service); 1 per course (Teaching):	Student focused materials, including samples of assessed student work or correspondence from current/former students.

Reflective practice:

<u>Points</u>	<u>Description</u>
2 points	Documentation of attending a teaching conference. Maximum of 2 points per year.
2 points per semester	Reflective responses to university-administered student evaluation comments/feedback on courses including plans to implement changes where relevant.
1 point	Documentation of attending a college- or university-sponsored Teaching or advising workshop. Maximum of 2 points per year.

Course quality and improvement:

<u>Points</u>	<u>Description</u>
2 points	Documentation of use of innovative or intensive teaching

1 point	and/or methods of assessing student learning. This can include technology usage, updated assignments/activities, or the implementation of a new teaching method. (2 points per unique course prep each semester) Documentation of significant updating of course readings and/or other course materials. (1 point per unique course prep each semester)
---------	--

Advising effectiveness:

<u>Points</u>	<u>Description</u>
1 point per sum of 8 advisees	Assigned and demonstrated effective advising of undergraduate students, advisees assigned for Spring and Fall semesters. Maximum of 5 points per year
1 or 2 pts (grad)	One point as a member or 2 points as a chair of 2 nd year paper, comprehensive exam, or dissertation committees. Maximum of 5 points per year
1 per student	Undergraduate independent study/research supervision, honors add-on, undergraduate teaching practicum. Maximum of 5 points per year

Other:

<u>Points</u>	<u>Description</u>
4 points	Development and teaching of a new course, a new course prep, or a study abroad experiential learning trip.
4 points	Winning a teaching or advising award at the college level or higher.
4 points	Teaching or pedagogy-focused publication: peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter that is peer reviewed and/or published by ranked press or major professional association. May be counted for teaching OR research, but not both.
4 points	Presenting a paper at a professional association's teaching Conference, if not counted in research.
1 point	Community outreach/service learning (e.g. working at a food bank with students and documenting and reflecting on the experience), if not counted in service.

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For teaching faculty, this effort is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include 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 contribution to solving problems and addressing the needs, priorities, and initiatives of the Department, College, and University. See WVU guidelines section IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS, B. Faculty Categories, 4. Teaching-track faculty

6.1.3. Evaluation of Research

Criteria. The criteria to be used for evaluating research and publication include quality and impact of research, quantity of research, type of publication and/or creative works, authorship, originality, and publication outlet/granting agency.

Quality and Impact of Research. As an interdisciplinary department, the department recognizes that there are many ways to have impact on a field. Research performance is not based on number of research publications alone. As part of promotion and tenure processes, tenure-track assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure will also have their research externally reviewed to assess the quality and impact of the work, and associate professors seeking promotion to full professor who have research as an area of significant contribution will also have their research externally reviewed to assess the quality and impact of the work, and must also achieve a regional/national/international reputation in research, which is assessed in terms of both the quantity and quality of the research. Thus, it is the faculty member's responsibility to document the quality and impact of their research in annual performance evaluations as well as in cumulative performance reviews. (For more information about types of research to be included, see section 4.2.2. of this document.)

Quantity of Research. Faculty are expected to achieve of a level of research publications that aligns with the research percentage in their annual workload documents. Percentages outlined in workload documents must, furthermore, align with faculty appointment letters and any modifications to the faculty member's appointment (e.g., as outlined in special memoranda for faculty in administrative positions). Annual review of each faculty member's number of publications is to be assessed using a 3-year rolling average. Thus, while number per year matters, annual performance in research takes into consideration the 3-year rolling average. Rolling averages are meant to not penalize faculty who have multiple products that are published in a particular calendar year, falling outside of their control. They are also meant to allow for credit for long-form scholarship, including ethnographic or archival-based work and single-authored scholarly monographs. In either case, it is the faculty member's responsibility to document an ongoing research program that maintains productivity and forwards progression towards the next phase of promotion or reward, when applicable. Regarding the expected number of publications, each faculty member's research appointment percentage must also be considered.

Products from publicly engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship may include scholarly products beyond peer-reviewed articles. In cases where alternate products will replace expectations for peer-reviewed articles for promotion, tenure or meritorious ratings, the nature of these works will be specified in the faculty member's letter of appointment or in a memorandum of understanding and confirmed in the workload document. Activities which do not result in some form of scholarly product for dissemination, and yet still fall within the faculty member's professional responsibilities, normally should be documented as service.

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.

Originality. Research must be original to count towards evaluations and promotion. Examples of original research include articles, creative writing, critical editions, textbooks, creative works,

edited volumes, and publicly engaged scholarship. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document the level (e.g., national, international) and scope (disciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary) of the outlet. Similarly, it is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the level and scope of the granting agency.

Research Impact Given Publication Outlet/Granting Agency. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document the prestige/impact/innovativeness/accessibility/reach of the outlet in which the research/creative work appears and/or of the agency from which a grant/contract is received. It is also the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate how and the extent to which they have established a leading reputation in their field, which may be at the local, regional, national and/or international level.

The following descriptions are to be used to guide the FEC's and Department Chair's assessments of quality and quantity of research productivity. *These descriptions assume a faculty member with a workload research expectation of 40%. (For faculty with a research expectation of greater or less than 40%, the metrics below are to be adjusted to reflect the faculty member's actual research percentage (e.g., 50%, 30%, 20%, 10% etc.).*

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present:

- Evidence of publication(s) and/or grants/contracts that meets or exceeds the quality/quantity required according to the 3-year rolling average, given the percentage of their workload dedicated to research. For tenure-track faculty with a 40% research assignment, the rolling average required is one publication (or equivalents as defined in the next paragraph) per year. For 40% research, a three-year average of 1 = Excellent. For 50% research, average > 1.25 = Excellent; 30% research > 0.75 = Excellent; 20% research > 0.50 = Excellent; 10% research > 0.25 = Excellent.
- In addition to the publication criteria above, to receive a research descriptor of "Excellent" in a given year faculty members must document at least 2 of the following forms: article manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals; submission of a competitive external grant or fellowship; submission of a book proposal; an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-peer-reviewed publication, such as an encyclopedia entry or book review; non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings; public scholarship related to field of study but without a published product; pedagogical materials submitted for publication (if not counted under "Teaching"); documented evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project, such as a book manuscript, full article drafts, or laboratory, archival, or field-based research; a presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference.
- Documentation of research for credit may include the acceptance or publication of one scholarly article in a refereed journal; or acceptance or publication of a chapter in a book; or acceptance or publication of a research note of substantial length in a peer-reviewed journal; and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings from a national or international conference; and/or acceptance or publication of an edited book for which the faculty member is the/an editor whose research expertise is essential to the vision, structure, and scholarly contribution of the edition; and/or award of a nationally and/or internationally recognized externally funded grant/contract based on submission requiring active research related to the faculty member's area of expertise; and/or publicly engaged scholarship and creative works. 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).
- Note that a refereed and/or editorially reviewed scholarly book with a substantial scholarly

publisher, edited volumes, and textbooks, submitted for evaluation will be counted for up to three years upon acceptance or publication. To gain credit upon publication, faculty members must provide a copy of the full accepted or published manuscript.

- Note that publications such as book reviews, non-peer-reviewed book/journal introductions/chapters, and related publications that are scholarly but that involve primarily the review of others' work may also be submitted as evidence of faculty members' research productivity, but that the weight given to such pieces is less than full-length original research/scholarship. These kinds of publications, depending on the faculty members' percentage workload in research, may help contribute to a rating of excellent in any given year when evaluated as one among multiple publications. But such publications are not to be counted as equal to full-length original publications/creative pieces. (For faculty whose workload percentage for research is less than 30%, publications such as book reviews and introductions may be sufficient to warrant a rating of excellent in a given year.)
- (For more information about types of research to be included, see section 4.2.2. of this document.)

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

- Evidence that clearly demonstrates nearing the expected publication quality/quantity required, given the percentage of their workload dedicated to research. On a three-year rolling average, 40% Research = <1 but greater than 0.75 articles or equivalent; 50% = 1.00; 30% = 0.50; 20% = 0.33, 10% = no publication requirement, but evidence of 2 of the research activities listed in the paragraph below .
- In addition to the publication criteria above, to receive a research descriptor of "Good" in a given year faculty members must document at least 2 of the following forms: article manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals; submission of a competitive external grant or fellowship; submission of a book proposal; an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-peer-reviewed publication, such as an encyclopedia entry or book review; non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings; public scholarship related to field of study but without a published product; pedagogical materials submitted for publication (if not counted under "Teaching"); documented evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project, such as a book manuscript, full article drafts, or laboratory, archival, or field-based research; a presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference.

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

- Evidence that demonstrates progress in meeting expected publication/grant quality/quantity but is *well* below the number of publications required according to the 3-year rolling average, given the percentage of their workload dedicated to research. On a three-year rolling average, 40% = < 0.75 article or equivalent; 50% < 1 ; 30% < 0.33 ; 20% = 2 research activities listed below; 10% = 1 research activity listed below.
- In addition to the publication criteria above, a faculty member may receive a research descriptor of "Satisfactory" in a given year by documenting at least 1 of the following forms: article manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals; submission of a competitive external grant or fellowship; submission of a book proposal; an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-peer-reviewed publication, such as an encyclopedia entry or book review; non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings; public scholarship related to field of study but without a published product; pedagogical materials submitted for publication (if not counted under "Teaching"); documented evidence of substantial progress in an on-going research project, such as a book manuscript, full article drafts, or laboratory, archival, or field-based research; a presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional

conference.

Additional Notes Regarding Evaluation of Research:

- The ratings of excellent or good in themselves do not guarantee promotion or tenure.
- A faculty member may decide to claim credit for a publication for the year it is accepted or the year it is in print (but not both). Only books may be counted for credit for multiple years.
- Note that 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.

6.1.4. Rating of Service Contributions

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

Departmental Citizenship

All faculty whose appointments include a service component are expected to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the department in the operation of its academic programs. These activities should be specified in workload documents and may include work on departmental committees, task forces, and other administrative duties, serving as a faculty advisor to honor societies and clubs, and coordinating ad hoc committees and special events. Those faculty serving in an official administrative capacity (i.e. Chair, Associate or Assistant Chair) will have designated service percentage allocations outlined in an appointment letter and/or MOU (and subsequent workload documents) and will be considered as demonstrating leadership in these roles.

Application of Expertise

Outside the department, the particular combination of service contributions can vary among individual faculty members, in accordance with their specialized areas of competence, personal interests, letters of appointment and annual workload documents. Examples include the following, in no implied rank order:

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 or field; consulting for publishers; grant/contract review panels; grant/contract project advisory boards; 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.

To the State and Public, e.g., work with state or region K-12 teachers, public schools, local libraries, museums, shelters, gardens, and other community organizations; educational programs for the public, including (e.g.,) open lectures, educational activities youth groups, local pantries, and prison populations; educational workshops for the public. Other types of state and public service related to the field of expertise may apply.

To the College and University, e.g., work on faculty senate, committees, councils, task forces, and other participation in the governance/administrative system of the College and University;

study abroad program organization and administration; faculty advisor to College- and University-wide student organizations; and other consultations for units within the University. Other types of College and University service may apply.

Altered contracts and leadership designation: Those faculty with altered contracts that indicate a higher percentage of service will list service tasks that fall under the designative administrative position(s), and those that fall under service to the department. Those faculty without altered contracts (i.e. no MOU that designates an atypical/extra administrative role) will delineate the distribution of their duties between teaching and service.

Comparable service activities will be considered for evaluation. Activities unrelated to the mission of the University, College, Department, or Profession will not be counted as part of service. Evaluation of service will be based on both qualitative and quantitative dimensions as listed below.

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.

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.

Duration. Capacity and term of service.

Effort. Time and energy required by service activities.

Evaluation of service is a measure of the *quantity of service units*, including time and energy expended as well as the *outcomes produced*, including the *quality of the contribution*. One service unit is the equivalent amount of time as serving on a committee. Outside of committees, what counts as one service unit is ordinarily determined by one's workload document. The Department recognizes that faculty members perform a wide variety of service activities and that those whose service produces results deserve greater recognition than those whose contributions are minimal and/or produce little result. There is an expectation for tenure-track and teaching faculty that at least 1-2 of their service units should be in the department. Service faculty will likely have a higher expectation, as outlined in their MOU, contract, and/or workload documents. Departmental leadership positions (e.g., chairing a department committee) may count for 2 or more service units as specified in a faculty member's workload document or MOU. Faculty who apply their expertise in the form of non-departmental leadership positions may have them count for up to 2 service units as specified in their workload document or MOU. Faculty who have the opportunity to serve in significant professional service roles (e.g., accounting for a percentage of their time being funded by a journal publishing house), such as serving as a journal editor or officer in a professional society, must provide evidence, coordinate with the Chair to gain approval, and provide clear documentation of activities/accomplishments in their annual review document.

To receive a rating of **EXCELLENT**, a faculty member with a *20 percent service* obligation to the department will serve the equivalent of **three** service units and document how their service demonstrates a contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, and/or profession. A faculty member must fulfill departmental service expectations as outlined in their workload document or MOU. Other service units may come from any level of application of expertise (i.e., college, university, professional, and/or community) and documentation of impact and effort (i.e., the quality of service) as

described previously must be provided.

To receive a rating of **GOOD**, a faculty member with a *20 percent service* obligation will engage in the equivalent of **two** service units and document how their service demonstrates a contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, and/or profession. A faculty member must fulfill departmental service expectations as outlined in their workload document or MOU. The other service unit may come from any level of application of expertise (i.e., college, university, professional, and/or community) and documentation of impact and effort (i.e., the quality of service) as described previously must be provided). For example, a faculty member might serve on one departmental committee and one university committee.

To receive a rating of **SATISFACTORY**, a faculty member will effectively engage in **one** service unit. All faculty whose appointments include a service component are expected to contribute to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Such a contribution is a minimal expectation for an annual evaluation of "Satisfactory."

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 one service unit 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, in the workload plan, or an MOU. 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. For instance, for a faculty member with a 60% service component, Excellent = 9 or more service units; Good = 6-8 units; Satisfactory = 3-5 units; Unsatisfactory = < 3 units.

6.2 Standards for Promotion of Tenure-Track , Teaching-track, and Service-track Faculty Members

Promotion/Tenure Report

In a year when a faculty member is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member uses the Faculty Productivity Report template in Digital Measures to produce a Promotion/Tenure Report that links to supporting materials submitted to the digital evaluation file during the time in rank related to teaching, research, and service. This is a more extensive version of the Annual Report. The Promotion/Tenure Report and supporting materials are due on December 31.

Standards for Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty

The specific standards for promotion for tenure-track faculty are outlined in Table P1. Note that they require a preponderance of meritorious annual ratings in research and teaching for the period under review as well as for the last three years of that period. This is to guard against a deteriorating trend in the annual ratings.

Evaluation of the quality and impact of research will be assisted by external evaluations from reviewers at peer institutions. The external evaluations also will assist judgments about the faculty member's emerging (for promotion to Associate Professor) or established (for promotion to full Professor) national or international visibility in research.

The standards for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are more stringent than those from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. A faculty member seeking promotion to Professor must produce a greater quantity and higher quality of results than a faculty member seeking a promotion to Associate Professor.

Standards for Promotion of Teaching-track Faculty

The specific standards for promotion of teaching-track faculty are outlined in Table P2. Note that they require a preponderance of meritorious annual ratings in teaching for the period under review as well as for the last three years of that period. This is to guard against a deteriorating trend in the annual ratings. All faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For teaching-track faculty members without a specific research assignment in the Workload Plan, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. Teaching-track faculty with research assignments should provide evidence that their research activity meets the criteria outlined in Table P2.

To be promoted, the digital evaluation file must include evidence of a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence and of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission.

Standards for Promotion of Service-track Faculty

The specific standards for promotion of service-track faculty are outlined in Table P3 in Section XI. Note that they require a preponderance of meritorious annual ratings in service for the period under review as well as for the last three years of that period. This is to guard against a deteriorating trend in the annual ratings.

Service faculty assignments may include a 5-10% research component. A Service faculty appointment requires a reasonable contribution in research, and the expectations in terms of presentations or publications depends on the percentage of the assignment allocated to research.

P1: Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track & Tenured Faculty Members

Tenure-Track Assistant Professor to Tenured Associate Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
- Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. - At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating. - Evidence of regular participation as a member or chair of comprehensive	- At least 6 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly papers (or equivalent, as outlined in 4.2.2) have been published or have received final acceptance for publication during time in rank. - At least one external grant has been awarded as PI or co-I during time in rank, or a track record of grant applications shows promise of future awards, or research accomplishments that offset grant expectations. - Evidence of potential for national or international recognition of their scholarship.	- Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department. - Preponderance of "Satisfactory" or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank

exam, 2nd year paper, and
dissertation committees.

- Preponderance of “Good”
or “Excellent” annual
ratings from the FEC and
Department Chair during
time in rank and
meritorious in the last 3
years in rank.

- Research is judged to be of
high quality and impact by
external reviewers at peer
institutions.

- Preponderance of “Good”
or “Excellent” annual
ratings from the FEC and
Department Chair during
time in rank and
meritorious in the last 3
years in rank
-

Tenured Associate Professor to Tenured Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
- Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. - At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating. - Evidence of regular participation as a member or chair of comprehensive exam, 2nd year paper, and dissertation committees. - Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.	- At least 8 substantive scholarly peer-reviewed papers (or equivalent, as outlined in 4.2.2) published during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank. - Evidence of national or international recognition of their scholarship, as evidenced by quality of publications, international scope of publications, and/or citation counts. Can also include invitations to speak, service as an editor of a journal, election or appointment to leadership roles in scholarly organizations. - At least one external grant (as PI or Co-I) has been awarded during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, or a track record of grant applications shows promise of future awards, or research accomplishments that offset grant expectations. - Research is judged to be of high quality and impact by external reviewers at peer institutions.	- Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department. - Evidence of service to the college, university, profession, and/or community. - Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.

- Preponderance of
“Good” or “Excellent”
annual ratings from the
FEC and Department
Chair during time in
rank if less than 6
years, or during the last
6 years in rank, and
meritorious in the last
3 years in rank
-

P2: Promotion Standards for Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty Members

Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
- Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. - Demonstrated individual contributions to curricular development, programmatic growth and/or assessment. - At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating. - If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. - Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during the last 5-6 years in rank during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the	Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years.	- Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department. - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. - Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years.

last 6 years, and
meritorious in the last 3
years in rank.

Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
- Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. - Demonstrated individual contributions to curricular development, programmatic growth and/or assessment. - Demonstrated evidence that professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally or internationally, acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline or unit. - At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating. - If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.	Preponderance of "Satisfactory" or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank.	- Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department. - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. - Evidence of substantial contributions in service (e.g., as a committee chair) at the department, college, university, professional, or community levels. - Preponderance of "Satisfactory" or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.

- Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.

P3: Promotion Standards for Non-Tenure Track Service Faculty Members

Differences between the standards for promotion to full professor vs. promotion to associate professor are shown in bold type.

Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
• Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. • At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a satisfactory rating. • If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.	• If relevant, preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank.	• Service portfolios provide evidence of ongoing activities that address needs, priorities, and initiatives of the department, as well as needs of the institution and, if assigned, community service. • If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. • Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.

- Preponderance of
“Satisfactory” or better
annual ratings from FEC
and Department Chair
during time in rank if less
than 6 years, or during the
last 6 years in rank, and
meritorious in the last 3
years in rank.
-

Service Associate Professor to Service Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
- Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. - At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a satisfactory rating. - If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. - Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.	Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank.	- Service portfolios provide evidence of ongoing activities that address needs, priorities, and initiatives of the department, as well as needs of the institution and, if assigned, community service. - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. - Evidence of substantial contributions in service at the department, college, university, professional, or community levels. - Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and meritorious in the last 3 years in rank.

7. Rebuttal of recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or continuation, and Response to Annual Evaluation

According to WVU P&T guidelines, [Section XIII.A.4](#), and ECAS P&T guidelines, Section VIII, faculty members may write a *rebuttal* of a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or non-continuation, within 5 working days of receipt of the recommendation.

Faculty may also submit a *response* to the chair or the Dean of an annual review within 10 working days of receipt of the evaluation.

Prior to such action, the Department of Sociology & Anthropology also allows a faculty member to communicate with the chair of the FEC if the faculty member feels that there are inaccuracies, errors, or omissions in his or her annual evaluation(s). After reviewing the faculty member's appeal, the chair and/or the FEC can provide a corrected document if either the chair and/or the FEC feel(s) a correction is warranted.

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the chair. If decisions have been made that are construed as arbitrary or capricious, or in violation of a rule, then a grievance might be appropriate. In such cases, to be prudent, faculty should work informally with the chair while simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the fifteen-day window for filing a grievance will be met.

8. Performance-Based Salary Policy

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations. Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the dean of the college.

Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology uses the college formula. 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. Example

1:

- 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

Example 2:

- 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 Chair present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations.

The receipt of performance-based pay in one or several years does not guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted or tenured. The department makes a clear distinction between the process of promotion and tenure review and the annual ratings that are used for performance-based pay increases. Exemplary performance in teaching must be matched by an appropriate record in research following the criteria laid down in this document in order for a tenure-track faculty member to be promoted or tenured.

9. Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and continuation or non-continuation. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files.

The Department FEC must include a minimum of five members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure must not serve on the committee reviewing her/his evaluation file. When possible, the faculty evaluation committee shall reflect the larger faculty with the exception that the majority of the committee must be tenured and at the rank of Associate or Full Professor. Untenured or un-promoted tenure-track faculty may ask or may be asked to serve during their probationary period but no more than one term. There are no such limits for teaching or service-track faculty. A slate of eligible faculty – i.e., those who are not seeking promotion, on sabbatical or other reassignment – will be presented by the Department Chair at the final faculty meeting of the year. The faculty vote to approve the slate unless extenuating circumstances occur (e.g., the chair learns of a disqualifying characteristic). The Department Chair will select committee members using the following recommendations: (a) when possible at least one person at the rank of Professor will serve, (b) a majority of members of the committee will be tenured, (c) three year terms for tenured faculty will be staggered to ensure institutional memory, (d) ordinarily untenured tenure-track members of the committee serve for one year and have a much more nominal workload, (e) when possible, at least one Women's and Gender Studies faculty member, affiliate, or a faculty member with relevant WGST background will serve. Consecutive 3-year terms should ordinarily be avoided at all costs.

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

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. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential.

Members must recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating themselves, their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. Faculty members who serve on the College committee may not serve on the Department evaluation committee.

10. Procedure for 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.