

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION MANUAL

DIVISION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Approved by the Division March 26, 2010
Approved by the Office of the Provost June 10, 2010

INTRODUCTION

The Division of Public Administration's *Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual* supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure*. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the Division, the purpose of this manual 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 Division level. Division policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors (BoG), those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, and Division standards.

The Division of Public Administration's faculty evaluation process is intended to: guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the Division; 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. Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Eberly College faculty evaluation process includes several components: annual evaluation, performance-based pay determinations, and reviews for promotion and/or tenure. Tenure track and promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include provisions for promotion review. Information used in these reviews include: the letter of appointment, annual assignment, the faculty personnel file, annual performance reviews and feedback, and student evaluation information. Each of these processes and elements will be described in the following subsections.

REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service. Appointment letters are customarily issued on initial appointment. They may be revised and reissued as a result of a significant change in assignment. Additionally, specific appointment letters may be issued for administrative positions, distinguished professorships, or other distinct assignments.

Customarily, annual notices of appointment are issued to faculty in July prior to the beginning of the academic year.

The percentages of the appointment 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. A Memorandum of Understanding may be generated based on the particulars of the Annual Assignment, as described in the following subsection.

For Tenure track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Designated research-intensive appointments may be 30% teaching and 50% research, normally with two significant grants, as principal investigator or major co-investigator, required for award of tenure in research-intensive appointments.

For Teaching faculty, responsibilities are defined as 80% teaching and 20% service. For Clinical faculty, BoG Policy 2 stipulates the majority of the appointment be assigned to service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. Research faculty may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as principal investigator in externally funded research. Per BoG Policy 2, classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary. Teaching must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. There may be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are normally a maximum of .80FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

In summary, the allocation of a faculty member’s teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Appointments in the Eberly College normally fall within the following allocations:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Clinical Faculty ¹	30-48%	5-10% max	50+%
Teaching Faculty	80%	---- ²	20%
Research Faculty		100%	
Senior Lecturer	100%		
Lecturer	100%		

¹ Expectations considered in annual evaluations and possible promotion or performance-based salary increases for Clinical faculty at WVU/ECAS will include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and reasonable contribution in research. In ECAS, the criterion of “reasonable research contribution” for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank is normally one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference, per year. However, for discretionary promotion, a record of publication in refereed journals normally will be expected. Teaching assignments for Clinical faculty are normally a maximum of 14 credit hours during the nine-month academic year.

² Evaluation in a Teaching faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU P&T document (Part III.B., page 4, 2006-07 version): "Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For Teaching faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

Annual Assignment

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

In the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences and in the Division of Public Administration, annual workload plan forms are used to assist in developing activities for the academic year. These are developed through collaborative discussion between the Chair and the faculty member and are subsequently reviewed by the Dean.

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Division of Public Administration is four courses. "Research active" in this context is defined as demonstrating good or excellent performance in research based on annual review descriptors. In addition, all MPA tenure track faculty are expected to have associate or full membership on the graduate faculty to be considered as research active. Criteria for Graduate Faculty Membership are established by the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences.

Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to five courses. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the faculty member's expectations for promotion. For faculty members approved for sabbatical or professional development program leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's annual assignment for the leave period.

Faculty on a full year's professional development 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 Tenure track faculty member's annual evaluation would typically be 60%-70% teaching, 20-30% research and 10% service. Teaching faculty would typically be 90% teaching and 10% service.

Faculty on a full year's sabbatical leave would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester's sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

A similar allocation may apply for 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 should be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty Personnel File

Faculty must annually update personnel files with representative documentation of activities completed during the year under review. On the Division-specified deadline date (December 31 or the last business day in December) the file shall be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the student faculty evaluation instrument (SEIs) shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Each faculty personnel file must have an inventory of its contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, all faculty files and file inventories in the Eberly College will be organized following a format that maintains four separate inventories for (1) the administrative file, and for (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service documentation. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

1. The administrative file includes: (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) annual CVs and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include.

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation submitted by the faculty member for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify to which file each piece of documentation is submitted. The inclusion of a narrative that explains and puts materials in context is highly recommended. Each document should be tagged with its inventory number.

Once an item is entered into the personnel file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. Generally speaking, files may not leave the administrative office suite where they are housed. These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

Evaluation procedures shall also incorporate the assessments of all of the following: the individual faculty member under review, the FEC, the Division Chair, and in cases of fourth year review or tenure and/or promotion, the Dean's evaluation. The resulting documents that will be placed in the file will include: 1) the individual faculty member's annual report and any correspondence responding to subsequent evaluations carried out by the FEC, Division Chair, as

well as those carried out at the Dean's and Provost's levels, 2) the faculty evaluation committee's letter of evaluation, 2) the Chair's letter of evaluation, and, when conducted, 3) the Dean's letter of evaluation as well as those of the College Committee if an evaluation has been done by the committee. In addition, Provost's level reviews will be included in the file in cases of promotion and/or tenure.

EVALUATION PROCESSES

This section will describe the processes, roles, and responsibilities of those involved in the faculty evaluation process during: (1) annual performance reviews; (2) performance-based salary review; (3) fourth-year review for Tenure-track faculty; and (4) review for promotion and/or tenure.

Annual Performance Reviews

All faculty receive annual evaluations. The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. Furthermore, assessment ratings affect available salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. All Clinical faculty, Research faculty, Teaching faculty, and Tenure track faculty should participate in formalized evaluation and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process.

Step 1: Faculty Members Submit Documentation

All faculty members being evaluated shall report their activities each year, covering the previous calendar year. The report should present and document evidence bearing on activities and performance in work assignment areas (e.g. Teaching, Research, and Service). The information that, at a minimum, is to be found in the Faculty Personnel File is described in the University's faculty evaluation guidelines (see VII, Faculty Personnel File). The University guidelines also identify those supporting materials for which the faculty member is responsible to include in his/her personnel file.

The faculty member bears the responsibility to notify the Chair in writing in timely fashion as designated in University and College guidelines, if he/she wishes to be considered for discretionary promotion or to decline consideration for tenure in the critical year.

Step 2: Faculty Evaluation Committee Reviews File

The Division Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and (rarely) termination. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The FEC conducts annual peer reviews of all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members using the process described below. These reviews will be related to the faculty member's performance, tenure, and promotion in compliance with the standards, policies, and procedures established by the University, College, and Division.

Occasional and part-time clinical and adjunct faculty should receive reviews if appropriate to their assignment. In such instances, the Committee will evaluate performance on the basis of requirements set out in the individual's letter of appointment, contract, or other documents.

An FEC shall be established on an annual basis to participate in performance reviews. Evaluation procedures are structured so as to: (1) utilize the professional competence of the faculty in evaluating its members; (2) bring to bear objective outside evaluation as input in the evaluation process; (3) give the Chair guidelines to support legal responsibility, professional judgment, and Division development; and (4) allow administrative personnel and faculty to engage in planning and evaluation.

Composition

In the Division of Public Administration, the FEC will be composed of at least three faculty members. All ranks of tenure-track, teaching, or clinical faculty may serve on the FEC. The FEC composition should be inclusive of categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g. Clinical faculty, Teaching faculty, Tenure track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases. In the case where the Committee will be voting on tenure recommendations, the majority of the members must be tenured faculty.

The FEC may include external persons or other faculty as approved by the faculty of the Division and the Office of the Dean. The appointment of external members will be accomplished in conformity with Division, College, and University rules and regulations.

A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the FEC that will review her/his personnel file, as the FEC appointed each year reviews *all* faculty files under evaluation that year. Members may serve on the FEC, but must recuse themselves when the Committee 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 Committee may not serve on departmental faculty evaluation committees.

Appointment

The FEC will normally be appointed by September 1 on an annual basis. The Division faculty will meet as a whole in advance of this date to nominate and appoint members to the Committee from within the Division and outside the Division if deemed necessary. The list of nominees will be discussed and narrowed if deemed necessary. The Chair will then contact each nominee to determine willingness and ability to serve on the FEC. Those who are not willing or able will be struck from the list and the final list of nominees will be considered through deliberation of the Division faculty as a whole.

It is the expressed desire of the faculty that a consensus decision is reached in making appointments to the FEC. In the event that consensus is not achieved, the Division Chair may call for a vote and a majority of two-thirds (67 percent) will be required for appointment of a member to the FEC.

FEC membership will be forwarded to the Dean's office for information. The chair of the FEC will be selected by the committee itself. The chair will ideally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC.

FEC Responsibilities

The FEC will work closely with the Chair in carrying out its responsibilities. Most generally, the FEC will review University and College policies and procedures for promotion, tenure, and evaluation, to ensure Division compliance and also to make recommendations to the faculty for changes in Division promotion, tenure, and evaluation policies and procedures in order to improve them and to bring them into compliance with University and College guidelines.

The FEC will review requests for sabbatical and professional development leave, as well as emeritus designation. To support faculty evaluation, the FEC will provide information and assistance to all faculty members as a means of preparing them for the review process. The FEC will also recommend possible external reviewers at peer institutions for those faculty members being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, in accord with University and College guidelines.

The FEC will review and evaluate all faculty files under consideration that year. It is understood that members of the FEC keep Committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential.

The annual review focuses on performance for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years will 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 tenure, if applicable to their appointment, or continuing to remain productive. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are appropriate.

The annual review will be used to assess performance in context of expectations identified in appointment letters, workload documents, and other letters or documents relating to assignment. Evaluation of performance is also conducted to assess progress toward tenure and promotion. It is also used for purposes of rating performance for performance-based pay recommendations and special performance incentives that are in use for professors with five or more years of service in their rank.

The evaluation focuses on evidence in the personnel file. Meritorious work must be fully documented; for example, if 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 evidence that: (1) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. 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."

The FEC will assign a descriptor (Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) to each area of faculty responsibility. Areas of assignment are rated 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”. Both Excellent and Good are meritorious ratings. Specific guidelines for assignments to teaching, research, and service are provided in the following subsections.

Teaching. Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member’s overall contribution to the teaching mission of the Division. It is expected that syllabi for all courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the personnel file. It is expected that the results of student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. However, faculty should submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that goes beyond the results of student evaluations.

Supporting documentation for the evaluation of performance in teaching may include, but is not limited to, evidence drawn from the collective judgment of students, evidence of accessibility for students, evidence of respect for students, peer evaluation, analysis of course content and innovative development of new courses as well as established courses, evaluation of products produced by the instructor related to teaching such as course texts, videotapes, innovative use of instructional technology and computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success of former students, or other evidence deemed appropriate by the Division, School, or College.

Evidence of effective instruction may include but is not limited to:

1. *Priority One:* competence in basic and elective courses. Competence encompasses all areas of pedagogy, including conceptualizing, designing, and implementing basic and elective courses, as well as quality of teaching in such courses. For purposes of reporting, instruction of Directed or Independent studies is considered a priority one teaching activity.
2. *Priority Two:* competence in other teaching endeavors. This includes:
 - a. Academic and field advisement, including management of internship experiences
 - b. Thesis direction
 - c. Mentoring other faculty in teaching skills
 - d. Workshops and seminars to lay and peer audiences, including continuing education courses
 - e. Non-credit seminars provided to student groups
 - f. Serving on dissertation and thesis committees
 - g. Preparing teaching materials including the development of web-based courses, televised courses, etc.
 - h. Submitting and/or having accepted and/or implementing grant funded activities to support teaching
 - i. Other official activities that are of an essentially pedagogical nature.

Competence is demonstrated through qualitative and quantitative measures of pedagogy, and the fit of the course and its design to the curriculum and its core mission. The burden is upon the faculty member to demonstrate through narrative discussion and documentary evidence in his or her annual productivity reports and personnel file the quality of classroom performance. One criterion of the Faculty Evaluation Committee's and Division Chair's review could be the faculty member's examination of how knowledge and skills are being communicated to students in the classroom. This examination can be guided by the annual productivity reports, documented student comments on class evaluations, peer evaluations, exit interviews, and outside efforts (such as voluntary training).

Student evaluation of courses and faculty are an important source of information and a partial basis for the faculty evaluation committee and chair to develop their conclusions, ratings, and recommendations. Division policy requires that all credit-bearing activities (including internship/field placement and internship analysis) be evaluated using a format that insures objectivity and uniformity across the curriculum, where possible and feasible. Evaluations will be carried out in a manner that protects the anonymity of students and assures fairness. All course evaluations must be included in the annual report for review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Normally, the absence of evaluations will result in an unsatisfactory rating in teaching, because adequate evidence of effective teaching has not been provided. However, sole reliance on student evaluations is insufficient evidence of teaching competence.

The approach should be broad and inclusive. Some of the points to consider in fashioning an annual report of teaching activity may include but are not limited to:

1. 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.
2. Citing of student field practice and research projects.
3. Student products, such as group presentations and research projects, especially those involving public audiences beyond the classroom.
4. Peer reviews of teaching.
5. External reviews of teaching, if appropriate.

Meritorious (i.e. beyond satisfactory) teaching will include among the following (a) good student perceptions as measured quantitatively in student evaluation instruments and qualitatively through open-ended comments, correspondence, etc, (b) evidence of achievement in areas including but not limited to the following: commitment and effectiveness in such activities as graduate examinations, graduate theses and dissertations; sponsorship of student organizations or teams; advising; curriculum development; instructional leadership and coordination; internship development and supervision; receipt of a grant for instructional purposes; involvement with graduate students in presenting papers and/or in publishing; encouraging quality in the

curriculum, (c) involvement in continuing and professional education instruction relevant to the Division.

Research. Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the Division. It is expected that faculty will include in the file print copies of all publications to be counted for the review period. The unit may accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance.

For those with research as an area of significant contribution, faculty should submit evidence of research or scholarly or creative activity evidence that includes, but goes beyond, publications. While it is not possible to devise a workable weighting scheme for assessing the variety of acceptable forms of research and scholarly productivity, it is nonetheless possible and desirable to state some general principles to serve as guidelines. The guidelines for the Division of Public Administration include the following:

1. In assessing the research record of faculty under review for promotion and/or tenure, the greatest weight will be given to books and articles in peer-reviewed journals ("Priority One" category). As book publishers and journals vary greatly in quality, consideration will be given to the reputation they enjoy among professionals. In addition, evaluations of the faculty member's cumulative body of work by respected academic and peer practitioner reviewers will be sought.
2. A successful candidate for promotion and/or the awarding of tenure is required to have an active program of research. The area of expertise may have been identified in the initial letter of appointment or the areas of significant contribution may have been formally modified since the faculty member's initial appointment.
3. Weight will also be given to non-refereed publications that make positive contributions to government and public service and to the dissemination of research at professional meetings. Scholarship is often demonstrated through reports and analyses prepared for government and not-for-profit organizations in a service or consulting capacity, and may be demonstrated in the preparation of new course content, materials, or innovational methods of instruction.
4. Faculty collaboration on research and co-authored publications is encouraged; however, the faculty member is expected to identify for purposes of promotion and tenure decisions the extent or nature of his or her contribution to the work.
5. Faculty are encouraged to publish their research in journals that have a national or international reputation for excellence. These journals may be within a given faculty member's discipline or may be interdisciplinary.
6. Book chapters, monographs and other forms of publication are encouraged, particularly when a peer review process is followed. Consultant reports, working papers and other forms of scholarly productivity will usually carry lesser weight, except when they make

a demonstrably significant contribution to the body of knowledge in professional theory or practice.

7. Certain pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications may be appropriate for consideration as research rather than as teaching.
8. Faculty are encouraged to secure funding to support their scholarship. External funding plays an increasingly important role in the support of scholarship. Peer reviewed externally funded grants may also be an indicator of the quality of a faculty member's work.
9. Normally the work published will have been published while serving as a faculty member at West Virginia University and will identify the faculty member as affiliated with WVU.

Given the fact that public administration is a multi-disciplinary field of endeavor, there exists no list of approved journals for faculty publications. Publications of high quality and relevance may be found in the various sub-fields or special interest areas (e.g., budgeting and finance, human resources management, health management, and conflict resolution in public administration).

Tenure-track faculty should constantly be aware that their productivity in promotion and tenure decisions will be based on their overall record of research productivity as demonstrated through publication. A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) research contribution normally requires thorough documentation of an ongoing research agenda that is demonstrated through a record of publication and conference presentation. Evaluation will be based on the quality and visibility of various publishing outlets and on differences in time commitments that usually distinguish book-length from article-length research and writing projects.

In specific terms, research and scholarly productivity are given priority in the following order:

1. *Priority One:* professional books and refereed journal articles:
 - a. Refereed journal articles. This element normally requires blind peer review by anonymous reviewers.
 - b. A book that is published or under contract to be published (unequivocally accepted for publication) and is already completed. Its 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. Some 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 (of a substantial length) that have undergone some type of systematic professional peer review.

2. *Priority Two*: other publications and scholarly work:

- 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. The submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants for scholarly research or of the activities described in 2a above.

The FEC and the Chair will also review each faculty member’s research program over a longer period than the current calendar year in order to evaluate the trajectory of her/his efforts. Faculty members are encouraged to attach statements to their annual evaluation/activities reports, indicating how they would prefer their recent-past, present, and near-future research activities to be interpreted.

Annual, critical-year, and discretionary evaluations of faculty research performance will be based on evidence. Copies of refereed and published scholarly articles, books, and monographs must be provided, or evidence of professional peer reviews and announcements of editorial decisions to publish for both books and articles.

The FEC will give variable credit for a publication depending on its type and publication status. An annual rating of Excellent may be given for a peer-reviewed book or monograph when the manuscript has been accepted for publication, and again after the manuscript is actually published. (However, such a publication will only be counted once for purposes of promotion or tenure.) An annual rating of Excellent for a journal article may be given either in the year in which it is accepted for publication or for the year in which it appears in print, if those years differ. In their annual evaluation/activities reports, faculty members must indicate in which year they wish credit to be awarded for accepted journal articles.

In general, documentation related to research publications will be evaluated on the basis of the following stages in the process of research and publication:

Stage	Normal Rating
Research in progress, reflected in a partial or complete manuscript	Satisfactory
Conference paper presented and discussed	Satisfactory/Good
Grant proposals submitted to funding sources (proposed and awarded)	Satisfactory/Good
Technical reports completed and submitted to funders, agencies, etc.	Good
Book chapters or article submitted to publisher for peer review	Good
Article published or accepted for publication; book chapter published	Excellent

Book manuscript accepted	Good
Book published	Excellent

Clinical faculty assignments (a minimum of 50% service) may include a 5-10% research component. A clinical faculty appointment asks for only a reasonable contribution in research, and the annual file will be expected to include one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference. Other instances of scholarly activity such as peer-reviewed articles are welcome, but are not required to meet the criterion of reasonable research contribution for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank. However, should Clinical faculty wish to stand for promotion, a record of publication is expected.

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For Teaching faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University’s teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Division-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

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

Service is considered particularly important in the Division of Public Administration, in keeping with the public and social service ethos which underlies both the practice and study of the discipline and the mission of the University. The service that is envisioned embraces but goes beyond service to the University and profession, to include service projects directed to the citizens of West Virginia directly or through its governmental and public service institutions, or to citizens of the region, nation or world either directly or through governmental, community and public service institutions.

Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Faculty are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation. Private consulting requires approval of the Division Chair and the Dean.

The evaluation of service will 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 which are within a person’s professional expertise as a

faculty member and are performed with one's university affiliation identified. Annual reports for promotion and tenure 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.

Evidence of service includes but is not limited to:

1. *Service to the Community*

- a. Participation in a professional capacity in a community or other public organization
- b. Membership on committees and commissions at national, state, and local levels in a professional capacity
- c. Participation in University-sponsored off-campus programs, workshops, and conferences
- d. University affiliated consultancies to public and private agencies and individuals
- e. Development and direction of special educational programs for the public
- f. Professional presentations to community groups.
- g. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the community.
- h. Other external service activity

2. *Service to University and College*

- a. Committee work.
- b. Participating in creating, developing and operating joint degree programs and sharing arrangements with academic and service units within the University.
- c. Contributing to the improvement of management and operation processes of the University or any of its academic or administrative units.
- d. Faculty advisor to professional associations, honorary organizations and other student organizations.
- e. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the University and/or College.
- f. Other service activity

3. *Service to the Division and School*

- a. Service in Division assignments.
- b. Providing administrative services to the Division or School.
- c. Development of special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, and catalogs.
- d. Involvement in program and curriculum development.
- e. Academic advising, other than on instructional matters.
- f. Organizing colloquia and other Division or School programs.

- g. Development of cooperative arrangements with other academic and external units, leading to enrichment of our respective degree programs.
- h. Faculty advisor to professional associations, honorary organizations and other student organizations.
- i. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the Division and/or School.
- j. Other Division or School service.

4. *Service to the Profession*

- a. Holding offices and committee memberships in professional organizations.
- b. Referee for professional journal.
- c. Editorial work associated with journal (including position of editor).
- d. Consultancies for the profession, including but not limited to pre-publication review of manuscripts, and accreditation and peer review functions.
- e. Presenting speeches or workshops at professional conferences.
- f. Chairing or appearing as a panel discussant or reactor at professional conferences, or otherwise helping to facilitate a professional meeting or conference.
- g. Reviewer or developer within a Federal or state grant program.
- h. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the profession.
- i. Other professional service.

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution normally includes evidence of leadership in and/or outcomes of assigned service responsibilities.

Per the University *Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure* document, service activities that are acceptable when one is expected to make contributions characterized as reasonable should be differentiated in the unit's guidelines from those activities expected when service is an area of significant contribution. In the Division of Public Administration, service expectations for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution will be identified in appointment letters and workload documents.

FEC Reporting

The FEC will present in writing its formal actions and recommendations to the Division Chair and the College Dean, including but not limited to: summaries of its evaluations of faculty, promotion and tenure applications, requests for sabbatical, professional development, and other leave, and performance-based pay. The FEC will also make recommendations to the College relative to Graduate Faculty status. The Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files.

All members of the FEC must sign the Committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting.

Step 3: Division Chair Reviews File

The Chair shall review the evaluations and recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee in addition to making an independent evaluation of the performance of the faculty member relating to the calendar year under review, based on the faculty member's file. Copies of the FEC and the Division Chair evaluations are simultaneously given to the faculty member. The Chair's evaluation is added to the FEC's evaluation, and both are forwarded to the College for review by the College Committee and the Dean.

Step 4: Faculty Member's Right to Respond to Evaluations

According to University guidelines, faculty members can write a rebuttal of their Division evaluations from the FEC and/or the Division Chair; the rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

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

Appeal of a departmental descriptor (i.e., seeking action to have a descriptor changed) could be treated as described in the previous paragraph, and, if simultaneously grieved, must follow the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at pegboard.state.wv.us/ or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 293-9203.

(See: <http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4)

Performance-Based Salary Review

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations. Both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Division Chair will convert their annual evaluations for teaching, research, and service into three scores that will be used in establishing performance-based pay recommendations. These scores shall be weighted proportionate to annual assignment in calculating final recommendations. In this process, the descriptors used to rate performance in the evaluation guidelines (that is, ratings of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory) will be converted to performance-based pay components (4.5 points for Excellent, 3 for Good, 1 for Satisfactory, 0 for Unsatisfactory). A faculty member whose performance is assessed as Unsatisfactory in any area of assignment will receive no performance-based increase for that portion of his/her assignment. However, a rating of Unsatisfactory in one area does not preclude the possibility of awarding performance-based pay for meritorious accomplishment in one or more other area(s).

Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation and to participate in available raise plans but, for areas of

expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

The University's *Policies and Procedures for Annual Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure* indicate the following:

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of specific divisions, Colleges or other academic units and are to be judged accordingly. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution.

Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles. (p.2)

The [unit's] criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways which equitably reflect the particular responsibilities and assignments of each. (p. 3)

In accord with this, performance-based pay recommendations for a faculty member, which are based on his/her annual evaluation, should reflect the faculty member's annual assignment. Thus, the performance-based pay recommendations of a faculty member who, for example, has been on a sabbatical leave, should reflect that faculty member's level of accomplishment of the assignments associated with that leave.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall make an independent evaluation of each faculty member's merit. The Chair shall also assign merit to each faculty member in the Division using the same criteria and scoring formula. These two merit evaluations shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

The receipt of performance-based pay in one or several years is not related to promotion and/or tenure. If, for instance, an exemplary record in teaching is not matched by an appropriate record in research or service, such a faculty member would not be promoted or tenured although he/she may have received performance-based pay adjustments for teaching in each of several years.

Fourth-Year Review

Division FEC and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. However, tenure track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review by the College Dean to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. The Dean reviews the entire set of annual evaluations to date.

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. Significant contributions in teaching are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University.

Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the

letter of appointment. “Significant contributions” in research are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities.

Where concern arises regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the Dean will follow up with a request that the entire file be forwarded for assessment by the College Committee. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching and research, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Promotion and Tenure Review

Promotion to Associate Professor without Tenure (Non-Tenure Track)

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in Clinical, Research, or Teaching faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing Tenure track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a Clinical, Teaching, or promotion-eligible Research faculty member and her/his Chair 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 one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

In order to be recommended for promotion, a faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions and reasonable contributions in research, teaching, and/or service, as designated in their Letter of Appointment or as modified in a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding.

Faculty members under review for a promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be expected to have made a substantial beginning toward establishing their professional standing in such ways as scholarship is defined in the particular appointment.

For faculty who have a title with the prefix “Clinical” (as differentiated from faculty in the “clinical-track”), service will normally be one area in which significant contributions are expected.

For faculty who have service designated as an area of significant contribution in their letters of appointment, a criterion for promotion shall be demonstrating significant contribution in service. While service to the University and/or to the profession is worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must demonstrate significant service to the public at large (i.e., beyond the University or core professional communities). An example would include the creation and direction of service-learning projects directed to the citizens of West Virginia. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the University or to the profession on a national or international level. Such expectations should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (*Tenure Track*)

In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual's "critical year," as identified in the letter of appointment. This is generally the sixth year of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience may be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure in the appointment letter. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. Tenure track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may, during the fourth year of employment (by May 15th of the fourth year), request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean's approval of such request, the new critical year will be confirmed. In any case, if tenure is not awarded by the end of the established critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University should be included in the personnel file.

As recognized by the University guidelines, criteria for the granting of promotion and tenure must be informed by College and Division criteria. These criteria will take into account the distinctive character of the disciplines and the rank and status being sought by the faculty member under review. Included herein are definitions and descriptions pertinent to research, teaching and service evaluation criteria. These definitions and descriptions are intended to incorporate, clarify, and expand University and College promotion and tenure guidelines, insofar as they apply to the Division of Public Administration.

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 Memorandum of Understanding. 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.

Faculty members under review for the award of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with 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. Normally 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. 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. The publications would need to be quality products of importance for this minimum to be sufficient. In exceptional instances, e.g. a book, a lesser number of publications may be acceptable. In such instances, the publications will need to be of significant importance. 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.

The term “significant contribution” in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer institutions. This is determined in part through external review. Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member’s research or service from persons external to the University.

For faculty who have service designated as an area of significant contribution in their letters of appointment, a criterion for promotion and tenure shall be demonstrating significant contribution in service. While service to the University and/or to the profession is worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must demonstrate significant service to the public at large (i.e., beyond the University or core professional communities). An example would include the creation and direction of service-learning projects directed to the citizens of West Virginia. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the University or to the profession on a national or international level. Such expectations should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

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 Division in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost.

Promotion to Professor

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.

To achieve the rank of Professor, the expectation is that a Tenure track or Research faculty member has established himself or herself as an outstanding and recognized scholar in her/his respective discipline and has a distinguished record of research and publication. “Distinguished record” means a body of work receiving professional and peer recognition on a regional or national basis in a particular field of specialization. There must be evidence of continuous and ongoing scholarly publication in peer-reviewed outlets of high quality, influential manuscripts in

the field of expertise, and dissemination of research at professional meetings. For Clinical and Teaching faculty, there is equivalent expectation for professional and peer recognition in service or teaching, as defined by the appointment.

For all faculty with teaching responsibility, a continuing record of distinguished teaching is expected.

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

For faculty who have service designated as an area of significant contribution in their letters of appointment, a criterion for promotion shall be demonstrating significant contribution in service. While service to the University and/or to the profession is worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must demonstrate significant service to the public at large (i.e., beyond the University or core professional communities). An example would include the creation and direction of service-learning projects directed to the citizens of West Virginia. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the University or to the profession on a national or international level. Such expectations should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. 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. For promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

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 Division in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost.

PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

Following established University procedures, these guidelines may be amended through faculty input, Division approval, College approval, and final University approval.

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair of the Division. The Committee and the Chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the

Division faculty. If the faculty approve 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.

<<< end >>>