

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL

Approved by department February 7, 2014

Approved by the Office of the Dean July 13, 2015

Approved by the Office of the Provost July 22, 2015

The Department of Statistics 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 department, 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 departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS). 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 the event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, Department.

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

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College includes several components, among them the Appointment Letter, annual assignment, the Faculty Evaluation File, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track, and promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the areas of expected significant contribution, normally teaching and research; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to make significant progress towards fulfilling the expectations in one's Appointment Letter by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The Appointment Letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service.

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

For Teaching faculty, University guidelines specify the responsibilities as at least 80% teaching with the rest in research, service, or a combination. In the Eberly College, Teaching faculty normally are expected to have a service assignment; therefore, the responsibilities normally are defined as at least 80% teaching, 5% to 20% service, and 0% to 15% research.

For Clinical faculty, Board of Governors Policy 2 stipulates the appointment must have the majority of the assignment be 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.

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, Research, Teaching, and Tenure track faculty participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process.

In the Department of Statistics, each faculty member who participates in the annual planning and feedback process must document his/her annual assignment early in the calendar year with a *Faculty Workload Plan*. An end-of-year annual *Faculty Productivity Report* is also required to document completed work from the Faculty Workload Plan. The faculty member and Chair sign both documents. Required documentation is discussed further in the section on the *Faculty Evaluation File*.

The allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the Appointment Letter. Typical appointments in the Eberly College are listed below.

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Clinical Faculty ¹	Maximum of 14 credit hours	5-10% max	50+%
Teaching Faculty	80%	0-15% ²	5-20%
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 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 normally will be 80% teaching, 5-20% service, and 0-15% research. Per WVU P&T policy, "faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." Annual percentages may be adjusted in accord with circumstances documented in annual Faculty Workload Plans; however, regardless of percentages, expectations for promotions and/or tenure remain as they are described in the Appointment Letter unless adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Dean. For Teaching faculty, the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhance course and program effectiveness.

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Department of Statistics is four courses or the equivalent. "Research active" in this context is defined as having regular graduate faculty status. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to five courses or the equivalent. A faculty member may request, through the Faculty Workload Plan on a year-to-year basis, that their teaching assignment be reduced to 30% and their research assignment be increased to

50%. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not change a Tenure track faculty member's expectations for promotion.

Annual percentages may be adjusted in accordance with circumstances documented in the annual Faculty Workload Plan, as approved by the Chair and Dean; however, regardless of percentages, expectations for promotions and/or tenure are described in the Appointment Letter unless adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Dean.

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 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 are to be included in the evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must annually update evaluation files with representative documentation of activities completed during the calendar year under review. On the department-specified deadline date, the file shall be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline.

Each Faculty Evaluation File must have an inventory of its contents to ensure integrity. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, ECAS Faculty Evaluation Files will maintain four 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 Appointment Letter; (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) cumulative CV, annual Faculty Workload Plan, and annual Faculty Productivity Report; and (e) other information and records that the Chairperson or Dean may wish to include.

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify the intended file for each piece of documentation. The inclusion of a narrative placing material in context is highly recommended.

A Departmental Administrative Assistant will maintain the inventory and tag each document with its inventory number.

Once an item is entered into the evaluation 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.

In the Department of Statistics, the deadline for submitting materials to the Statistics Administrative Assistant tasked with organizing faculty files is end of business on the second business day after fall semester final exams. Prior to this deadline, each faculty member must submit a report and supporting documents for the calendar year under review as well as a cumulative CV. The forms for the annual Faculty Workload Plan and Faculty Productivity Report are the ones recommended by ECAS and the Department of Statistics. When submitting supporting documentation, it should be tagged with its intended file (i.e., administrative, teaching, research, or service).

The Faculty Workload Plan should be added to the Faculty Evaluation File upon approval by the Dean—generally in the spring. Faculty members are encouraged to document their work in ways that emphasize annual activities as a part of an ongoing process. Faculty should give all materials to the Administrative Assistant tasked with doing faculty evaluation throughout the year.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Clinical, Research, Teaching, and Tenure track faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process. All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both a committee of faculty and by the Chair.

Faculty Evaluation Committee. The 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 committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files.

The Department of Statistics FEC will normally include five members with a tenured majority. The faculty member on the related ECAS committee may not serve on the department FEC. Faculty under consideration for promotion and/or tenure and the Chair may not serve on the FEC or the related ECAS committee. Each member of the FEC is excluded while reviewing her/his Faculty Evaluation File. The FEC committee composition should be inclusive of categories of promotable faculty in the Department of Statistics (i.e., clinical/research/teaching assistant/associate/full professors and Tenure track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases.

FEC membership is redefined annually at the first departmental meeting of the Fall semester as follows. The Administrative Assistant tasked with taking departmental meeting minutes will pass out a ballot with two lists of faculty who are eligible to serve on the FEC, i.e., tenured and untenured. The ballot will be distributed to the voting members of the department, and they will be instructed to circle five names, where no more than two are from the untenured list. Ballots should be submitted shortly after some brief discussion, e.g., faculty may state that they do or do not want to serve on the FEC. The Administrative Assistant will collect the ballots, tally them, and report the FEC membership to the entire department. Those with the highest vote counts are on the committee, subject to the constraint that the majority must be tenured. Eligible voting faculty may submit an absentee ballot before the meeting.

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

Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso affects the Chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting Chair for that single deliberation.

After faculty evaluations are completed, 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.

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

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

The annual review normally covers performance only for the 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.

Ratings affect annual salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. Both “excellent” and “good” are meritorious ratings. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to “satisfactory” or lower is appropriate.

Meritorious work should be fully documented; for example, if information is provided for one course when one’s assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating for the entire assignment should be questioned.

It is incumbent upon faculty to put evidence in their file that (1) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment and (2) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File. If such evidence has not been provided, the reader’s response should be, “in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I [we] must conclude that the faculty member’s work is unsatisfactory.”

To assist faculty members in assembling annual file materials and to assist the FEC in making informed and consistent evaluations, the College suggests the following framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes in the areas of teaching, research, or service. One, some, or all of the following three criteria may apply.

1. Significance or Impact: To what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *benefit* or affect students, our department, our college, our university, our profession, or other communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect *originality and development* within a body of work?
2. Engagement: To what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *generate, apply, and/or use knowledge* and insight consistent with current directions in our field of study? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate *thoroughness, reliability, and availability*?
3. Context: To what degree are the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *consistent with goals* important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on *knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations*? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or *keep current* with changes?

Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. It is expected that student evaluations for all normally graded courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. Student evaluations should be collected using either the Senate SEI instrument or an instrument approved by the Department of Statistics. It is also expected that a syllabus for each teaching preparation be submitted to the teaching file.

Faculty should submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations. This evidence might include: the effective use of innovative pedagogic methods, assessment of learning objectives, positive interactions with students beyond classroom duties (e.g., formal or informal advising or membership on student committees), the publication of teaching-related material, and teaching-related grants. Teaching of independent studies or extra one-credit hour courses is not necessarily a method for increased merit, unless the reason for offering courses outside of the department's structure is justified.

In general, faculty must not double-count effort across files. While a list of student committees is arguably most appropriate in the teaching file, evidence of helpful consulting during such committee work may fit better in the teaching or research file, but not both; one should err on the side of filing this evidence under research if a collaborative publication or grant is likely.

Meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) teaching contribution normally requires reasonably high SEI scores across evaluated courses. This criterion alone may not be sufficient since lower SEI scores might be associated with lower course GPAs, and a low response rate or small class size may result in SEI scores that don't accurately reflect the quality of instruction. Direct comparisons of SEI scores and course GPAs are made by course. If, for example, a course had only one section and no historical distributions were available, this course might be compared to courses at the same level (i.e., 100+, 200+, etc.) having a similar student audience (e.g., non-STAT M.S. students). Reasonable SEI scores combined with other types of evidence given above may also lead to a meritorious rating.

Teaching faculty assignments may or may 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 Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

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

Faculty should submit evidence of research or scholarly or creative activity that includes, but goes beyond, publications. This evidence might include: grants, grant proposals, working manuscripts, or professional presentations. Faculty members will also receive credit for national awards, citations, foundation funding, and issued patents.

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) research contribution normally requires at least one of the following: a publication in a professional peer-reviewed statistical journal, collaborative publications in peer-reviewed non-statistical journals, or involvement on a funded grant. Journal rankings, the prestige of the granting agencies, and the number of publications and grants are factors in awarding the extent of a meritorious contribution, i.e., good vs. excellent. Evaluation is based primarily on the quality of research, but the quantity of research as well as the percent of the workload allocated to research also matters.

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.

Evaluation of Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, college, university, or profession. Service should thus be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, or profession.

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.

Faculty should submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and annual Faculty Workload Plan. Evidence might include service to the: profession; department, college, and/or university; state and/or region; or statistical consulting for faculty, staff, and students at WVU. The Department believes that its service mission is consistent with the rest of ECAS in terms of committee work and other professional activities. However, consulting as a service activity is unique within ECAS. Nonetheless, normal consulting activities are subsumed under service only if it is justifiable to count them as neither teaching nor research.

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

Per the University *Procedures* 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.

Service expectations of faculty with service as an area of significant contribution (e.g., statistical consulting) should be listed in their Appointment Letter or Memorandum of Understanding. On the other hand, faculty expected to provide reasonable service contributions might focus on a particular strength or interest (e.g., chairing a critical department course redesign or serving as an associate editor for a quality statistics journal), especially when such leadership roles and/or outcomes promote a positive reputation for WVU's Department of Statistics. However, all faculty members are expected to participate in some of the annual departmental service (e.g., FEC and program committees).

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to University guidelines, responses to annual reviews may be submitted at any time and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the Department Chair with an additional memo to 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 Department Chair or 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 Department Chair or 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.

Performance-Based Salary Policy

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

Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college.

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

The Department of Statistics uses the College's descriptors, descriptor values, and Merit Score summary. Descriptors are translated to the point values: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0, and the Merit Score is the sum of descriptor values with annual percentage weights (see examples below).

Category	Annual Percentage	Descriptor (value)	Merit Contribution
Teaching	40%	Good (2.5)	100 = 40 * 2.5
Research	40%	Excellent (4.0)	160 = 40 * 4.0
Service	20%	Satisfactory (1.0)	20 = 20 * 1.0
Merit Score:			280

Category	Annual Percentage	Descriptor (value)	Merit Contribution
Teaching	80%	Good (2.5)	200 = 80 * 2.5
Service	20%	Satisfactory (2.5)	50 = 20 * 2.5
Merit Score:			250

[Note: Under the University's current performance based salary policy, separate amounts are allocated in each unit by employee category type. That is, employee category FT—Tenure track faculty—have a separate raise pool from 1.0 FTE FN/AP/NC employees.]

If the FEC and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the Merit Score is an average of the two scores.

Fourth-Year Review

Tenure track faculty are subject to a more rigorous fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the Appointment Letter. "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. "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. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract prior to the critical year.

Fourth-year review is conducted following normal annual review procedures. For Tenure track faculty at the fourth-year point, the Dean reviews the set of annual evaluations to date. 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.

Promotion and/or Tenure Review

In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual's sixth year on the faculty, the "critical year," as identified in the Appointment Letter. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience may, in the Appointment Letter, be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

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 Faculty Evaluation File.

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. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

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.

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

For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for an extended period of limited productivity, as long as more recent quantitative and qualitative productivity has been regularly achieved and maintained in an appropriate disciplinary area. Holding the rank of Professor designates that the faculty member's academic achievement merits recognition as a distinguished authority in his/her field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the faculty member for his/her contributions to the discipline. A Professor sustains high levels of performance in his/her assignments and responsibilities in all mission areas. The record of a successful candidate for Professor must have shown evidence of high-quality productivity over an extended period of time.

The expectations of the Department of Statistics for earning tenure, for promotion from Assistant to Associate Rank, or for promotion from Associate to Full Rank follow from the Appointment Letter, Annual Performance Reviews, temporary adjustments in the Faculty Workload Plan, and any Memoranda of Understanding that were signed by the appropriate parties. These are typically based on the descriptors meritorious and satisfactory defined earlier in this document for each of the three areas of evaluation.

In the case of earning tenure and/or promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the recommendation by the Department of Statistics to the Dean of ECAS normally will be based on whether

or not the faculty member has demonstrated meritorious performance in teaching and research as well as at least satisfactory performance in service during his/her appointment.

In the case of promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the recommendation by the Department of Statistics to the Dean of ECAS normally will be based on whether or not the faculty member has demonstrated meritorious performance in teaching and research as well as at least satisfactory service during the most recent five or six years after promotion to Associate Rank.

Work literally "in press" or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print.

For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

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 evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Tenure, Promotion, or Termination Recommendations

When a recommendation for tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment 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.

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 Chair render negative recommendations). The petition should 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. Negative department reviews of tenure cases are automatically reviewed by the college committee and the Dean.

Procedure for modification of this document

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

Timeline

The Department of Statistics follows the normal timeline for faculty evaluation as established by the ECAS and the Provost. The evaluation period is based on the calendar year.