

**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION,
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES**

APPROVED PER FACULTY VOTE 4/16/2026

APPROVED BY THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST 4/16/2026

1.	Faculty assignments	2
2.	Faculty evaluation file.....	2
3.	Faculty Evaluation Committee	2
3.1	Membership	2
3.2	Election	3
3.3	Duties	3
4.	Annual performance reviews and annual report	3
4.1	Evaluation process and principles.....	3
4.2	Performance Descriptors.....	4
4.3	Holistic review for annual rating	5
4.4	Evaluation of Teaching.....	5
4.4.1	Expectations and documentation	5
4.4.2	Teaching contributions.....	6
4.5	Evaluation of Research	7
4.5.1	Expectations and documentation	7
4.5.2	Research contributions.....	9
4.6	Evaluation of service.....	10
4.6.1	Expectations and documentation	10
4.6.2	Service contributions	10
4.7	Public and community-engaged contributions.....	11
4.8	Other contributions	12
5.	Criteria for promotion or tenure.....	12
5.1	Areas of significant contribution	12
5.2	Mid-Tenure Review and Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report	13
5.3	Discretionary Promotions	13
5.4	Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	13
5.5	External Review.....	13
5.6	Standards for promotion of tenure-track faculty members (40/40/20)	14
5.6.1	From assistant to associate professor.....	14
5.6.2	From associate professor to professor.....	15
5.6.3	Changes in the standards for promotion	16
5.7	Standards for promotion for teaching-track faculty members (80/0/20)	16
5.7.1	From teaching assistant to teaching associate.....	16
5.7.2	From teaching associate to teaching professor	16
5.8	Standards for promotion for non-standard assignments	16
6.	Response to annual evaluation and rebuttals of recommendations	16
7.	Performance-based salary policy	17
8.	Procedure for modification of this document	17

This document outlines the policies and criteria for faculty evaluation of teaching, research, and service in the Department of Chemistry, serving as a guide for annual reviews, performance-based salary increases, and recommendations for promotion and tenure. It is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success and excellence, to clarify faculty goals, and to inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department. The document supplements and complements the current *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*, and *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*.

1. Faculty assignments

The appointment letter outlines broad expectations for the position, including the percentages of the assignment allocated to research, teaching, and service. Assignments are reported yearly in the faculty member's workload form. Tenure-track faculty typically have percent teaching/research/service assignments of 40/40/20, while teaching-track faculty typically have an 80/20 teaching/service percent assignment. Special cases may exist that necessitate a different percent effort toward research, teaching, and service, as described in the Chemistry Workload Guidelines. Faculty assignments are determined on an annual basis as outlined in their workload plan and are used to define areas of significant and reasonable contribution for promotion and tenure (see Section 5.1).

2. Faculty evaluation file

Faculty members are required to annually update their evaluation file and submit a faculty productivity report via the WVU digital evaluation file (Digital Measures, also known as Faculty Success). All materials must be submitted by 11:59 pm on September 30th.

This electronic file serves as the basis for performance review and must contain all required documentation for each respective area of responsibility (teaching, research, and service), as well as administrative documents such as the letter of appointment and memoranda.

The file must include:

- A current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- The departmental workload form
- The faculty productivity report
- The electronic version of published manuscripts
- An annual report narrative, which should contextualize all work for the review period and comment on relevant progress toward long-term goals.
- Credit allocation spreadsheet (see Section 4.2)
- For mid-tenure review, and subsequent tenure and promotion reviews, the file also must include narrative(s) for each area of significant contribution.

3. Faculty Evaluation Committee

3.1 Membership

The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall consist of five (5) faculty members. The composition of this committee shall consist of one (1) tenured Full Professor, two (2) tenured faculty, with the other two (2) members elected from the remaining pool of eligible faculty (assistant, associate,

and full professor ranks), with the stipulation that at least one (1) of the two elected members must be a teaching-track faculty member.

The following individuals, however, are not eligible to serve on the FEC: (a) the Department Chair, (b) anyone under consideration for promotion or tenure, and (c) anyone who is serving on the College Committee or the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Anyone who is in the immediate family or household of an individual who is evaluated by the Committee (see Section XIII of the WVU *Procedures* document) will recuse themselves from the specific annual review, promotion, and tenure cases.

The Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be tenured and elected by a secret ballot at the same meeting as the membership of the committee is determined. To be elected, a candidate must receive a majority vote of the eligible faculty (as specified in the Department's bylaws). Any changes in membership of the Faculty Evaluation Committee requiring a new election of members of the committee will also require a new election for the chair of the committee.

3.2 Election

Membership in this committee shall be elected by a secret ballot held annually at the last faculty meeting in the spring semester. The members of this committee shall serve for a two-year term. The terms of service shall alternate. In even-numbered years, one Full Professor, one Tenured Faculty, and one member at-large shall be elected. In odd-numbered years, a Tenured Faculty and one at-large member shall be elected. To be elected, a candidate must receive votes of a majority of the eligible voting members of the Chemistry faculty in the Department.

3.3 Duties

The committee duties include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Reappointment in the current assignments based on the review of the Annual Productivity Report of faculty members.
- This committee shall make recommendations for salary merit raises as described by the University and College guidelines.
- This committee shall vote on recommendations for promotion and tenure decisions and report those recommendations to the Department Chair and the College.
- This committee shall review the graduate faculty status of all faculty members every three years and make recommendations to the chair of the department for continuation and change.

This committee shall present its recommendations to the faculty in rank (independent of tenure status) regarding any promotion and/or tenure decisions. The faculty in rank will provide an advisory vote to the Department Chair. The Chair's recommendation on promotion and/or tenure will incorporate the aggregate voting outcome and the total count of voting faculty members.

4. Annual performance reviews and annual report

4.1 Evaluation process and principles

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All faculty members who have not reached the rank of full professor and are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and by the Chair. Professors must formally request an evaluation by the FEC at least 90 days in advance of their file closing and will otherwise only be reviewed by the Chair.

The annual review covers performance principally for the year under review. Evaluation reports 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 is remaining productive. Where applicable, the FEC must note in its annual review whether sufficient progress has been made towards promotion, tenure, and salary enhancement.

All performance evaluations will be based on a holistic assessment of the evidence provided in the file.

4.2 Performance Descriptors

The annual review of faculty performance is assessed in areas of teaching, research, and service with one of the four possible descriptors: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. Both Excellent and Good are meritorious ratings. A rating of Good indicates that a faculty member is on track to meet or exceed the criteria for promotion and tenure. A rating of Excellent recognizes those who deliver exceptional performances, meriting special attention and recognition. A Satisfactory rating, while sufficient to justify continuation, does not indicate a meritorious performance and is not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure for areas of expected significant contribution.

Credits, as defined in Sections 4.4.2, 4.5.2, and 4.6.2, for contributions in research, teaching, and service are assigned based on efforts, outcomes, and merit per review cycle. Credits for a specific contribution accumulate, unless indicated otherwise. Departmental expectations are set at a baseline of total credits equal to 50% of a faculty member's assigned percentage in each area. To achieve a Good rating, a faculty member must earn a total of credits equal to at least 75% of their assigned percentage. An Excellent rating is awarded when a faculty member earns credits equal to or greater than their assigned percentage value. Table 1 below describes each performance descriptor and summarizes credit thresholds for a 100% assignment.

Table 1 Minimum Merit credits for 100% assignment

Descriptor	Criteria	Minimum credits for 100% assignment
Excellent	Demonstrates high-impact contributions, well above the department's expectations.	100+
Good	Demonstrates significant contributions, above the department's expectations.	75-99
Satisfactory	Demonstrates both responsibility and effort to meet departmental expectations.	50-74
Unsatisfactory	The faculty member did not meet the criterion for satisfactory, or they did not meet a minimum level of professionalism in fulfilling their service responsibilities.	<50

For an assignment of $X\%$, the credit thresholds can be calculated by multiplying the values in Table 1 by $X/100$. For a tenure-track faculty member with a 40/40/20 percent assignment, the thresholds for both teaching and research are 20 credits for a Satisfactory rating, 30 credits for a Good rating, and 40 credits for an Excellent rating. Teaching faculty members with 80/20 assignments need a minimum of 40 credits in teaching for a Satisfactory rating, 60 for a Good rating, and 80 for an Excellent rating. In service, faculty members with a 20% assignment need 10, 15, and 20 credits for satisfactory, good, and excellent ratings, respectively.

The credit allocation spreadsheet (provided by the FEC) will be used by faculty for an initial assessment of their credits. The FEC will then be responsible for reviewing both the credit allocation spreadsheet and the annual report narrative to verify that all claimed credits are correctly attributed, aligned with the departmental definitions, and appropriately justified by the documentation in the faculty evaluation file. If the FEC determines that a claimed credit is not supported by the documentation or does not align with the criteria defined in Sections 4.4.2, 4.5.2, or 4.6.2, the FEC will adjust the credit attribution accordingly for the purpose of calculating the faculty member's total credit score and assigning the performance descriptor.

The FEC will consider documented external and non-performance related factors (e.g., administrative decisions, resource limitations, or broader systemic disruptions) that may have negatively impacted a faculty member's productivity or rate of progress toward long-term goals.

4.3 Holistic review for annual rating

The calculated credit totals serve as the primary, quantitative basis for assigning performance descriptors (Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) as defined in Table 1 and Section 4.2. The FEC reserves the right to adjust a faculty member's performance descriptor away from the rating indicated by the credit threshold, provided the adjustment is based on a specific, written expectation established in the previous year's annual review. The purpose is to ensure that faculty address areas of concern or capitalize on documented opportunities for exceptional achievement over time.

Any decision by the FEC to adjust a performance descriptor away from the rating indicated by the credit threshold requires a supermajority vote (four of five members) of the FEC and a clear written statement in the evaluation report. This statement must detail the specific area for adjustment, the specific expectation noted in the previous year's review, and evidence showing the faculty members' failure or success in meeting that expectation during the current review period.

4.4 Evaluation of Teaching

4.4.1 Expectations and documentation

The teaching mission of the department is diverse, with courses ranging from large undergraduate service courses to more specialized graduate-level courses. The number of students served is not the determinant of the significance of the teaching assignment.

The department expects that faculty members maintain an instructional environment that enables student learning; syllabi are organized, up to date, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria.

The Eberly College requires that syllabi and student feedback for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, be included in the file for annual review. If no students replied to the feedback surveys, faculty members must justify the lack of data (e.g., "student evaluations were offered but none were received") and discuss any other metrics to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The Department of Chemistry does not require students' feedback surveys of laboratory courses.

For each course, faculty must provide a brief analysis of their SPOT results. This analysis should directly address negative trends or repeated student issues and include concrete steps to be taken in future courses. The FEC will review the teaching documentation in the file, taking into account the faculty member's comments in the annual report narrative. The quality of teaching may also be documented through the inclusion of course materials, student work, new course proposals,

peer evaluations, notes and letters, evidence of professional development, evidence of presentations on teaching, awards, teaching grants, etc. A list of teaching contributions is provided in Section 4.4.2.

Tenure-track faculty with research as an area of significant contribution are expected to be members of and chair graduate committees, and mentor graduate and undergraduate students through research. These mentoring activities are credited in Teaching.

Among the conventions of teaching in higher education, faculty are expected to write recommendations for students and to discuss informally with colleagues about pedagogy (not including teaching workshops). Such work does not need to be documented.

4.4.2 Teaching contributions

Contributions of teaching are defined as:

- **Effort**

These contributions represent ongoing work and engagement that form the foundation of a faculty member's teaching career.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Effort credits</i>
Participating in recruiting events	5 each
Assessing and analysis of students' learning	5 (up to 20 credits)
Graduate exam/thesis committees member/chair	5 (maximum)
Undergraduate students research mentoring	5 (maximum)
Teaching one section of a course	5 each
Teaching one or more sections of a lab	5 per semester
Teaching assignment for advising undergraduate students	5 each
Teaching assignment for laboratory course coordination	5 each
Other teaching assignment (non-research related)	5 each
First time teaching a course (already established course)	10 each
Peer evaluations of teaching	5 (up to 10 credits)
Evidence of professional development	5 (up to 20 credits)
Participation in teaching-related workshops/seminars	5 (up to 10 credits)
Presentations on teaching	5 each
Innovation in instruction (Technology, Activities)	5 each

- **Outcomes**

These contributions represent the results of a faculty member's teaching efforts.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Outcome credits</i>
Development of instructional materials	10 each
Public and community-engaged teaching	15 each
Evidence of student learning (e.g., student-led peer review, documented conceptual growth in learning logs, mastery of advanced lab techniques, or application of theory to open-ended problem solving)	15 each
Systematic Assessment-Based Instructional Advancement	15 each

Application and assessment of findings to course/program effectiveness	15 each
Publications in chemical education (If not in research)	20 each
New course development	20 each
WVU teaching/mentoring nomination	25 each (up to 25 credits)
Teaching Grant (Internal or External)	20 each
Published Textbook	30 each
Teaching Award (National/International)	40 each

- **Merit**

These contributions represent exceptional quality and have a significant impact beyond the standard output.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Bonus credits</i>
New course added to the Chemistry BS curriculum	+10 credits
Contributions that benefit the whole department or extend to the college or university	+10 credits
Invited keynote presentation on teaching or pedagogy at a major national or international conference	+10 credits
WVU teaching/mentoring award	+10 each

4.5 Evaluation of Research

4.5.1 Expectations and documentation

Faculty in the Department of Chemistry are expected to establish and maintain an active research program consistent with the terms of their letter of appointment. An active program is expected to report scientific results published in refereed scientific journals. The term *published* indicates the value-added of a documented editorial process (e.g., not self-published) and includes print, digital, and hybrid works. Long form and short form work (books, edited volumes, critical editions) must be published/produced by recognized high-impact presses and/or digital venues of national or international academic reputation. The department recognizes that publication in open-access, peer-reviewed journals is valuable, and they will be considered at the same level as non-open-access journals. Publications (electronic version of published manuscripts) must be included in the annual evaluation file. Manuscripts accepted for publication but not yet published may be included in the file together with the letters of acceptance. Editorial work may also be submitted and can be documented by the final journal issue (or, if not available, proofs). The work presented should strictly be from research conducted while the faculty member was in a tenure-track position at West Virginia University (unless the appointment letter allowed credit towards tenure or promotion for work done before starting at WVU).

While the department values interdisciplinary and collaborative work, faculty are expected to be one of the primary authors on the majority of their publications. In cases where the faculty member is not a corresponding author, they must describe their role, the scope of the project, and the project's outcomes in their annual narrative.

Research published in predatory journals will not receive credit. Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false

or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices.

All other activities must be documented with proper evidence. Providing peer reviews for grants and manuscripts is included in Service to the Profession (see Section 4.6.2)

Documentation (award letter, budget documentation) is required for grant awards, either imported automatically or manually. The faculty member's role on the project must be made clear. If the project is a subaward under another investigator/institution, that context must be described as well. Major external grants are external funding from federal and state agencies, non-profit organizations, industry, or professional societies. While major grants are typically anticipated to be higher than \$50,000 annually, this threshold may be adjusted to align with the funding norms of a specific field. Faculty members must provide a clear rationale to justify any lower funding levels, explaining how they are appropriate for their area of research. Below is a non-exhaustive list of major funding mechanisms:

Federal and Government Agencies

- National Science Foundation (NSF):
 - Regular submission
 - NSF CAREER Award
 - Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU)
 - Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) Program
- National Institutes of Health (NIH):
 - R01 Grant
 - K99/R00
- Department of Energy (DOE)
- Department of Defense (DoD)

Professional Societies and Foundations

- American Chemical Society (ACS):
 - ACS Petroleum Research Fund (ACS-PRF), Doctoral New Investigator (DNI) Grants, and New Directions (ND) Grants: For established researchers to pursue new avenues of research.
 - ACS Green Chemistry Institute
- The Welch Foundation
- The Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation
- The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
- The W.M. Keck Foundation

Industry-Based

- Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Companies: Pfizer, Merck, Eli Lilly and Company, and Bristol Myers Squibb.
- Chemical and Materials Companies: DuPont, Dow, and BASF.
- Energy Companies: Shell, Chevron

High-profile grants are distinguished from standard major grants by their exceptional scope, prestige, and institutional impact. These awards are often collaborative in nature, such as large-scale center grants (e.g., NSF Centers, NIH P-series), multi-investigator instrumentation grants (e.g., MRI), or state-wide initiatives like EPSCoR grants. Such funding mechanisms are recognized for significantly increasing the external visibility of the Department, College, University, or State. Additionally, highly competitive individual awards that signal elite national

standing—such as Early Career awards (e.g., NSF CAREER, DOE Early Career)—are considered high-profile due to their rigorous selection process and high impact on the faculty member's research trajectory, regardless of their non-collaborative structure.

4.5.2 Research contributions

Contributions of research are defined as:

- **Effort**

These contributions demonstrate ongoing productivity and professional engagement.

- **Outcomes**

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Effort credits</i>
Proposal writing workshops	5
Recruitment one or more graduate students (Pre-tenure only)	5
Ongoing external funding (PI or Co-PI)	5 (up to 10 credits)
Rating of "highly meritorious" in a non-funded proposal	5 (up to 10 credits)
Development of a research database	5
Manuscript under review	5
Submitting a major proposal (PI or Co-PI)	5
Setting up a new research laboratory (First two years)	10

These contributions represent successful outcomes of research and scholarship.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Outcome credits</i>
Poster presentation	5 (up to 10 credits)
Senior personnel on new major grant	5
1 peer-reviewed manuscript (Contributing author)	5
1 peer-reviewed manuscript (Lead author)	10
Contributing talk (Students)	10 (up to 20 credits)
Contributing talk (Faculty)	10
Internal grant award	10
Lead author of a book chapter	10
Public and community-engaged research	10
Invited talk (regional, national, or international)	15
WVU research award	20
Editing or co-editing a book/journal	20
New major grant (Lead PI or Co-PI)	20
Inventor or co-inventor on a patent	25
Scientific society research award	30
National/international research award	40

- **Merit**

These contributions demonstrate exceptional quality and have a significant impact beyond the standard output.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Bonus credits</i>
High-Impact Publication (Lead author in Science or Nature)	+20 credits
Peer-Reviewed Manuscript (Lead author) in a top-tier journal	+10 credits
Invited Talk as a keynote or distinguished lecture	+5 credits
High-Profile Major Grant (e.g., Center grants, EPSCoR, or Early Career Awards)	+10 credits

4.6 Evaluation of service

4.6.1 Expectations and documentation

The Department of Chemistry values service to the department, the College, and the University; service to the chemistry profession, service in chemical education, and service in representing the profession and the University in the broader community. Faculty must document their own efforts and successes to the extent possible. As the FEC reviews files, it will assess the service documentation in the file, considering the faculty member's comments in the annual narrative.

Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of an annual review. Faculty are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate.

Service activities internal to the department need only be listed on the report; documentation may be included, but is not required. All other service (College, University, profession, community) should be documented. This may include letters, emails, or documents related to membership, work, or chairing of College, Faculty Senate, or University committees outside of the Department. For service to the profession, documentation may include invitations, evidence of committee memberships, or evidence of duties performed. Service to the community must reflect the faculty member's professional expertise and can be documented in any number of ways, such as with invitations, correspondence, or flyers. Faculty in administrative positions should include a narrative defining the parameters and expectations of their position, along with information on how those expectations were met. Notice of honors, awards, and grants for service should also be documented. Among the conventions of service in higher education and outside of formal mentoring committees, faculty are expected to write recommendations for colleagues and to read colleagues' work at their request. Such service does not need to be documented.

4.6.2 Service contributions

Contributions of service are defined as:

- **Effort**

These activities are part of being a good departmental or university citizen

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Effort credits</i>
Participation on (Departmental) committees	5 (up to 10)
Recruiting activities (If not counted in teaching)	5
Advising a student organization	5
Serving on a committee/panel (College/University)	5 (up to 10)
Reviewer of internal grant proposals	5
Reviewer for journals or textbooks	5 (up to 10)

Serving on a panel for an external funding agency	5
Reviewer for an external funding agency	5 (up to 5 per agency)
Providing professional expertise within the department/college /university (technical consulting, or policy development)	5
Holding an administrative office in a scientific society	5
Providing professional expertise to scientific groups or organizations	5
Providing professional activities to scientific groups or organizations	5

• **Outcomes**

These contributions have a clear, high-impact outcome, often involving leadership or a completed project.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Outcome credits</i>
Conduct a peer review of teaching	10
Chairing a committee (department, college, university)	10
Acquisition of funding for projects that augment the department’s service capabilities	10
Directing a shared facility (X-ray, NMR, other major instruments)	10
Serving as an Associate or Senior Editor on a peer-reviewed journal	10
Chairs/organizes session at professional national/international conference	10
Service course coordinator	10

• **Merit**

These contributions demonstrate exceptional quality and impact beyond the standard output.

<i>Contributions</i>	<i>Bonus credits</i>
Demonstrated active participation on a committee (Departmental)	10 (up to 20)
Evidence of community-engaged work with a major, lasting impact	5
Holding an administrative office in a scientific society or organization	5
Evidence of exceptional service to the profession (e.g. professional awards)	5

4.7 Public and community-engaged contributions

Public and community-engaged teaching is direct and meaningful, generating, transmitting, sharing, and applying knowledge for the benefit of an external audience, thereby extending learning beyond the traditional classroom walls. Community-engaged teaching may include, but is not limited to, curricular development; developing, implementing and evaluating experiential, off-campus assignments for students, such as those in service-learning classes, as well as study abroad programs with community engagement components, and online and off-campus education; pre-college courses for K-12 youth, occupational short courses, certificates, and licensure programs; conferences, seminars, not-for-credit classes, and workshops; educational enrichment programs for the public and alumni; educational media interviews or translating written materials for general public audiences; materials to enhance public understanding; and self-directed, managed learning environments, such as museums, libraries, or gardens. Faculty are expected to

document public and community-engaged research and to discuss their scope and significance for the community.

Public and community-engaged research and scholarship are works conducted in collaboration with and/or for the benefit of community partners. It may include but is not limited to community-based, participatory research, applied research, contractual research, demonstration projects, needs and assets assessments, and program evaluations; collaboratively created, produced, or performed film, theater, music, performance, sculpture, writing, spoken works, multimedia projects, and exhibitions; copyrights, patents, licenses for commercial use, innovation and entrepreneurship activities, university-managed or supported businesses ventures (business parks or incubators), new business ventures and start-ups, inventions, and social entrepreneurship. Faculty are expected to document public and community-engaged research and to discuss their scope and significance for the community.

Public and community-engaged service and practice are the use of University expertise to address specific issues identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. This work may include, but is not limited to, technical assistance, consulting, policy analysis, expert testimony, legal advice, clinical practice, diagnostic services, patient care for humans and animals, and advisory boards and other discipline-related services to community organizations. Faculty are expected to document public and community-engaged service and to discuss their scope and significance for the community.

4.8 Other contributions

A faculty member may request up to 5 additional credits under teaching, research, and service for activities not listed in Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6. A brief, written rationale explaining the nature of their achievements, impact, and why they merit a specific number of credits must be added to the narrative. The FEC will review the proposal and vote to award a portion or all the requested credits, using its professional judgment to ensure the score accurately reflects the contribution.

5. Criteria for promotion or tenure

5.1 Areas of significant contribution

To be promoted, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions in one or more areas of evaluation (teaching, research, and service), with a reasonable contribution in any other assigned areas. The specific number of areas of significant contribution is defined in the faculty member's letter of appointment. A significant contribution in a specific area is defined by a preponderance of excellent or good ratings in previous annual reviews, plus relevant criteria as specified in Sections 5.6 and 5.7 (e.g., number of peer-reviewed publications). Areas of significant contribution of emphasis are typically teaching and research for tenure-track faculty and teaching for teaching-track faculty. A preponderance of satisfactory ratings is not sufficient for promotion. A reasonable contribution in an area of evaluation is normally activities at or beyond the departmental level.

Once tenure has been achieved, the criteria for subsequent promotion can be modified to establish a different pair of areas of significant contribution. Such a change should be requested primarily to assist the Department or College in carrying out its mission; a change of areas should not be considered solely because of a faculty member's lack of achievement in one area or her/his recent accomplishments in another. In the event the change involves replacing research with service, the document must identify both the types and quantity of service expected and how that service will be measured; in addition, reasonable contributions in research must be defined, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, in the agreement. It is appropriate to establish a period, as established in

the University Procedures, that must elapse after the approval of the request before the individual can be considered for promotion using the new expected areas of significant contribution. Such a modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, Chairperson of the department, in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee, the Dean of the college, and the Provost. If such a request is granted, external reviews of service activities will be expected. Faculty members are reminded that successful teaching is an expectation of all members of the department who are assigned to teach, and as a criterion for promotion to full professor, significant contributions must be made in teaching.

5.2 Mid-Tenure Review and Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report

Tenure-track faculty are automatically subject to a more thorough review two years before their critical year to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Normally, this report is required of probationary faculty two years before the Critical Year, in which case the report summarizes work since the initial appointment at WVU. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for work done before starting at WVU, the credited work should also be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report. For mid-tenure review, and subsequent tenure and promotion reviews, the file must include narrative(s) for each area of significant contribution.

Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the pre-promotion report, may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Faculty members (tenure-track and non-tenure-track) applying for discretionary promotion should refer to the ECAS guidelines to request a pre-promotion report.

5.3 Discretionary Promotions

A tenure-track faculty member will be reviewed automatically in their critical year, unless the faculty member requests no review, in which case a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Otherwise, the faculty member must initiate consideration for a discretionary promotion. A faculty member whose application for promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least two full years after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

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. For discretionary promotions, special weight will normally be placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period.

5.4 Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty applying for promotion in rank when teaching is an area of significant contribution. A peer evaluation must be conducted by a peer from within the department-or by an external (to the department, college, or university) individual before the mid-tenure/promotion review. After promotion, faculty are encouraged to seek peer evaluations regularly.

5.5 External Review

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member with research as a significant area of contribution is being considered for tenure or promotion, the evaluation file must contain

evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research from persons external to the University. Faculty with teaching as their sole significant area of contribution are not required to seek external reviews. The department will follow the procedures and deadlines of the University Procedures for External Evaluation of faculty members.

5.6 Standards for promotion of tenure-track faculty members (40/40/20)

5.6.1 From assistant to associate professor

For faculty who have received an approved extension of the tenure clock, the evaluation will be based on their overall record without considering the total time since their original appointment. To be recommended for tenure and promotion to associate professor, a tenure-track faculty member should have a record of:

Teaching:

- Student learning and success.
- Commitment to teaching excellence as demonstrated by contributions listed in Section 4.4.1.
- A documented record of pedagogical adaptation and positive outcome through sustained positive student feedback or a sustained upward trajectory in this feedback.

Research:

- The expectation is that a tenure-track faculty member will have published at least 6 scientific papers in peer-reviewed journals for a 40/40/20 assignment. A majority of manuscripts must reflect a primary role, which may include corresponding author, lead author, or sole author, and should clearly detail the faculty's original contribution to the study.
- Meet one of the two following, regarding external funding:
 - Having secured external funding that is sufficient to support at least part of their research program.
 - Although secured external funding is preferred, faculty may demonstrate high potential for future funding by documentation of a pattern of consistent viable submissions to federal or major funding mechanisms throughout the pre-tenure period, with at least half of those receiving positive peer review feedback. This will involve high-quality submissions to agencies/mechanisms, normally at least four submissions to at least two agencies/mechanisms. In this context, viable means a complete proposal that meets the submission criteria of the targeted funding agency and receives panel and/or referee written feedback as well as merit review scoring when appropriate.

Manuscripts submitted in the promotion file must have been accepted. The work presented should strictly be from research conducted while the faculty member was in a tenure-track position at West Virginia University, unless a specific exception is noted in the offer letter. Edited book chapters in which the faculty member was a corresponding author, lead author, or sole author will count toward the required publication minimum if they underwent a rigorous, independent, scholarly peer-review process. The faculty member must clearly document the nature and scope of this peer-review process in their annual narrative to allow the FEC to evaluate its equivalence to the standards of a peer-reviewed journal.

The number of published papers and the pursuit/acquisition of federal funding only are not sufficient to warrant promotion or tenure. The quality of the overall research productivity will also

be examined. External reviews of research are required for tenure decisions as described in Section 5.5. The comments from the external reviewers will be taken into consideration and will serve as the primary evidence for assessing the quality, impact, and sustainability of the overall research program.

5.6.2 From associate professor to professor

The criteria for promotion to full professor are set to be more rigorous than for promotion to associate professor. To be recommended for promotion to professor, a tenure-track faculty candidate should have a record of:

Teaching:

- Sustained student learning and success.
- Sustained teaching excellence
- New lecture preparation/development at the graduate or undergraduate levels
- Assessment of teaching and/or innovations in teaching
- Sustained positive feedback from students.

Research:

- Having published beyond the work used to achieve the previous promotion. The expectation is that a faculty candidate for promotion will have published at least 9 scientific papers in peer-reviewed journals for a 40/40/20 assignment. A majority of the manuscripts must reflect a primary role, which may include corresponding author, lead author, or sole author, and should clearly detail the faculty's original contribution to the study.
- Demonstrated sustained external funding through the acquisition of at least one major grant and continued pursuit of at least one additional major award.
- Be an established member of their scientific community by giving invited talks at conferences or peer institutions.
- Engage in professional activities (conference/workshop organization, panel reviews, editorial roles, ...)

The number of published papers is not sufficient to warrant promotion or tenure, and the quality of the overall research productivity will be examined. The work considered for review should be performed since the last promotion, within a relatively recent period, and within the context of an ongoing and cohesive research agenda. For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on the work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. External reviews of research will be required for promotion decisions for faculty for whom research is an area of significant contribution, as described in Section 5.5.

Tenured faculty should refer to the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* for guidance on promotion based on service. It should be noted that for promotion based on service, service activities will go far beyond the kinds of service that are expected for one to achieve good university citizenship. Exceptions to this practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the University, profession, or on a national or international level. Exceptions for promotion will be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

5.6.3 Changes in the standards for promotion

Any deviations from the standard publication requirements for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure or Full Professor must be formally established in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). This MoU must define how different disciplinary norms and alternative scholarly outputs meet the rigor of the department's baseline expectations. All such agreements require approval by the Department Chair and the Dean.

5.7 Standards for promotion for teaching-track faculty members (80/0/20)

5.7.1 From teaching assistant to teaching associate

To be recommended for promotion to teaching associate professor, a teaching-track faculty candidate should have a record of:

- Student learning and success at the undergraduate level
- Commitment to teaching excellence through assessment and innovation in teaching
- Showing a sustained upward trajectory in positive student feedback, with a documented record of pedagogical adaptation and positive outcomes.
- Curriculum development
- Ongoing contributions to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives

5.7.2 From teaching associate to teaching professor

The criteria for promotion to full professor are set to be more rigorous than for promotion to associate professor. To be promoted to the full professor level, a teaching associate professor must have a minimum record of:

- Sustained student learning and success at the undergraduate level.
- Sustained teaching excellence
- New lecture preparation/development at the graduate or undergraduate levels
- Implementation and assessment of teaching innovations
- Sustained positive feedback from students.
- Application of findings from assessments or research studies to enhance course and program effectiveness
- Curriculum development
- Evidence of contributions to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

5.8 Standards for promotion for non-standard assignments

The promotion standards outlined in Sections 5.6 and 5.7 are established for the typical Tenure-Track (40/40/20) and Teaching-Track (80/0/20) assignments, respectively. For faculty members whose assignment percentages deviate from these baselines, the quantitative requirements will be adjusted proportionally. When the adjusted requirements result in a non-integer number for items such as peer-reviewed publications or grant proposals, the number will be rounded up to the closest whole integer.

6. Response to annual evaluation and rebuttals of recommendations

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to evaluations from the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Department Chair. The reactions fall into two general classes:

“responses” to annual evaluative descriptors and “rebuttals” to recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, or continuation. Responses to annual reviews at the department level may be submitted within 10 working days of receiving the evaluation. When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or continuation, a rebuttal may be submitted to the Dean within five working days of receiving the evaluation. Details can be found in the University’s guidelines; see Sections XIII.A.4-7 about reactions to departmental evaluations (reactions to college-level evaluations are described in Section XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6.

If decisions have been made that are construed as capricious or in violation of the Procedures, then a grievance might be appropriate. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at <http://grievanceprocedure.wvu.edu/>.

7. Performance-based salary policy

Annual evaluations will be used when considering performance-based salary recommendations. The department will follow the guidelines provided by the Eberly Dean to determine performance-based salary increases. When annual review ratings are used to determine salary increases, the formula below should be used.

The department's Performance-Based Salary Policy uses the descriptor values stipulated by the College. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: “Excellent” = 4.0; “Good” = 2.5; “Satisfactory” = 1.0; “Unsatisfactory” = 0.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution by the rating value; e.g.

40% teaching:	$40 \times \text{Teaching rating value}$
40% research:	$40 \times \text{Research rating value}$
<u>20% service:</u>	<u>$20 \times \text{Service rating value}$</u>
Maximum score for 40/40/20 assignment	400
80% teaching:	$80 \times \text{Teaching rating value}$
<u>20% service:</u>	<u>$20 \times \text{Service rating value}$</u>
Maximum score for 80/00/20 assignment	400

8. 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. The FEC will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the faculty. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a two-thirds vote of eligible voting faculty, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.