GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES

Approved by the Provost Office 12/18/2023

These Guidelines complement the WVU Evaluation Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure as well as the Eberly College Guidelines. These program-specific guidelines are designed to guide the program's evaluation process by establishing program standards and procedures. Program-level evaluations must conform to the policies and procedures promulgated by The Eberly College, West Virginia University (WVU), and its Board of Governors. Therefore, faculty members, the MDS Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the Director must familiarize themselves with the contents of the University Procedures document, ECAS Guidelines, relevant rules of the Board of Governors, in addition to the program guidelines approved by the Dean and the Provost.

All MDS faculty are evaluated annually. All faculty (except full professors) are evaluated by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and by the Director. Full professors must formally request an evaluation by the FEC or will otherwise only be reviewed by the Director.

The evaluation process in MDS is intended to promote faculty development and achievement, clarify faculty goals, inform annual workload assignments that align with the short- and long-term vision of the program, and provide consistent and clear criteria for performance-based salary increases and for promotion recommendations, as applicable**.** The process thus offers both a summative and formative assessment.

1. The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must update their annual evaluation file each year with representative documentation of activities completed during the year under review. The file shall be closed for the annual review period ending December 31st. All parts of the annual file must be finished and submitted by the deadline. They cannot be altered after the deadline. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

The "annual evaluation file" is a collection of electronic documents and data uploaded by the faculty member and institution. Currently WVU uses Digital Measures (a/k/a/ Faculty Success by Watermark), but these guidelines refer to any current or subsequent electronic system adopted by WVU. The annual evaluation file contains documentation of teaching, research, and service, as well as administrative documents such as the letter of appointment and memoranda. Each year, in addition to updating their activity in the annual evaluation file, the faculty member must upload a current c.v., a teaching portfolio, and an annual narrative. The annual narrative should be about two pages in length. Instead of simply listing what is already evident in the annual evaluation file, the narrative should highlight and contextualize what the faculty member considers to be their most important contributions during the review period. After upload of these documents, the faculty must generate and submit a faculty productivity report, which contains entered data and links to all other uploaded documents in the annual evaluation file and is the item to guide the director and FEC in their respective reviews.

It is highly recommended that new faculty meet with the director before submitting their faculty productivity report. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the components of the file and answer any specific questions about what to include, where to list items, and how to document them with supporting evidence.

The following sections detail requirements and illustrate how faculty may document their professional activities, but these illustrations are not exhaustive. Please keep in mind that all reported activities require documentation as supporting evidence in the annual file. Otherwise, they will not receive credit from the FEC committee; its evaluation is and must be based entirely on the material included in the faculty member's faculty productivity report.

1.1 Documentation of Teaching

For every course taught during the review period, syllabi, and student evaluations (with student comments) must be included in the annual evaluation file. In addition, the annual narrative should highlight key teaching accomplishments during the review period. Quality of teaching is documented in further detail by a teaching portfolio, annually revised and uploaded to the annual evaluation file. The teaching portfolio is both a summative and formative document that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching as well as efforts to improve. Details about the contents of the teaching portfolio are provided in Section 3.1 below.

If a faculty member receives a course reassignment for advising, their advising will count as a corresponding percentage of their teaching effort. Faculty with reassignments for advising should document their advising work by submitting an Advising Portfolio in addition to their Teaching Portfolio. Guidelines for the Advising Portfolio are provided separately in the MDS Program Handbook.

1.2 Documentation of Research

A publication can only be credited one time for one annual review. It cannot be counted across multiple review years.

Published research must go through a peer review process (open, closed, editorial, or otherwise) to be counted as part of a research profile. The term "published" indicates the product of a documented editorial process (e.g., not self-published), and the publisher should have a recognized, high-impact press of national or international academic reputation (e.g., not a "vanity press"). To receive credit for publications, electronic links or copies must be uploaded to the annual evaluation file. Works accepted for publication but not yet published may be included in the annual evaluation file; in such cases, copies of letters of acceptance and contracts must be provided. Note that if a work is counted pre-publication in an annual review, it can't be counted again in future years. Editorial work may also be submitted for research and can be documented by the final journal issue (or if not available, proofs). A copy of the award letter and the proposal are appropriate documentation for funded research grants; the faculty member's specific role and contribution to the funded project must be included in the personnel file entry (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, etc.).

Other research activity might include keynote addresses, paper presentations, poster presentations, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and other publications related to the faculty member's area of research. These must also be documented in the annual evaluation file.

The program recognizes collaborative research as equal in value to independent research. To document collaborative work, a faculty member must specify the type of collaboration and contextualize their collaborative work in their narrative. According to the taxonomy created by Ede and Lunsford, collaboration may involve co-creation (creators work together at every stage of the process); co-writing (creators divide the work according to tasks or skill sets; each creator drafts a quantifiable amount of the finished project, etc.); or group writing (projects with many creators who contribute various components; co-authors may work on pieces of the work over time before one or two members of the group compile those pieces for editing and proofreading). Accordingly, faculty should fully describe their personal contribution to the collaborative project, the need for collaboration in the project, the significance of the project, and/or the results from the collaboration.

1.3 Documentation of Service

Service activities internal to the MDS program need only be listed in the annual evaluation file; documentation may be included but is not required. All other service outside of the program should be documented with some supporting evidence.

Documentation of service to the profession may include letters and emails related to such service (invitations, evidence of committee memberships, evidence of duties performed, etc.).

Documentation of service to the college and university may include letters, emails, or documents related to membership, work, or chairing of College, Faculty Senate, or University committees outside of the Department.

Service to the community must be directly related to the faculty member's professional expertise and may be documented in any number of ways (invitations, correspondence, flyers, etc.).

Notice of honors, awards, and grants for service (in the profession, for the public, or for the department, college, or university) should be documented in the file.

Please note: Among the conventions of service in higher education, faculty are expected to write recommendations for colleagues and to read colleagues' work at their request. Such service does not need to be documented.

2. The Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) normally consists of a minimum of five (5) members, at least three of whom hold the rank of Associate Professor or above. Given the unique composition of the MDS unit entirely of non-tenured faculty, it is appropriate that non-tenured

Teaching and Service Associate Professors be counted toward this number. The committee may include faculty who are appointed to the unit as well as faculty selected from other units. The following individuals, however, are not eligible: (a) the Director, (b) anyone under consideration for promotion in a given year, (c) anyone who is in the immediate family or household of an individual who is evaluated by the Committee (see Section XIII of the WVU Procedures document), and (d) anyone who is serving on the ECAS FEC (see Section VI of these Guidelines).

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) is engaged in two specific activities: annual reviews, typically with a recommendation regarding continuation; and reviews for purposes of promotion, continuation, or non-continuation. The FEC convenes in January and February and conducts its evaluations based on the documents submitted for review in the faculty file. Applying the criteria set forth in this document, the FEC will evaluate the faculty productivity report for each faculty member and write a letter of evaluation that assesses each faculty member in terms of their respective areas of contribution. The annual evaluation letter shall provide an assessment of annual performance and inform the faculty member about their progress toward promotion. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving success and productivity.

The FEC's responsibility is to ensure that the review process is accurate, fair, and based on sound documentation. Members of the FEC must keep all committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential. After receiving the letters from the FEC, the Director will then write their own letter of evaluation and share both letters with the ECAS Dean as well as the respective faculty member.

3. Faculty Evaluation Process.

Faculty must submit their annual evaluation file with representative documentation of activities completed during the year under review by December 31st. The annual review covers performance only during the calendar year under review. However, evaluation letters from previous years will be consulted to determine whether a faculty member has responded to previous suggestions for improvement, and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion, if applicable to their appointment, or continuing to remain productive.

The annual review conducted by the FEC should not simply be a summative evaluation of the faculty member's achievement. It shall also be formative and provide clear recommendations that foster continued growth and development, particularly where improvement will be needed for promotion or continuation.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance will assess performance in each area according to the four following descriptors: Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient

to justify continuation but not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure for areas of expected significant contribution), or Unsatisfactory.

Ratings affect salary increases and future promotion. Both Excellent and Good are meritorious ratings. Work should be fully documented. Without proper documentation, a faculty member cannot receive meritorious ratings. In such cases, a Satisfactory rating or lower is appropriate. Each annual review also includes a vote for or against continuation.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide for the annual file evidence that (1) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the FEC of the quality of their contribution. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the annual evaluation file. If no such evidence has been provided, the FEC's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we must conclude that the faculty member's work is Unsatisfactory."

3.1 Evaluation of Teaching

The principal component of the annual review of teaching is the faculty member's teaching portfolio. The portfolio provides evidence of self-reflection and efforts for continual growth. New faculty will be instructed by the director in how to develop a teaching portfolio. The portfolio, along with a current c.v.., shall be uploaded to the annual evaluation file as supporting documents. The main focus of the portfolio should be to demonstrate efforts for continual growth and improvement.

The portfolio should be no longer than 12 single-spaced pages and include the following elements in the table of contents: 1. The annual teaching narrative (1-2 pages). 2. A statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical goals (1 page). 3. Sample new assignments, course materials, or other efforts to improve. 4. Professional Development activities. 5. Service Activities. 6. Self-reflection and statement of future goals (1-2 pages). Appendix (optional- does not count toward the 12 page limit).

Effective teaching should stimulate critical thinking and curiosity, disseminate knowledge, and develop communication skills. Teaching includes traditional modes of instruction in-person, but it can also occur outside the classroom through community engagement and in different modes such as online or hybrid learning. Advising/mentoring is also a critical, but often underappreciated, dimension of teaching that is essential to student success. The goal of the teaching endeavor is to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits that should culminate in degree completion. The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence; integrity; continuous learning; a dedication to improvement; the ability to transfer knowledge; respect for differences and diversity; and the ability to cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. These traits should be evident and documented in the annual evaluation file.

Effective teaching can be documented in a variety of ways. The supporting documentation in the teaching section of the annual evaluation file must include a syllabus for each course taught during the review period, student feedback on instruction (SEI scores and students' written comments), a peer observation of teaching (when appropriate), and a teaching portfolio. While

West Virginia University Board of Governors Rule 4.2 requires student feedback to be part of the faculty evaluation process and it must be present in the annual evaluation file, MDS Programs does not rely solely on SEIs or student comments on instruction. Of equal or greater importance is the teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio should document a faculty member's efforts of continuous growth and development of teaching. Factoring growth as well as accomplishment, performance evaluations in the area of teaching will be based on a holistic assessment of all the evidence provided in the file.

Of further note, some aspects of instruction are overlooked or undervalued by traditional approaches to the evaluation of teaching. For example, MDS programs recognizes the value of teaching that helps to promote the diversity, equity, inclusion, and/or social justice work of the University. To receive credit for such work, faculty must document their contributions in the teaching portfolio. Likewise, public and community-engaged teaching are valued forms of instruction in MDS. Community engaged teaching may include, but is not limited to, experiential, off-campus assignments for students, such as those in service-learning classes or study abroad programs with community engagement components. It may also include pre-college courses for K-12 youth, occupational short courses, certificates, and licensure programs, etc. To receive credit for these types of activities, faculty must document their contributions in the teaching portfolio.

Excellent. Teaching excellence is evident from the materials in the file; accomplishments and materials related to instruction are of a consistently exceptional quality and deserve recognition with the highest level of merit. The quality of the pedagogy is evident in the rigor of course materials; syllabi are well- organized, creative, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. The profile of teaching excellence is characterized by high scores on SEIs (4.5 average or above) and student comments are almost entirely positive. The profile of teaching excellence is also displayed in the teaching portfolio which demonstrates a strong commitment to self-reflection, feedback from student and peer observation, and/or professional development efforts. Documentation for a descriptor of Excellent will typically include multiple types of evidence supportive of the highest level of merit.

Good. Good teaching is evident from the materials in the file; accomplishments and materials related to instruction are of a consistently good quality and deserve recognition of merit. The quality of the pedagogy is evident in the rigor of course materials; syllabi are well-organized, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. The profile of good teaching may include positive SEIs (4.49-4.1), and student comments are mostly positive. The profile of good teaching includes a full commitment to self-assessment, peer observation, and/or professional development. Documentation for a descriptor of Good will include multiple types of evidence supportive of meritorious teaching.

Satisfactory. Satisfactory teaching is evident from the materials in the file; accomplishment and materials related to instruction are of satisfactory quality to meets departmental expectations. The quality of the pedagogy is evident at a responsible level in the course materials, but not one that is particularly rigorous; syllabi are organized, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. SEIs mostly meet but do not exceed expectations (4.09-3.6) and student comments are a balanced mixture of positive and negative. The profile of

satisfactory teaching includes some commitment to self-assessment, peer observation, and/or professional development. Documentation for a descriptor of Satisfactory will predominately include evidence of teaching activities that meet (but do not exceed) the reasonable expectations of teaching in the program.

If the faculty member only provides limited documentation of their teaching (e.g., an incomplete teaching portfolio that doesn't follow guidelines, lack of updated material, etc.), then a rating of "Satisfactory" is appropriate. A second consecutive year of limited evidence will result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory."

Unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory teaching is evident from the materials in the file (or lack thereof), which demonstrates that teaching does not meet departmental expectations. The pedagogy does not maintain an instructional environment that enables student learning; syllabi are not organized, or not appropriate for the subject, or not clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. Teaching materials in the file reflect pedagogy that is not yet developed or is disengaged. The teaching profile that emerges from the documentation provides little evidence of the faculty member's positive engagement with or positive effect on students. The teaching profile also provides little or no evidence of engagement in activities related to self-assessment and/or professional development for the improvement of teaching. SEIs are below average in comparison with peers (3.59-0) and qualitative student comments are mostly negative. Documentation for a descriptor of Unsatisfactory is usually missing and will predominately include evidence of teaching activities that do not meet reasonable expectations of quality teaching.

If a faculty member does not provide documentation of their teaching (e.g. lack of a portfolio, no syllabi, etc.), then the rating of "Unsatisfactory" is appropriate.

3.2 Evaluation of Research

A teaching or service faculty appointment does not normally have an expectation to contribute to the area of research. Research activity is welcome, but not required for the purpose of annual review and continuation in rank and is not an expectation for promotion or salary enhancement. The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who have research effort included in their workload assignment (typically up to 15%).

The MDS Program embraces a broad definition of scholarship. It recognizes the value of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and collaborative work as well as public and community engaged research. Accordingly, all of these forms of research can be regarded positively in the FEC's evaluation of research. The gold standard of research in MDS is peer-reviewed publication (book or journal article) with a nationally recognized journal or publisher in interdisciplinary studies or a field related to a faculty member's area of expertise. For the purpose of evaluation, works written collaboratively with other authors may also be considered of equal importance with those written by a single author, depending on the faculty member's scope of contribution. Faculty should contextualize the project, including their role as an author, the scope of the project, and the project's outcomes, in their narrative. Likewise, community-engaged research can be counted in this area. Contributions to community-engaged research must be documented by evidence in

the file through a combination of some of the following: 1. Clear academic and community change goals, including a final deliverable that will directly benefit the communities involved. 2. Appropriate use of scholarship to guide and inform community-engagement activities. 3. Evidence of impact on the university (e.g., student learning, faculty scholarly outcomes, etc.), and relevant communities. 4. Effective dissemination and presentation to community audiences. 5. Peer reviews and community feedback. This should be contextualized in the faculty member's narrative.

Faculty can count an item accepted for publication (but not yet published) in an annual review, but that item must not be counted again in subsequent years. Once an item is published, it must be counted in that year's annual review if it has not been counted previously. In other words, faculty cannot bank their publications and count them in future years.

Excellent. The profile of research excellence is evident from the materials in the file; work and materials related to research are of exceptional quality and deserve recognition with the highest level of merit. Normally, the following products will merit a ranking of Excellent. The publication of a single-authored book and the editing or co-editing of a collection of essays will receive a research descriptor of Excellent.

Funded research proposals that require substantial application and review processes contribute to a research descriptor of Excellent for the year in which they are awarded. In general, the profile of smaller funded research proposals will be assessed by the status of the funding agency, the competitiveness of the grant competition, the amount of funding, and the duration of the funding.

The publication of one single-author article in a peer reviewed journal will receive a research descriptor of Excellent. A co-authored article may receive a research descriptor of Excellent, depending on the extent of the faculty member's contribution. The editing or co-editing of an issue of a journal each receive a research descriptor of Excellent. A significant contribution to community-engaged research can also receive a descriptor of Excellent.

The presentation of work at national conferences, the publication of book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, and other short research-oriented works, may contribute in combination to a research descriptor of Excellent. In general, this will depend on the quality and impact of the product.

Note: The preceding examples of meritorious productivity (Excellent) are not exhaustive.

Good. The profile of good research is evident from the materials in the file; work and materials related to research are of a high quality and deserve recognition with merit. The evolution of a scholarly profile is ongoing and wide-ranging, and the profile of good research reflects a commitment to professional development even if those multiple research efforts have not yet come to fruition.

The presentation of work at a regional or small conference, and the publication of book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, and other short research-oriented works, (which may or may

not be peer reviewed) can receive a research descriptor of Good. In general, this will depend on the quality and impact of the product.

Note: The preceding examples of meritorious productivity (Good) are not exhaustive.

Satisfactory. The profile of satisfactory research is evident from the materials in the file, which demonstrate an effort to meet expectations of research. The profile of satisfactory research reflects some commitment to research. The profile of satisfactory research generally lacks publications but can include work submitted for publication and documentation of work in progress. Presentations or short publications may contribute to a research descriptor of Satisfactory.

Unsatisfactory. The profile of unsatisfactory research is evident from the file; the documentation of research may be missing or incomplete. The profile of unsatisfactory research reflects a lack of engagement with research activities, a lack of commitment to research, or a lack of quality of the research produced.

3.3 Evaluation of Service

Service activities include service to the Institution (at the levels of the University, college, and/or academic unit), the community, and the profession. First and foremost, service to the Institution includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the MDS program. 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 MDS committees; mentoring of students and junior faculty; facilitating professional development opportunities; student recruitment; contributing to program-level assessment of learning, etc. This level of service to the unit is required for a Satisfactory evaluation in the area of Service.

Meritorious service includes either more extensive service to the MDS unit or significant contribution in service to the college, university, community, or profession. While service to the unit does not require documentation in the file, these other forms of service should be documented in the narrative and the file to demonstrate a faculty member's overall impact and contribution.

Service contributions considered for evaluation should be within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, approved by the Director, and performed with one's University affiliation identified.

Service to the community may include public and community-engaged service that utilizes expertise to address specific issues identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. This may include but is not limited to consulting, policy analysis, expert testimony, advisory boards, and other disciplinary-related service to community organizations. Private employment or work apart from the University shall not be considered as part of an annual review.

The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who contribute 20% of their effort to service. Faculty members who devote a larger or smaller portion of their time to

service and whose annual workload forms thus reflect a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 80%, 50%, or 10% service) should note that percentage in their narrative. The overall expectations of impact shift accordingly.

Excellent. There is unmistakable evidence that service has been performed that is well above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, program, or application of professional expertise to the community. Excellent service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: Activities that directly address program, college, university, or professional goals; extensive and continuing responsibilities in terms of organization, leadership or administration, documentation, etc.; work that clearly benefits our program, college, university, or profession; positive results and products of service efforts.

A descriptor of Excellent will typically include evidence of multiple activities. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not simply the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award an Excellent for service.

Good. There is evidence that service has been performed that is above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, program, or application of professional expertise to the community. Good service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: Activities that directly address program, college, university, or professional goals; significant responsibilities in terms of organization, documentation, etc. (often as a contributing member of a committee or organization); work that benefits our program, college, university, or profession; positive results and products of service efforts.

A descriptor of Good will typically include evidence of multiple activities. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not simply the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Good for service.

Satisfactory. There is evidence that service has been performed that is at the level expected of faculty in terms of contribution to the profession, university, college, program, or application of professional expertise to the community. Opportunities to provide service have been pursued. Satisfactory service is typically characterized by: Activities that directly address program, college, university, or professional goals; service responsibilities that require little beyond attendance.

A descriptor of Satisfactory will typically include evidence of activities in at least one of the categories listed earlier in this section. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Satisfactory for service.

Unsatisfactory. There is little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed time or effort in terms of service. The faculty member has made expected contributions to the life of the program. The faculty member interacts minimally with the program, college, university, profession, or community in a professional capacity.

Note: Faculty members with administrative appointments must show evidence of their ability to create and maintain programs or activities that meet the needs and priorities of the program, college, or university, as applicable. 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 program, college, and university.

4. Responses and Rebuttals

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to evaluations from the program's Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Director. These reactions fall into two general classes: "responses" in the general case and "rebuttals" in specific situations. Responses to annual reviews at the program level must be submitted by the end of the calendar year in which it was received. When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding promotion, or non-continuation, a rebuttal may be submitted to the Dean within five working days of receiving the evaluation. Details can be found in the University's guidelines; see Sections XIII.A.6, XIII.A.4, and XIII.A.5 about reactions to departmental evaluations (reactions to college-level evaluations are described in Section XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6).

A faculty member may also file a grievance. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at http://grievanceprocedure.wvu.edu/.

5. Performance-Based Salary Policy
Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations, when applicable. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward meritorious performance.

The program's descriptors translate to points as follows: Excellent = 4; Good = 3; Satisfactory = 1; Unsatisfactory = 0. This translates to 400 possible points. The total score is calculated from multiplying workload percentages by descriptor scores. For example:

80% teaching = 80 x 3 (rating of Good) = 240/320
20% service = 20 x 3 (rating of Good) = 60/80
Merit Total Score = 300/400 possible

If the FEC and the Director present different ratings descriptors, the merit score will be an average of the two evaluations. If a raise follows one or more years where no raises were awarded, then the descriptors assigned during those years are averaged with the new descriptors to determine a faculty member's merit score unless the University sets forth a standard practice.

Unless there are university or college guidelines or policies to the contrary in a given year, the Director will forward the total merit score to the Dean, who will use that score to calculate each faculty member's raise in accordance with university and college guidelines and policies in effect at the time. See the Eberly College guidelines, section X. PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES for more information.

6. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report

In addition to the annual review, faculty can request a pre-promotion review to be evaluated (usually occurring two years before an application for promotion). The cumulative pre-promotion report is a faculty productivity report that summarizes accomplishments during an appropriate period of review to assist a faculty member with planning and preparation for an application for promotion. Because promotion of Teaching-track and Service-track faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory. However, such reviews can be requested so that non-tenure track faculty members can obtain the program's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

7. Cumulative Promotion Report

The cumulative promotion report summarizes accomplishments during the period of review to be considered in an application for promotion. If the appointment letter awards credit towards promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, the credited work must also be included in the cumulative promotion report. The cumulative promotion report's end date is on December 31 of the calendar year in which promotion is sought.

The cumulative promotion report is a faculty productivity report run for a longer period using an appropriate date range as set forth above and will automatically draw administrative materials and all available documentation that the faculty has uploaded for each area of contribution (research, teaching, and service) as applicable. In addition, the faculty member should upload a detailed narrative where the candidate makes a case for promotion by highlighting their contributions to teaching and service (and research, as appropriate), and a complete c.v. Responsibility for preparing the narratives and documentation lies solely with the candidate.

8. Criteria for Promotion

The standards for promotion in MDS for Teaching-track and Service-track faculty are outlined separately below.

8.1 Teaching-Track Faculty

Teaching-track faculty members have renewable term appointments in which the principal assignment is teaching, and are designated with the prefix "teaching," accompanying an academic rank set forth in BOG Rule 4.2 (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor). These positions make a significant contribution to teaching in all of its manifestations, including but not limited to classroom instruction, advising, and program development. Normally, a teaching-track faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Teaching-track appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. Promotion is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a teaching-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a teaching-track faculty member and their Director may initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

For teaching faculty, a positive recommendation for promotion requires a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence combined with a preponderance of meritorious ratings (Good or Excellent) in annual reviews of teaching. However, meritorious annual evaluations of previous years alone are not sufficient for promotion. In addition, the FEC will examine the promotion file independently and arrive at an overall assessment of its merits. The promotion file must provide evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the program's teaching mission, including an assessment of instructional outcomes and effectiveness, evidence of growth and development during the period under review, and evidence of valuable ongoing contribution to the defined needs, priorities, and initiatives of the program, college, and university.

Faculty appointed at the rank of instructor are eligible for promotion after at least six years with a preponderance of meritorious ratings of teaching. In addition to meeting the requirements of the College guidelines, their evaluation file must show a sustained record of teaching excellence that contributes to the University's overall teaching mission. Such evidence will include positive student evaluations, peer teaching observations, and evidence of continual self-assessment of instructional processes/outcomes.

For faculty at the rank of assistant professor who wish to stand for promotion to associate professor, the evaluation file must show a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence combined with evidence of significant curricular and/or programmatic development and important contributions to the University's overall teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include continual self-assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to the enhancement of course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives. The faculty member must show for a separate period of at least six years and a greater overall contribution than in the years leading up to the previous promotion.

The criteria for promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor are more stringent than the criteria for promotion to associate professor. The faculty member must show for a separate period of at least six years and a greater overall contribution than in the years leading up to the previous promotion. Promotion to the rank of teaching professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and through external review, recognize the professor for their instructional contributions to the discipline.

8.2 Service-Track Faculty

Service-track faculty members have renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is service, and are designated with the prefix "service," accompanying an academic rank set forth in BOG Rule 4.2 (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor). A service faculty appointment must have service assignments of at least 50%, with classroom instruction or other assignment secondary. Typically, service faculty will have service and teaching as their significant areas of contribution. Some service faculty may also have a reasonable contribution in research but that is not required; for example, the service faculty assignment may be 50% service, 10% research, and 40% teaching. These positions make a significant contribution

to service in some of its many manifestations, including but not limited to program, college, institutional and/or public service. Promotion is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a service-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a service-track faculty member and the Director may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

For Service Faculty, a positive recommendation for promotion must be supported by a preponderance of meritorious (Good or Excellent) ratings on annual reviews of service and in a second area of significant contribution, normally Teaching. However, meritorious annual evaluations of previous years alone are not sufficient for promotion. In addition, the FEC will examine the promotion file independently and arrive at an overall assessment of its merits. The promotion file should provide evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the program's service mission, including an assessment of service outcomes and effectiveness, evidence of growth and development during the period under review, and evidence of valuable ongoing contribution to the defined needs, priorities, and initiatives of the program, college, and university. To qualify for promotion at any level, service faculty must also be evaluated through the external review process.

In accordance with university policy, service activities for the benefit of citizens of the state have primary emphasis for purposes of promotion. While service to the university and professions are worthy of consideration, normally a faculty member must have significant service activities (which can include the creation and direction of service-learning projects) directed to the citizens of West Virginia.

Service instructors who wish to stand for promotion must demonstrate a preponderance of meritorious ratings in their areas of significant contribution during the review period. The file should demonstrate an ongoing contribution to the service mission of the unit, addressing unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives, as well as the needs of the institution and community. It should also display a continual effort to grow and improve in those efforts. These contributions should be related to administration, governance, community outreach, or other areas of service outlined in the appointment letter.

For service assistant professors who wish to stand for promotion to associate professor, the evaluation file should demonstrate a sustained record of service excellence with a preponderance of meritorious ratings in their areas of significant contribution during the review period. The file should demonstrate an ongoing contribution to the service mission of the unit, addressing unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives, as well as the needs of the institution and community. These contributions should be related to administration, governance, community outreach, or other areas of service outlined in the appointment letter. The faculty member must show for a separate period of at least six years a greater overall contribution than in the years leading up to the previous promotion.

The criteria for promotion from associate to full professor are more stringent than the criteria for promotion to associate professor. The faculty member must show for a separate period of at least six years a greater overall contribution than in the years leading up to the previous promotion. Promotion to the rank of service professor designates that the faculty member's achievement

merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and through external review, recognize the professor for their service contributions to the profession.

9. Criteria for Non-renewal

For teaching-faculty, a rating of Unsatisfactory in the area of Teaching may lead to a teaching improvement plan. A teaching improvement plan is a written agreement between the director and the faculty member, subject to the dean's approval. It is designed to remediate the faculty member's performance, which might include increased classroom observations, Teaching and Learning support, mentoring and other professional development. For service-faculty, a rating of Unsatisfactory in the area of Service or another area of significant contribution may lead to a recommendation of non-renewal. For service-faculty, a rating of Unsatisfactory in the area of teaching or service will lead to an improvement plan in the relevant area. The improvement plan is a written agreement between the director and the faculty member, subject to the dean's approval. It aims to remediate the faculty member's performance in the relevant area. If a faculty member receives an "Unsatisfactory" rating in an area of significant contribution for two successive years, the result will be a recommendation for non-continuation, if under an extended contract or non-renewal. A recommendation of non-continuation will automatically initiate additional levels of review by the college and provost before the final decision is made.

10. Overview of the Review Process

For the sake of clarity, here is a brief overview of the steps in the review process.
a. The committee will review and evaluate material in the faculty member's evaluation file. Based only on this evidence, the committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against continuation and/or promotion. The committee shall indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for promotion. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the Director. The total number of positive and negative votes or abstentions must be indicated. An abstention (recusal) can only occur when there is a conflict of interest.

b. The Director will review the evaluation file as well as the committee's evaluation statement and recommendation regarding each faculty member and will make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member. The Director shall indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Director of the evaluative comments and recommendations of both the FEC committee and the Director at the same time. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file and shared with the faculty member, including the signatures, votes, or abstentions, if applicable.

c. If the faculty member receives a positive recommendation for promotion from either the FEC committee or Director, the file is submitted for review at the college level. If both such recommendations are negative, the file is submitted to the Dean for information.

d. When a recommendation against promotion or for non-continuation has been made, the faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations for review at the college level. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five (5) working days of receipt of the evaluations.

e. A faculty member may petition the Dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations for promotion (i.e., when both the department committee and the department Chairperson render negative recommendations). The rebuttal must reach the Dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. The Dean shall forward the petition to the college evaluation committee as a matter of course for its recommendation. Non-continuation cases are automatically reviewed by the college committee and the Dean.

f. Responses to annual reviews may be forwarded to the Director and/or Dean any time after the receipt of the evaluation(s). The response will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the Director with an additional memo placed in the file. If the faculty member disagrees or otherwise takes issue with the evaluations or the assignment of descriptors, the faculty member may work informally with the Director. Afterwards, the faculty member may ask the Dean to review the evaluations or descriptors. However, any informal efforts to resolve any such issue will not serve to suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances. After considering the faculty member's request, the Dean may direct the Director or the committee to reconsider their action based on a written justification that would be placed in the faculty evaluation file. Any subsequent adjustments would be documented in an additional memo to the file.

11. Amendments

This document is a component of the MDS Program Handbook. Any changes thus require approval through the process for modifying the MDS Program Handbook and then additional approval at the college and provost level. All FEC criteria and evaluation process must be consistent with the policies and standards established by ECAS and university, and in case of conflict, are superseded by ECAS and university-wide policies.