

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL

Approved by Philosophy Department April 14, 2011

Approved by the Office of the Provost June 30, 2011

The Department of Philosophy 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. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, Department.

The Philosophy Department'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 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 letter of appointment, annual assignment, the faculty personnel file, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track, and promotion-eligible 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, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations in one's letter of appointment 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 in research-intensive appointments.

For Teaching faculty, responsibilities are defined as 80% teaching and 20% service.

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

The allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Appointments in the Eberly College are normally:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Teaching Faculty	80%	--- ¹	20%
Research Faculty		100%	
Senior Lecturer	100%		
Lecturer	100%		

¹ Evaluation in a Teaching faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU P&T policy, "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.

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Philosophy Department is five courses. "Research active" in this context is defined as current graduate faculty status, and/or producing scholarly work that is published or presented to peers (e.g., at professional meetings, conferences, or academic institutions). Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to six courses. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the tenured faculty member's expectations for promotion.

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.

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 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 academic 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 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 sample 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 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 which file each piece of documentation is submitted to. The inclusion of a narrative placing 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

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

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track, Research, and Teaching 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 FEC will normally include a minimum of five members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his personnel file. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty. The committee composition should be *inclusive* of categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g., Tenure track and Teaching faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases.

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

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

Members must 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 will serve as acting chair for that single deliberation. Faculty members who serve on the College committee may not serve on the departmental evaluation committee.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will 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 provide for the file evidence 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 personnel file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the reviewer'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 Faculty Evaluation Committee 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 criteria may apply:

1. Significance or Impact: To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, 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, research, or service) *generate, advance, apply, and/or use* knowledge and insights 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, 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. Tabulated student evaluations and student comments for all courses taught in Fall and Spring Semesters (excluding tutorials, etc.) must be included in faculty files. The WVU Student Evaluation of Instruction form is specifically required; self-designed questionnaires may be used in addition to but not in place of the Senate form. In advance of each annual review, faculty members will submit available WVU evaluations for those courses taught in the most recent semesters for which evaluations were not previously reviewed. At the time of promotion and/or tenure review, the candidate under review may, at his or her discretion, arrange for the independent, early tabulation of teaching evaluations for those courses taught in the final semester before the faculty file closes for review. These evaluations will then be added to the candidate's file before the closing deadline. Faculty members in their first semester after a sabbatical or leave may also request such early tabulation, as may new faculty members in their first semester in the department.

For a typical year in which a faculty member teaches five courses, the average of the four highest student responses to the question about teaching effectiveness on the WVU Student Evaluation of Instruction form will provide the benchmark for the evaluation of teaching according to the following criteria:

Satisfactory teaching:	3.0 to 4.0
Good teaching:	4.0 to 4.3
Excellent teaching:	4.3 through 5.0

When appropriate, the benchmark evaluation will be raised or lowered after considering the following: Assessments of teaching based on these criteria can be evaluated either upward or downward based on the following additional considerations:

1. Other information made available as part of the WVU Student Evaluation of Instruction, including both tabulated average responses and written student comments
2. A listing of courses taught and numbers of students for each class
3. A description of academic advising activities
4. Copies of up-to-date course syllabi setting forth the course organization, type of exams and exam expectations, term papers or other writing requirements (if any), texts and other assigned or recommended readings, lecture topics and other class expectations
5. Development of new courses, or revision of existing courses
6. Teaching awards
7. Peer evaluations
8. Participation on graduate committees
9. Textbooks authored (Although textbooks normally provide evidence of contributions to teaching, those that offer significant original, scholarly, or critical additions to the presentation of philosophical material may provide evidence of contributions to research).
10. Evidence of the development or use of instructional technology and computer assisted instruction

11. Any additional material which the faculty member may wish to submit

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) teaching contribution normally requires an average of at least 4.0 on question 11 of the WVU Student Evaluation of Instruction forms. However, in view of the additional considerations listed above, it is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition of a meritorious contribution to teaching.

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 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 department 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, but is not limited to:

1. Published articles, book chapters, monographs, books, etc. Although textbooks normally provide evidence of contributions to teaching, those that offer significant original, scholarly, or critical additions to the presentation of philosophical material may provide evidence of contributions to research.
2. Works in progress or a detailed description of works in progress (what has been done, what has to be done and schedule of completion)
3. Pre-publication or post-publication reviews and the extent cited (i.e., manuscript reviews by external specialist(s) in the field)
4. Presentations of papers at conferences or to professional groups
5. Substantial reviews of books or review essays published in professional journals
6. Serving as a commentator at professional meetings
7. Awards or grants received
8. Additional material which the faculty member may wish to submit

The creation of a complete record of faculty research may call for an article, chapter or book to be reported as accepted for publication in one calendar year and published in another calendar year. However, for the purposes of yearly review, and for the purposes of tenure and promotion, such a piece of scholarship will be acknowledged only once.

An excellent research contribution normally requires at least one article accepted for publication or presentation of a paper at a conference or to a professional group. Significant progress on an extended project, such as a book manuscript, may also merit an excellent. A good research contribution normally requires the production of a paper or book chapter that has or will be submitted for publication or a paper that has or will be submitted for presentation at a conference or to a professional group.

Unless specified in a faculty member's letter of appointment or annual assignment, department members will not be expected to secure grants or other outside funding. Although the receipt of grants and awards can furnish evidence of merit, unless explicitly stated in a department member's letter of appointment or annual assignment, the failure to secure grants shall not furnish evidence of lack of merit.

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 their annual assignment. This evidence might include, but is not limited to:

1. Serving on department, Eberly College, or university committees
2. Serving on editorial boards for professional journals
3. Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or academic publishers
4. Serving as a moderator or session chair at a professional meeting
5. Reviewing submissions for presentations at professional organizations
6. Publishing brief book reviews or notes
7. Providing service to the public (e.g., workshops, presentations, consultation)
8. Serving as an advisor for a department or university sponsored organization
9. Serving as an officer or board member of a professional organization

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. In the Philosophy Department, service expectations for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution normally include department, Eberly College, and university service activities, such as service on committees, planning and organizing events, and serving as an advisor for a student club or organization..

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to University guidelines [<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4] faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the FEC and/or the Department 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.

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.

Unless otherwise specified in the department's approved Performance-Based Salary Policy document, the College descriptor values are the default values. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating; e.g.

40% teaching = 40×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 100
40% research = 40×4.0 (rating of "Excellent") = 160
20% service = 20×1.0 (rating of "Satisfactory") = 20
Merit Score = 280

80% teaching = 80×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 200
20% service = 20×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 50
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 Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations, unless the unit's approved guidelines provide for a different resolution.

The Philosophy Department uses the College descriptor values.

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 a particular focus on the expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. "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.

Department/Division committee and Chair reviews in the fourth year are 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 letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience 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 personnel 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 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 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 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.

Unless otherwise specified in the letter of appointment, in order to be recommended for tenure and promotion, a tenure track faculty member in the Philosophy Department will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and in teaching in the classroom, or other settings, and reasonable contributions in service. Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty members who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for tenure, significant contributions must be made in teaching.

"Significant contributions" in research are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure and promotion who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities. This standard will be interpreted to mean that the department member's research meets or exceeds criteria for tenure and promotion at peer research universities. Peer research universities are determined by department chair, in consultation with the evaluation committee, *subject to approval by the Dean*. Since publication of scholarly research is the primary method of demonstrating excellence in research, failure to publish will result in denial of tenure and promotion. It should be noted that there is no specific number of publications that is either necessary or sufficient for tenure and

promotion; the department will look for evidence of a long term commitment to scholarly work, and a high probability of continued scholarly productivity.

“Significant contributions” in teaching are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure and promotion who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. This standard will be interpreted to mean that the department member’s teaching meets or exceeds WVU criteria for meritorious teaching. In some cases, external reviews of teaching contributions may be appropriate.

A candidate for tenure and promotion will be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions in the area of service. Tenure track faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor satisfy the requirement for reasonable service if they play a significant role in the activities of the department. Participation in professional, public service and other university service will be noted and rewarded but not required.

In order to be recommended for promotion to the rank of Professor, a tenured faculty member will normally be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and either teaching in the classroom or other settings or service. In the third area of endeavor, the faculty member will be expected to make reasonable contributions. The areas of significant contribution in which each faculty member is expected to perform will be identified in the letter of appointment, or modified in a subsequent document. Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty who are assigned to teach and is a requirement for promotion to the rank of Professor.

The standards for promotion to the rank of Professor differ from the standards for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the following three respects: (a) The research on the basis of which a tenure track faculty member is evaluated for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may include published research that is straightforwardly based on the faculty member’s PhD dissertation; such research would not normally be considered for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. (b) A decision in favor of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may be based upon a record of significant improvement in teaching performance over the probationary period; it is expected that a faculty member who is promoted to the rank of Professor will have demonstrated a consistently high level of teaching competence subsequent to promotion to associate professor. (c) Non-tenured faculty members satisfy the requirement for reasonable service if they play a significant role in the activities of the department; tenured faculty members are expected to participate in additional service, including service to the College, the University, the profession, or the public.

For promotion to both Associate Professor and Professor, outside evaluations of scholarly work will be required, in conformity with University and College guidelines. Such evaluations will help provide guidance in evaluating the quality of the work and in assessing its impact on the field. In general, evaluations of scholarship for the purposes of making a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure will be based on both its quantity and quality.

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

Procedure for modification of this document

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair of the Department. The

Committee and the Chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the Faculty. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.