

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
EBERLY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Guidelines for Annual Review, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved by the School of Social Work May 14, 2010 [revised and re-approved June 30, 2026]
Approved by the Office of the Provost June 14, 2010 [revised and re-approved June 30, 2026]

The School of Social Work Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Pay 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 within the School, the purpose of this document is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the School level. School policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University 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 document and in the Board of Governors and University and Eberly College documents. In the event of conflict among documents, their precedence, in the following order, is Board of Governors, University, Eberly College, and School of Social Work.

The School of Social Work's faculty evaluation process is intended to: Guide faculty toward enhanced success; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the School; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, the digital evaluation file, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenured, tenure-track, and promotion-eligible service, teaching, and research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. By Eberly College policies, tenure-track faculty are also subject to a cumulative pre-promotion review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations of one's letter of appointment, by the time of the cumulative pre-promotion review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Reference to “tenure-track” faculty in this document includes tenure-track faculty during their probationary period, unless otherwise noted. “Tenured faculty” are faculty who have earned tenure. Reference to “non-tenure track” faculty will include all other faculty tracks (e.g., visiting, service, research, or teaching faculty).

Appointment Letters and Assignments

Each faculty member shall have an appointment letter that defines broad, ongoing and multi-year expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service.

A faculty member’s assignment in teaching, research, and service normally adds up to a 100% full time assignment. These assignments may differ depending upon the faculty member’s categorization.

Tenure-track, Tenured, Teaching, Research, and Service faculty positions are promotable. In such cases, the appointment letter identifies the area(s) of significant contribution in which meritorious performance is required as well as the timeline for promotion. In some cases, the letter may give an individual with previous relevant experience (normally in a similar position) the option to count achievements at their previous institution towards promotion or tenure, if applicable, at WVU.

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual workload plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and the Director. They provide opportunities to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All tenured, tenure-track, and promotion-eligible and/or performance-based salary-eligible non-tenure track faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The allocation of a faculty member’s teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Standard workload assignments in the School of Social Work are stipulated in the School of Social Work Workload Guidelines document.

The standard annual teaching assignment for research-active tenured and tenure-track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the School of Social Work is four 3- or 4-credit courses or their equivalent. “Research-active” in this context is defined as engaged in ongoing scholarly work that leads to regular publication in peer-reviewed outlets and/or grant activity. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their teaching assignments adjusted to include additional teaching. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the faculty member’s expectations for promotion (See Section XI of the West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure). The percentages of the appointments allocated to teaching, research, and service that are applied in annual reviews and calculation of performance-based salary

increases remain as they are described in the appointment letter unless adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Dean.

For faculty members approved for sabbatical leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the leave period.

For various types of leave certain standard allocation percentages will ordinarily apply:

- Faculty on a full year's sabbatical leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester's leave, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member's annual evaluation would typically be 70% teaching, 20% research and 10% service. Teaching faculty would typically be 90% teaching and 10% service.
- Faculty on a full year sabbatical leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 70% research, 20% teaching and 10% service.
- A similar allocation may apply to other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

Copies of the approved leave application and plan (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the digital evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

Tenure-Track Faculty

For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Under standard College guidelines, designated research-intensive tenured or tenure-track appointments may be 30% teaching and 50-60% research—normally with substantive external grant activity as a principal investigator or major co-investigator – required for award of tenure in research-intensive appointments. Initial tenure-track appointments normally are made at the rank of Assistant Professor and normally require a doctoral degree in social work or a relevant field.

Teaching & Service Faculty

The standard workload assignment for full-time teaching faculty is based on four courses or teaching equivalents (a teaching equivalent is a 3 or 4 credit hour course) per semester or eight

courses or teaching equivalents per academic year. Expectations for teaching may be adjusted depending upon various objective criteria, including expectations for research/scholarship productivity and external grants, active participation in graduate programs, and significant service expectations.

For non-tenure-track teaching faculty, responsibilities are typically defined as 80% teaching and 20% service. For non-tenure-track service faculty, normally 60% or more of the assignment is in service and 40% or less is in teaching. Normally, no research requirement is assigned for teaching and service faculty. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works, as defined in the letter of appointment. For Teaching-track faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. Evaluation for teaching and service assignments will be based on the percentage breakdown.

The Faculty File

Faculty must annually update their digital evaluation file with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On a deadline date specified by the School, the file shall be closed for the review period. After the deadline date, only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file for that year.

Digital evaluation files will be organized following a format that maintains sections for faculty to document (1) the administrative file, and for documentation of (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service.

The administrative section of the digital file includes elements archived by the administration (not faculty). These include: (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, subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; (d) other information and records that the school director may wish to include.

The teaching, research, and service sections of the digital file include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member submits documentation to the appropriate sections. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is required.

Annual Report

Faculty members are responsible for documenting the information required for assessment of their own performance in the digital evaluation file. Faculty must provide a digital faculty productivity report using the format established by the School and Eberly College. The full reporting of information and its presentation and discussion are important to the faculty evaluation process.

Faculty Responsibility for Information. The burden is on the faculty member to provide adequate information for a full and fair assessment by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and the School Director. Under University policy, the FEC and School Director will limit their review to information in the annual report and digital evaluation file. Where there is missing information and/or documentation, the FEC and School Director cannot provide recognition or credit for work done. Normally, the absence of student evaluations will result in an unsatisfactory rating in teaching because adequate evidence of effective teaching has not been provided.

Submission of Annual Report. Faculty members must submit their electronic annual productivity report by **December 31** each year. In addition, faculty members are advised to retain an electronic copy for their own use and files.

Digital Evaluation Files

Faculty are strongly encouraged to keep their digital evaluation file updated throughout the year. The School Director may also include items in the digital evaluation file and must advise faculty of these additions. The annual report will cover all important activities and accomplishments during the year and may refer to items already part of the digital evaluation file.

The digital evaluation file will be kept in a system specified by the University (Digital Measures/Faculty Success by Watermark, as of the date of these guidelines). Faculty will have secure access to their file. Administrative support may be utilized to assist the FEC and School Director with distributing draft letters, counting and recording votes, collecting signatures, making copies and performing other duties as assigned. All personnel involved in faculty reviews will maintain confidentiality.

Digital Evaluation File Access. The School FEC members shall have access to the faculty digital evaluation files. Access to the file for members of the FEC is limited to the annual review process, promotion and tenure review, and emeritus status review.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review process spelled out in this document also serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks.

All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are to be reviewed and receive annual evaluations by the School Director. Fully promoted faculty are evaluated yearly solely by the School Director unless they submit a written request for an evaluation by the FEC ninety days before their file closes for review. All other faculty are evaluated by both the School Director and FEC. All full-time or promotable non-tenure track, tenure-track, and tenured faculty participate in formalized annual workload planning and feedback. Non-tenure track

faculty will also participate in this process unless stated otherwise in their letter of appointment.

For all faculty, feedback will include observations, advice or suggestions from the committee and School Director related to the faculty member's performance, prospects for promotion, or other relevant issues. The yearly evaluation also includes a judgment about whether the faculty member is on track for the next career step (promotion, tenure) and what steps, if any, are needed for improvement.

Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as the designated committee of faculty for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and, when necessary, non-continuation. The committee will ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based only on the contents of a faculty member's digital evaluation file, as indicated above. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty evaluation files.

All members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even when a member is recused from voting. One or more FEC members may also write a dissenting opinion that is included as part of the regular letter.

Organization of the Social Work Faculty Evaluation Committee

1. The FEC shall consist of at least five members, the majority of whom must hold tenure. Members of the Committee are generally elected by the full-time (1.0 FTE) permanent faculty members who are subject to evaluation by the FEC. Regardless of whether FEC members are elected by the faculty or appointed by the School Director, upon consultation with the FEC, the individuals eligible for potential membership on the FEC must be inclusive of categories of full-time permanent faculty in the unit (Tenured, Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Service) who qualify for performance-based salary increases. The term of service is one year.

The following individuals are not eligible to serve on the Committee: (a) the School Director, (b) anyone under consideration for promotion or tenure, and (c) anyone who is serving on the College FEC. Anyone who is in the immediate family or household of an individual who is evaluated by the FEC may serve but should recuse themselves for reviews of that individual. Because the salaries of Research faculty members are contingent on external funding, they are not considered "permanent" faculty members for the purposes of these Guidelines. The FEC will be formed by September 15 of each year.

2. The FEC shall elect a Chair. The FEC Chair shall be responsible for assigning committee members to annual reviews. The Chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on the FEC. Possible conflicts of interest in evaluating specific faculty members will be discussed so that members of the FEC can be recused if necessary.
3. The FEC shall be responsible for carefully reviewing each faculty member's digital evaluation file and writing a review letter that will be signed by the FEC. Annual review letters for tenure-track and tenured faculty in non-critical years and non-tenure track faculty shall be drafted by working procedures established by each FEC. For each letter, a majority vote of the full committee will be necessary to recommend continuation, promotion, the award of tenure and assignment of the descriptors (excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) used to determine performance-based pay.
4. In promotion and/or tenure decisions, the two primary FEC reviewers for that individual must be at or above the rank being considered. For tenure-track and tenured faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion, the two primary reviewers must be tenured faculty at the rank being considered or higher. If additional members are needed for the FEC, they will be selected by the School Director based on that year's FEC voting results. The School Director will appoint the required number of additional members who meet the ranking requirements based upon who received the highest number of faculty votes for appointment to that year's FEC.
6. Members must recuse themselves when the FEC is evaluating a 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 FEC may not serve on School FEC in the same year.
7. It is understood that members of the FEC keep deliberations and all information contained in digital evaluation files confidential.

Performance Descriptors

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.

The annual review normally covers performance only for the calendar year under review (i.e., spring, summer, and fall of the calendar year). However, evaluative statements from previous years may be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement, and

to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable to their appointment.

Peer review by the committee should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are made. Letters should clearly state whether a faculty member is making progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

A faculty member's work must be adequately documented. If, for example, information is provided for one course when one's assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating should be questioned.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide for the digital evaluation file evidence (1) that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the digital evaluation file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the reader's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I must conclude that the faculty member's work is unsatisfactory."

Evaluation of Research and Scholarship

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work must 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. The unit may accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance.

Faculty must submit evidence of research or scholarly or creative activity evidence that includes, but goes beyond, publications. This evidence might include:

Research Priority Categorizations

Priority One. Priority one products include peer-reviewed journal articles books, grants, and other products of scholarship as defined below.

- a) **Peer reviewed journal articles.** Refers to journal articles that normally have undergone peer review (blinded or unblinded).
- b) **Books.** Refers to books that are already completed and either published or under contract to be published (unequivocally accepted for publication). Book quality will be judged by: (1) the identity and reputation of the publisher, (2) professional external review and opinion (in published form such as a book review, or in letter form solicited from external peer evaluators with recognized stature in the subject matter of the work), and (3) the judgment of the committee based on the complexity and skill demonstrated in the undertaking, and the significance of the work in the field. Edited books may be included depending on the significance of the contributions of the editor. A book judged applicable according to these methods can be the equivalent of multiple journal publications or book chapters.
- c) **Book chapters, monographs, edited series and research notes.** These elements must be of a substantial length and have undergone some type of systematic professional peer review.
- d) **External funding.** Refers to external grants secured by the faculty member during the review year. Note: Funded external research grants may count as a Priority 1 publication but are not intended to replace publications required for promotion or tenure.

Priority Two. Includes publications and scholarly work such as:

- a) Applied research such as consulting studies, reports, and other professional applications for governmental, nonprofit, or other public or community users resulting in publications or written research products may be given weight to the extent that they represent a valuable contribution to public service or governance and a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in professional theory and practice.
- b) Peer reviewed conference and professional society papers and published proceedings. In exceptional circumstances, such publications may be appropriate as a Priority One publication.
- c) Teaching or clinical notes in a journal (i.e., short pieces about teaching pedagogy, etc. that are not peer-reviewed)
- d) Internal or non-competitive funding for research projects as evaluated (judged) by the FEC.
- e) Book reviews.

Review of Priority One Publications

Priority One publications include peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and books. Books judged according to the criteria listed can be the equivalent of multiple journal publications and book chapters. As assessed by the FEC, a book may be considered for scholarly work beyond the year in which it is published. Generally, books will be given credit for up to three years for the purposes of performance-based pay, depending on the complexity, length and significance of the work; that is, an annual rating of Excellent may be given for a peer-reviewed book when the manuscript has been accepted for publication, again when the book is actually published, and a third time in the following year. However, such a publication will only be counted once for purposes of promotion or tenure. Less credit may be provided if the book is edited and/or a revised edition of the original work depending on the original work involved.

Review of Grants

Research grants will be reviewed in terms of the overall role, impact, innovation, inclusion of blind peer-review, grantors (e.g., NIH, NSF), or importance. Funded external research grants may count as a Priority 1 publication but are not intended to replace scholarship required for promotion or tenure. Current activity associated with the ongoing implementation of a grant should be included in a faculty member's Annual Productivity Report and taken into account by the FEC and School Director in their review. Funding as a PI and Co-PI is of value; therefore, either status is eligible for the above.

Collaborative and Individual Scholarship

Faculty collaboration is encouraged. Collaboration may be within the field or cross-disciplinary. However, a research portfolio is strengthened when it includes some research work and some research products/publications that show the competence and ability of the individual faculty member's 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 body of work includes single and/or first-authored research.

Research Credit in Individual Year

A research publication must be credited only once. An article "in press," but not yet published, may be counted during an evaluation year, but may not be counted during any later years. If credit is assigned for an "in press" article, unequivocal documentation of acceptance must be provided, and the publication cannot be counted in any other year's report. An article that is published may be counted during that year or the subsequent year, but not during any later year. No publication may be counted for credit more than once. The annual report template supplies information to the Faculty Evaluation Committee about work in progress, acceptance and publication lag.

Research Honors

Appropriate information regarding awards, prizes and recognitions from state, regional, national or international awards, prizes or other honors bestowed on the faculty member may be noted by the faculty member in their annual review and should be appropriately acknowledged by the committee.

Performance Criteria for Research & Scholarship

Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to maintain research and scholarly activity, producing peer reviewed articles, book chapters, books, grants, presentations, or other scholarly outputs. Faculty are responsible for noting for the FEC their research contributions. The following tables depict criteria for annual research ratings for faculty who have a workload assignment to research. These are categorized based on differential percentage workload assignments as outlined in the SSW Workload Guidelines.

Rating Criteria for Faculty with 50% Workload Allocation to Research:

| Rating | Productivity |
|----------------|---|
| Excellent | <p>Documents any <u>one</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 or more peer-reviewed priority one publications, • Publication of a scholarly book, or • 1 or more peer-reviewed priority one publications plus one or more new external grant awards.¹ <p>Sponsored research is sufficient to cover the cost of the instructional reassignment either by course buy-out or indirect cost allocation.</p> |
| Good | <p>Documents at least 1 peer-reviewed priority one publication <u>and</u> any one of the following priority 2 items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or more manuscripts submitted for publication review, • Management of 1 or more existing internal or external grants, • 1 or more new internal grants, or • 1 or more peer-reviewed professional presentations. <p>Sponsored research is sufficient to cover the cost of the instructional reassignment either by course buy-out or indirect cost allocation.</p> |
| Satisfactory | <p>Documents no peer-reviewed priority one items but does document 1-2 priority two items. Additional research work is reflected through either a partial or complete manuscript that has not yet been submitted; or, a grant proposal in progress that has not yet been submitted. Sponsored research is sufficient to cover the cost of the instructional reassignment either by course buy-out or indirect cost allocation.</p> |
| Unsatisfactory | <p>Research productivity is less than the productivity required for satisfactory.</p> |

Rating Criteria for Faculty with 40% Workload Allocation to Research:

| Rating | Productivity |
|----------------|---|
| Excellent | Documents any <u>one</u> of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or more peer-reviewed priority one publications, or • Publication of a scholarly book, or • 1 or more new external grant awards.¹ |
| Good | No priority 1 publications, but documents any two of the following priority 2 items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or more manuscripts submitted for publication review, • Management of 1 or more existing internal or external grants, • 1 or more new internal grants, or • 1 or more peer-reviewed professional presentations. |
| Satisfactory | No priority 1 or 2 items. Some research work is reflected through either a partial or complete manuscript that has not yet been submitted; or, grant proposal in progress that has not yet been submitted. |
| Unsatisfactory | Research productivity less than the productivity required for satisfactory |

Rating Criteria for Faculty with 30% Workload Allocation to Research:

| Rating | Productivity |
|----------------|---|
| Excellent | Documents any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or more peer-reviewed (priority 1) publications, • Submission of a peer-reviewed (priority 1) publication for consideration, or • 1 or more new external grant awards.¹ |
| Good | Documents no priority 1 publications or submissions, but documents <u>two</u> or more of any of the following priority 2 items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of 1 or more existing internal or external grants, • Awarding of 1 or more new internal grants, or • 1 or more peer-reviewed professional presentations. |
| Satisfactory | No priority 1 or 2 items. Some research work is reflected through either a partial or complete manuscript that has not yet been submitted; or, a grant proposal in progress that has not yet been submitted. |
| Unsatisfactory | Research productivity less than the productivity required for satisfactory |

Rating Criteria for Faculty with 20%-25% Workload Allocation to Research:

| Rating | Productivity |
|---------------|--|
| Excellent | Documents any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or more peer-reviewed (priority 1) publications, |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or more new external grant awards,¹ • Submission of a peer-reviewed (priority 1) publication for consideration, • 1 or more external grant awards, or • <u>Two</u> priority two items, such as peer-reviewed professional presentations, awarding of an internal grant, or management of one or more existing internal or external grants. |
| Good | <p>No priority 1 publications, but one or more of any of the following priority 2 items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of an existing internal or external grant, • Awarding of a new internal grant, or • A peer-reviewed professional presentation. |
| Satisfactory | <p>No priority 1 or 2 items. Some research work is reflected through either a partial or complete manuscript that has not yet been submitted; or, a grant proposal in progress that has not yet been submitted.</p> |
| Unsatisfactory | <p>Research productivity is less than the productivity required for satisfactory.</p> |

¹Note: Funded external research grants may count as a priority 1 publication but are not intended to replace publications required for promotion or tenure.

Evaluation of Teaching

It is expected that a faculty member’s teaching is documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate their overall contribution to the teaching mission of the School. The summary of student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the faculty member’s digital evaluation file as part of their annual productivity report.

Teaching-track 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, as defined in the letter of appointment. For Teaching-track faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes.

Categorization of Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness including evidence as defined in the following categorizations:

Priority One. Requires demonstration of competence in each of the following in all required and elective courses, including field courses. Competence encompasses all areas of pedagogy, including conceptualizing, designing, and implementing basic and elective courses, quality of teaching in such courses, and external funding of teaching-related activities.

Priority Two. Priority two teaching effectiveness refers to other teaching endeavors such as:

- academic and field advising,
- field instruction,
- dissertation or thesis supervision,
- workshops and seminars to lay and peer audiences, including continuing education courses,
- non-credit seminars provided to student groups,
- serving on dissertation and thesis committees,
- preparing teaching materials, including the development of online courses,
- updating courses,
- serving as a course lead,
- submitting and/or having accepted and/or implementing grant funded activities to support teaching, and/or
- other official activities that are of an essentially pedagogical nature.

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty members are encouraged to utilize a teaching portfolio approach that provides an opportunity for holistic assessment of instruction by including the following in their digital evaluation file:

Qualitative and Quantitative Measures

Competence may be demonstrated through qualitative and quantitative measures of pedagogy. Faculty may go beyond the quantitative numbers from the course evaluation system to provide additional information, and the FEC must go beyond quantitative data in assessing teaching competence.

Other Options for Documentation

Further documentation may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- instructional materials (handouts, study guides, in class visual tools, etc.),
- sample examinations/assignments,
- course development,
- other evaluation instruments,
- correspondence from current/former students,

- review of course syllabi and organization (syllabi should be clear, reflect current literature in the field, and apprise the student of all relevant expectations and requirements pertinent to the course),
- citing of student field practice and research projects,
- student products, such as group presentations and research projects, especially those involving public,
- evidence of reaching audiences beyond the classroom,
- peer reviews of teaching,
- participation in teaching-related workshops/seminars,
- teaching awards/recognition,
- external funding related to teaching, and/or
- honors and awards related to teaching.

Required Course Evaluations

It is the policy of the School of Social Work that all courses will be evaluated. All credit-bearing activities (including internship/field placement and internship analysis) are to be evaluated using a format that insures objectivity and uniformity across the curriculum, where possible and feasible. Summaries of all social work course evaluations must be included in the annual faculty productivity report.

Required Evaluation Measures

Generally, the currently approved faculty-senate form for solicitation of student feedback must be used to evaluate all courses and the summary report must be uploaded to the digital evaluation file. Exceptions and other formats must be justified based on University policies, the nature of the course, its delivery, format, size, or other pertinent factors.

Justified Exceptions

Exceptions for courses which are not regular courses should be noted and justified. Exceptions might include independent study courses, courses taught outside the School of Social Work, or orientation courses.

Course Evaluation Period Covered

The annual faculty productivity report must include the course evaluations for all courses taught during the evaluation year (i.e., spring, summer, and fall of the calendar year).

Evaluation Data to Submit

The summary of course evaluation statistics from the formal course evaluations is required. Student comments from the formal course evaluations for each course are also required. Faculty may also submit other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as self-administered evaluations (quantitative and/or qualitative), evidence of the achievement of student outcomes (such as grades and/or other notable achievements related to the course), and/or other anecdotal evidence (e.g., student comments and feedback, either via formal course evaluations or other means).

Course Syllabi

Course syllabi for all courses taught during the review year must be included in the annual faculty productivity report in the digital evaluation file. Syllabi are an important indication of course organization, teaching practices and standards, currency of information and literature, student expectations and learning designs.

Performance Criteria for Teaching

The following table depicts teaching ratings for faculty who have teaching as a substantive area of their workload

| Rating | Productivity |
|-----------|--|
| Excellent | <i>Consistently demonstrates excellent teaching effectiveness, as evidenced by student ratings and/or evidence of positive learning outcomes as described by the narrative and supporting materials (including both quantitative data and qualitative comments from SPOT and/or other evaluation methods) across courses and semesters; provides complete documentation including course syllabi and a summary of teaching practice; addresses plans to modify courses and/or teaching based on student feedback as appropriate; and demonstrates evidence of engagement in at least two priority two teaching activities, one of which must include curriculum development.</i> |
| Good | <i>Generally demonstrates excellent teaching effectiveness, as evidenced by student ratings and/or evidence of positive learning outcomes as described by the narrative and supporting materials (including both quantitative data and qualitative comments from SPOT or other evaluation methods) across courses and semesters; provides complete documentation including course syllabi and a summary of teaching practice; addresses plans to modify courses and/or teaching based on student feedback as appropriate;</i> |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| | and demonstrates evidence of engagement in at least one priority two teaching activity. |
| Satisfactory | <i>Student ratings show mixed results, indicating satisfactory teaching effectiveness as evidenced by student ratings and/or some evidence of positive learning outcomes as described by the narrative and supporting materials (including both quantitative data and qualitative comments from SPOT or other evaluation methods) across courses and semesters; provides some supporting material such as course syllabi, a summary of teaching practice, plans to modify course and/or teaching based on student feedback as appropriate; participation in priority two teaching activities may not be sufficiently documented.</i> |
| Unsatisfactory | <i>Student ratings are consistently low across courses and semesters indicating unsatisfactory teaching effectiveness as evidenced by student ratings and/or lack of evidence of positive learning outcomes as described by the narrative and supporting materials (including both quantitative data and qualitative comments from SPOT or other evaluation methods) across courses and semesters; includes few or no supporting materials such as course syllabi, a summary of teaching practice, plans to modify course and/or teaching based on student feedback as appropriate; participation in priority two teaching activities may not be sufficiently documented.</i> |

Evaluation of Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member’s professional expertise, which have some relation to the School, 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 School, College, University, or profession.

Unpaid consulting that is conducted using a person’s University title and expertise related to the person’s job duties with the University may be counted toward service credit. Paid consulting or outside work that is not conducted using a person’s University title and expertise may not be counted toward service credit. Paid consulting or outside work that is conducted using a person’s University title and expertise will be reviewed by the School Director and Dean’s Office on a case-by-case basis to determine whether it can be counted toward service credit. Consulting by faculty members is normally limited to no more than one working day per week and should not prevent a faculty member from fulfilling responsibilities to the institution. Leave eligible employees completing consulting work must use annual leave if this work is completed during University working hours. Consulting work must be approved in advance by the School Director and College. University resources may not be used for consulting work. Outside employment and consulting activities must be consistent with University policies and guidelines.

While service is an area of expected reasonable contribution for most faculty, service is regarded as an area of importance for all faculty in the School of Social Work in keeping with

the public and social service ethos which underlies both the practice and study of the profession and the mission of the University.

The evaluation of service should include an assessment of the degree to which the service cited yields important benefits to the University, society, or the profession. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and are performed with one's University affiliation identified. Annual reports should include not only a list of activities in which the faculty member has engaged, but also an elaboration of one's involvement, including time (e.g., met once a week), productivity (i.e., actual tasks carried out), and other pertinent information which would enable the Committee to determine the level and quality of involvement.

A routine expectation of all faculty members is that they provide service to the School, Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, and/or the larger University. Such service is one of the ways in which faculty members contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the School.

Types of Service. Types of service can include, but are not limited to, each of the following categories.

1. **Service to the Community.** Service to the community can include, but is not limited to, any of the following:
 - participation in a professional capacity in a community or other public organization,
 - membership on committees and commissions at national, state, and local levels in a professional capacity,
 - participation in University-sponsored off-campus programs, workshops, and conferences,
 - consultancies to public agencies,
 - development and direction of special educational programs for the public,
 - professional presentations to community groups,
 - submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the community,
 - other external service activity,
 - securing and/or or managing external funding that supports community service work, and/or
 - honors and awards for community service.

2. **Service to the School.** Service to the School can include, but is not limited to, any of the following:
 - School committee work,
 - providing administrative services to the School,

- developing special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, and catalogs,
- involvement in program and curriculum development,
- online course development,
- academic advising, other than on instructional matters, if not counted as a course equivalent for teaching,
- organizing colloquia and other School programs,
- developing cooperative arrangements with other academic and external units, leading to enrichment of our respective degree programs,
- service as a faculty advisor to professional associations, honorary organizations and other student organizations,
- submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the School,
- securing and/or or managing external funding that supports School service work,
- honors and awards for School service,
- mentoring other faculty in teaching and/or research skills, and/or
- other School service work.

3. *Service to the College and University.* Service to the College and University can include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- College or University committee work,
- participating in creating, developing and operating joint degree programs and sharing arrangements with academic and service units within the University,
- contributing to the improvement of management and operation processes of the University or any of its academic or administrative units,
- serving as faculty advisor to professional associations, honorary organizations and other student organizations,
- submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the College and/or University,
- receipt and/or management of external funding that supports College or University service work,
- honors and awards for College or University service, and/or
- other College or University service work.

4. *Service to the Profession.* Service to the profession can include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- holding offices and/or committee memberships in professional organization,
- providing reviews for grants, professional journals or books,
- editorial work associated with journal (including position of editor or editorial

board member),

- consultancies for the profession, including but not limited to, pre-publication review of manuscripts, and accreditation and peer review functions,
- presenting speeches or workshops at professional conferences,
- chairing or appearing as a panel discussant or reactor at professional conferences, or otherwise helping to facilitate a professional meeting or conference,
- serving as reviewer or developer within a federal, state, or foundation grant program,
- submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the profession,
- securing and/or managing external funding that supports service work to the profession,
- honors and awards for service to the profession, and/or
- other service to the profession.

Performance Criteria for Service

In the School of Social Work, service expectations for faculty with service as an area of “significant contribution” will reference expectations defined in the letter of appointment and in annual assignment documents. Faculty will normally include in their annual faculty productivity report a narrative, in combination with documentation, to help the FEC and other colleagues in the School understand the significance and impact of their assigned service work and additional service efforts. Such evidence may include assessment of program growth and/or impact, and/or examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and/or explanation of how program coordination or other service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the School, College, and University.

Service workload assignments for teaching, tenured and tenure-track faculty are typically 20%. For these faculty members, service responsibilities encompass School, College, University, professional, and community service activities.

Some faculty have higher service allocations due to administrative appointments or specific assignments in their job description (e.g., service faculty and those with additional administrative appointments). These individuals have service responsibilities that are directly tied to their job description and/or administrative appointment letter. Due to their higher service allocations, these faculty must provide supporting evidence of the service activities required per their administrative appointment as well as additional voluntary service activities. They should also provide evidence of the effectiveness and/or impact of these activities (as defined in the first paragraph of this section). For service-track faculty, special weight will be applied to service activities that address the needs of the community and/or social work profession. Examples may include (but are not limited to): providing training and/or

consultation to social service agencies and organizations, service to social work professional organizations, membership on local boards, and/or outreach/recruitment activities.

The following tables provide guidelines for yearly evaluation of service to be used by both the FEC and School Director. For faculty with administrative appointments and/or who are designated service-track faculty, the FEC will evaluate their administrative activities, to the extent they are able, based on submitted documentation in their digital evaluation file and the individual’s yearly narrative. The Director will provide a complete evaluation of all service activities for these individuals, based on submitted documentation in the digital record and the individual’s yearly narrative.

For faculty with service workloads **higher than 20%** due to administrative appointments and/or designated as service-track faculty:

| | Productivity |
|----------------|--|
| Excellent | Active participation in and completion of assigned service activities within the School as per their job description and workload document. There is strong evidence of the effectiveness and/or impact of these activities submitted in the digital evaluation file and discussion in the narrative. Participation in at least two additional service activities within the School, College, university, community, and/or professional levels. |
| Good | Active participation in and completion of assigned service activities within the School as per their job description and workload document. There is some evidence of the effectiveness and/or impact of these activities submitted in their digital evaluation file and/or through discussion in the narrative. Participation in at least one additional service activity within the College, university, community, and/or professional levels. |
| Satisfactory | Active participation in and completion of assigned service activities within the School as per their job description and workload document. There is some evidence of the effectiveness and/or impact of these activities submitted in their digital evaluation file and through discussion in the narrative, but evidence is limited or incomplete. There may be no evidence of additional service activities at the College, university, community, and/or professional levels and/or documentation is incomplete. |
| Unsatisfactory | Assigned service activities in the School, as per their job description and workload document, are not completed as assigned and/or are completed with poor quality. There may be no evidence of additional activities at the College, University, community, and/or professional levels. |

Rating criteria for faculty with service allocations of **20% or lower**:

| | Productivity |
|-----------|---|
| Excellent | At least two service activities within the School, College, University, community, and/or professional levels. There is evidence of the |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | effectiveness and/or impact of these activities submitted in the digital evaluation file and through discussion in the narrative. |
| Good | At least one service activity within the School, College, University, community, and/or professional levels. There is evidence of the effectiveness and/or impact of these activities submitted in digital evaluation file and through discussion in the narrative. |
| Satisfactory | There is evidence of service activities at the School, College, University, community, and/or professional levels, but documentation and evidence of the effectiveness and/or impact of these activities submitted in the digital evaluation file and through discussion in the narrative is limited or incomplete. |
| Unsatisfactory | There is no evidence of service activities at the School, College, University, and/or professional levels; or, assigned service activities at the School, College, and/or University levels are not completed; or, assigned service activities at the School, College, and/or University levels are completed with poor quality. |

Categorization of Grants in Annual Review

Teaching, research, and service grants on which a faculty member is named as a principal investigator, co-investigator, awardee or which are received through the efforts of that faculty member are to be included in the faculty member’s annual Faculty Productivity Report and taken into account by the FEC in their review. Grants may be included under either Priority One or Priority Two teaching, research, or service activity, as deemed appropriate and explained by the faculty member. In all cases, the FEC will be free to disagree and consider the activity more appropriate under some other heading. For purposes of this policy, “grants” refers to many different forms of programmatic financial inflows typically resulting from the initiative of individual faculty members. This may include grants, contracts, large donations and all other forms of financial award.

Rebuttals or Responses to Faculty Evaluations

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to evaluations from the School FEC, School Director, College FEC, or Dean. The reactions fall into 2 general classes: “responses” in the general case and “rebuttals” in specific situations. These are described in more detail in the WVU *Procedures* document: For reactions to School-level evaluations see Sections XIII.A.5, XIII.A.6, and XIII.A.7; for reactions to College-level evaluations, see Section XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6.

Each evaluation letter must advise the faculty member of the appropriate type of reaction that is available to them, as follows:

Rebuttals

When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or non-continuation, the evaluation should include a statement advising the faculty member of their right of rebuttal at the next level. In a School-level evaluation, the statement should say that “If you wish to challenge this evaluation, you may submit a rebuttal to the Dean of the Eberly College within 5 working days of your receipt of this evaluation.” In a College-level evaluation, the statement should replace “Dean of the Eberly College” with “Provost.”

Responses

Responses to annual reviews at the School-level may be submitted within 10 working days. Evaluations without a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or non-continuation should say, “You may, at any time, submit a response to this evaluation to [School Director] or the Dean of the Eberly College, in accordance with Section XIII.A.7 of the WVU *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.*”

Performance-Based Salary Policy

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations. Evaluations of 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.

In years in which performance-based raises are approved, the School Director submits to the Office of the Dean the following information for each faculty member who is eligible for a raise: ratings of performance in teaching, research, and service, and the workload percentages in teaching, research, and service. Categorical ratings are converted to numbers as follows; “Excellent” = 4.0; “Good” = 2.5; “Satisfactory” = 1.0, “Unsatisfactory” = 0.

If the FEC and the second evaluator (usually the School Director) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is weighted 1:1 for the FEC and second evaluator respectively.

Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and/or Tenure Review

Both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty are eligible for promotion. In a tenure-track appointment, tenure normally must have been awarded by the end of the individual’s sixth year on the faculty, the “critical year,” as identified in the letter of appointment, unless extended pursuant to BOG Faculty Rule 4.5. If tenure is not awarded, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the subsequent year.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in non-tenure track faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College follows the same promotion timeline governing tenure track positions; that is, subject to

reappointment, a promotion-eligible non-tenure track faculty member and the person's School Director may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. A 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

Tenure and non-tenure track faculty with qualifying work experience as identified in the letter of appointment may request a specified number of years of credit toward tenure or discretionary promotion. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year or year of eligibility for discretionary promotion. If credit is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University should be included in the digital evaluation file. In the case of tenure-track faculty, if tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

Tenure and non-tenure track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure or discretionary promotion during the first year, but no later than the end of the second year, may during the fourth year of employment (by May 15th of the fourth year) request that the critical year or eligibility for discretionary promotion be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean's approval of such request, the new critical year or year of eligibility for discretionary promotion will be confirmed. For tenure-track faculty if tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year. For non-tenure track faculty, promotion is discretionary and does not impact their continued appointment, but if their application is unsuccessful, they must wait at least two full years after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

Per WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure, in years when a faculty member who has research as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the digital evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research from persons external to the University.

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, weight is generally placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term associate professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a "continuous program" of scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record.

Except as otherwise provided in “Criteria for Tenure” section below, in order to be recommended for promotion, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and teaching, and reasonable contributions in the area of service. The areas of significant contribution in which each faculty member is expected to perform will be identified in the letter of appointment or modified in a subsequent document. Inasmuch as successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty who are assigned to teach, significant contributions will have been made in teaching. For faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution, service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the State will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion purposes.

Cumulative Pre-Promotion Review

Two years before the Critical Year, probationary Tenure-Track faculty members are subject to a more rigorous review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected of Tenure-Track faculty members, there will be particular focus on the expectation to have developed an active, independent, and sustainable research program as defined in the letter of appointment.

Even though the cumulative pre-promotion report is required to support an evaluation of a Tenure-Track faculty member’s progress toward tenure, it may be used to gauge any faculty member’s progress toward promotion. Therefore, the School allows Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured associate professors to submit cumulative pre-promotion reports to solicit the School’s detailed feedback on their program toward promotion.

The cumulative pre-promotion report should be based either on work since the initial appointment at WVU or work since the last promotion at WVU, whichever is later. If the appointment letter allows credit toward promotion for work done before starting at WVU and that credit was claimed, then the credited work must also be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.

A cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is conducted by both the FEC and the School Director in addition to the annual evaluation. The evaluation is based on the cumulative pre-promotion report as well as evidence in the digital evaluation file. In addition to ratings of teaching, research, and service (as appropriate to the faculty member’s assignment), the evaluation includes a judgment about whether the faculty member is on track for the next career step (promotion, tenure) and what steps, if any, are needed for improvement.

In the case of probationary Tenure-track faculty members, the cumulative pre-promotion evaluation also includes a judgment about the likelihood of success by the Critical Year, and a recommendation to continue the faculty member at their current rank (termination is recommended by voting against continuation). In a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation, a recommendation in favor of continuation suggests that the faculty member is likely to attain

tenure in the critical year. A recommendation against continuation suggests that the faculty member is unlikely to attain tenure in the critical year.

External Review

Per *WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, in years when a faculty member who has research as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the digital evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research from persons external to the University. Procedures for soliciting external reviews are as described in the College and University guidelines.

In any year that external reviews are part of the faculty member's file, the School FEC, School Director, College FEC, and Dean will take those reviews into account as part of its overall review of the faculty member's performance.

External evaluations are not required for promotion for teaching-track or service-track faculty but can be one method used to demonstrate national or international recognition.

Criteria for Tenure/Promotion: Tenure Track Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Professor/Awarding of Tenure

At the rank of Assistant Professor, it is normally expected that faculty will have completed a doctorate in the appropriate field. In addition, they shall show promise of development into productive scholars, as evidenced by a research agenda or other plan for scholarly activity.

Ordinarily, the recommendation to tenure a faculty member will be coupled with a recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Thus, faculty members applying for tenure will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and in teaching and reasonable contributions in service. Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty members who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for tenure, significant contributions will have been made in teaching.

Faculty members under review for the award of tenure (essentially, the same as review for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor) will be expected to have made a substantial beginning toward establishing their professional standing as productive scholars. This will be reflected in a cumulative body of published work during the course of their probationary period totaling, at a minimum, six (6) Priority I publications and evidence of grant activity. This is a minimum number with which it may be possible for a faculty member to be considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The publications need to be quality products of importance for this minimum to be sufficient. In such instances, the file needs to clearly support the case for significant contributions in research and for the significant importance of the publications. There must be clear indication that the faculty member will continue to be a productive scholar, as evidenced by an ongoing research agenda and work in progress, possibly in association with the acquisition of grant funds related to his or her interests. Work literally "in press" or unequivocally accepted for publication may be

appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print.

Faculty members under review for the award of tenure and promotion to rank of Associate Professor are must have a preponderance of “good” and “excellent” ratings in the area of teaching and research. A preponderance of meritorious ratings, indicates that the individual has made progress towards a “significant” contribution in this area, which is a requirement for promotion. In the area of service, they are expected to have demonstrated a “reasonable” contribution, which is defined by preponderance of satisfactory, good, and/or excellent ratings.

Administrative Assignments

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the one in which the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or tenure, should have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the School or department in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the Director/Chair, the Dean and by the Provost.

Promotion to Full Professor

To achieve the rank of Professor, the expectation is that the faculty member will attain a distinguished record of research and publication. "Distinguished record" means a body of work of quality receiving professional and peer recognition on a national and/or international basis in a particular field of specialization. There must also be a continued record of distinguished teaching. The faculty member should also have at least a reasonable record of service.

This will be also reflected in a cumulative body of published work since the date of promotion to Associate Professor, which includes a minimum of (7 or more) Priority I publications and evidence of grant activity. The publications need to be quality products of importance for this minimum to be sufficient. In exceptional instances, a lesser number of publications (e.g., a book) may be acceptable. In such instances, the file needs to clearly support the case for significant contribution and for the significant importance of the publications. There must be clear indication that the faculty member will continue to be a productive scholar, as evidenced by an ongoing research agenda and work in progress, possibly in association with the acquisition of grant funds related to his or her interests. Work literally “in press” or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print. For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

To be promoted to the rank of Full Professor, individuals must also demonstrate the development of a national and/or international presence in their respective field of study. This

is evaluated through a holistic review of the reports from external evaluations as well as the evidence in the digital evaluation file. Activities that can serve as examples of the development of a national presence can include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- receipt and management of nationally funded grants,
- service on editorial boards of national/international publications,
- service on review boards for national grants,
- presentations at national/international conferences,
- citation indices,
- serving as an invited, keynote, or plenary speaker at national/international conferences,
- service as a member, chair, or president of national/international committees,
- receipt of national or international awards,
- organizing symposia,
- fellowship awards,
- Visiting Professorships,
- leading and/or service as the principal investigator on multi-site or large-scale funded projects,
- external reviewer for tenure promotion for other institutions,
- consulting for government agencies,
- contributing to policy reports/guidelines,
- being quoted in national media,
- publishing widely adopted textbooks, and/or
- other indicators of national presence.

In the area of teaching, individuals must also demonstrate continued significant contributions to teaching as evidenced by a continued preponderance of “good” and “excellent” yearly ratings from the School Director and FEC as well as demonstration of School, College, and/or University leadership in the development of curriculum and teaching. This could include, but is not limited to, activities such as:

- curriculum development,
- curriculum review,
- coordination of continuing education or other educational programming,
- serving as a course lead for social work program courses, and/or
- other leadership activities related to teaching.

Individuals must also continue to demonstrate reasonable contributions to service, as evidenced by a preponderance of satisfactory, good, and/or excellent ratings in this category during the review period.

Criteria for Promotion: Teaching-track Faculty

For School faculty who have a title with the prefix “teaching,” teaching is their primary area in which significant contributions are expected. Teaching-track faculty may also have a service component, in which reasonable contributions are expected. Teaching-track faculty assignments 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-track faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes.

For promotion to all ranks within this track, 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 School-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Promotion from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor

An individual initially appointed as Teaching Instructor may be promoted to Teaching Assistant Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in social work or a relevant discipline, or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant. Professional and academic experience that is significant and relevant may include any of the following:

- prior employment as a practicing social worker,
- post MSW and/or independent licensure,
- work in an academic position related to social work (e.g., in a department or School of social work), and/or
- other practice and/or academic experience related to social work.

To be promoted from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor, the individual must demonstrate significant contributions to teaching as demonstrated by a preponderance of “good” and “excellent” ratings in teaching during the evaluation period and demonstrate evidence of teaching leadership through curricular and/or programmatic development activities at the School level. This may include activities such as curriculum review, development, or updates. It may also include serving as a course lead for one or more Social Work program courses.

They must also demonstrate reasonable contributions in their other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor

An individual may be promoted to Teaching Associate Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in social work or a relevant discipline, or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant, with significant and relevant experience as defined above. To be promoted from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor, the individual must demonstrate significant contributions to teaching as demonstrated by a preponderance of “good” and “excellent” ratings in teaching during the evaluation period. Yearly ratings and review letters must also indicate that the individual consistently meets and/or exceeds the expectations outlined in their appointment letter for their position.

They must also demonstrate teaching leadership at the School, College, University, and/or community levels through activities such as:

- curriculum development,
- programmatic development,
- curriculum review and updates,
- serving as a course lead for one or more Social Work program courses,
- coordination and/or provision of continuing education and/or other educational programming, and/or
- other teaching or educational activities related to social work.

They must also demonstrate reasonable contributions in their other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor

An individual may be promoted to Teaching Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in social work or a relevant discipline, or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant, with significant and relevant experience as defined above. To be promoted from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor, the individual must demonstrate significant contributions to teaching, as demonstrated by a preponderance of “good” and “excellent” ratings in teaching during the evaluation period. Yearly ratings and review letters must also indicate that the individual consistently meets and/or exceeds the expectations outlined in their appointment letter for their position.

They must also demonstrate continued teaching leadership at the School, College, University, and/or community levels through activities such as:

- curriculum development,
- programmatic development,
- curriculum review and updates,
- serving as a course lead for one or more Social Work program courses,
- coordination and/or provision of continuing education and/or other educational programming, and/or,

- other teaching or educational activities related to social work.

In addition, to be promoted to Teaching Professor, an individual must demonstrate 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. National and international recognition can be documented by any combination of the following:

- nominations/awards for teaching and advising that are external to WVU,
- records of presentations or invited lectures at conferences, forums, or symposia,
- publications in peer-reviewed journals,
- external evaluations, and/or
- any other information that demonstrates national or international recognition of teaching.

Although external evaluations are not required, they can be used as an indicator of national recognition.

Finally, they must demonstrate reasonable contributions in their other area(s) of assignment.

Criteria for Promotion: Service-track Faculty

For School faculty who have a title with the prefix "service," service will normally be one area in which significant contributions are expected. Service-track faculty are normally assigned 60% of their workload to service, although higher allocations may be assigned in the letter of appointment due to additional administrative responsibilities.

For service-track faculty, a criterion for promotion and/or tenure shall be demonstrating significant contributions in service. This service includes service required by their appointment letter and job description. Such expectations should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents. Service expectations also include service in addition to their administrative/job requirements at the School, College, University, community, and professional levels. This includes service to the professional social work and local communities.

Promotion from Service Instructor to Service Assistant Professor

An individual initially appointed as Service Instructor may be promoted to Service Assistant Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in social work or a relevant discipline, or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant, with significant and relevant experience as defined above in the Teaching-track section. To be promoted from Service Instructor to Service Assistant Professor, the individual must demonstrate significant contributions to service as demonstrated by a preponderance of "good" and "excellent" ratings in service during the evaluation period. Yearly ratings and review letters must also indicate that the individual consistently meets and/or exceeds the expectations outlined in their appointment letter for their position. They must also demonstrate reasonable contributions in other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion from Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor

An individual may be promoted to Service Associate Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in social work or a relevant discipline, or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant, with significant and relevant experience as defined above. To be promoted from Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor, the individual must continue to demonstrate significant contributions to service as demonstrated by a preponderance of “good” and “excellent” ratings in service for all annual reviews during the evaluation period. Yearly ratings and review letters must also indicate that the individual consistently meets and/or exceeds the expectations outlined in their appointment letter for their position.

They must also demonstrate service leadership at the School, College, University, and/or community levels through activities such as:

- service as a chair for service-related committees in the SSW,
- service as a member, chair, or president of service-related committees or boards at the College, University, and/or community level,
- coordination of service-related activities (e.g., student fairs, recruitment events, field activities, student events, etc.),
- coordination/leadership of student groups (e.g., student social work organizations, Phi Alpha), and/or
- other service activities not required by their appointment letter/position description.

They must also demonstrate reasonable contributions in their other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion from Service Associate Professor to Service Professor

An individual may be promoted to Service Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in social work or a relevant discipline, or 2) an advanced graduate degree in social work or a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant, with significant and relevant experience as defined above. They must also demonstrate significant service contributions as demonstrated by a preponderance of “good” and “excellent” ratings in service during the evaluation period. Yearly ratings and review letters must also indicate that the individual consistently meets and/or exceeds the expectations outlined in their appointment letter for their position.

They must also demonstrate continued service leadership at the School, College, University, and/or community levels through activities such as:

- service as a chair for service-related committees in the SSW,
- service as a member, chair, or president of service-related committees or boards at the College, University, and/or community level,
- coordination of service-related activities (e.g., student fairs, recruitment events, field activities, student events, etc.),

- coordination/leadership of student groups (e.g., student social work organizations, Phi Alpha), and/or
- other service activities not required by their appointment letter/position description.

In addition, to be promoted to Service Professor, an individual must demonstrate that professional colleagues, both within the University and nationally or internationally, acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to service in the discipline.

National and international recognition can be documented by any combination of the following:

- nominations/awards for service that are external to WVU,
- records of presentations or invited lectures at conferences, forums, or symposia,
- publications in peer-reviewed journals,
- external evaluations,
- any other information that demonstrates national or international recognition of service.

Although external evaluations are not required for promotion for Service-track Faculty, they can be used as one (but not a required) method of demonstrating national recognition.

Finally, they must demonstrate reasonable contributions in their other area(s) of assignment.

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 FEC and to the School Director. The FEC and the School Director 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.

Modification of these policies and procedures for annual faculty evaluation, promotion, tenure, and merit, requires a simple majority vote of the full, benefits-eligible, social work faculty: tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track.