

WASHINGTON CENTER FOR CIVICS, CULTURE, AND STATESMANSHIP

Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual

Approved by the Office of the Provost: 4/22/2026

Table of Contents

- I. Preamble and Governing Authority
- II. Center Mission and Statutory Principles
- III. Definitions and Governance
 - A. The Director
 - B. The Academic Council
 - C. Faculty Evaluation Committees
 - D. Conflict of Interest and Recusal
 - E. Quorum and Voting
 - F. Supplemental Membership
- IV. Appointments and Classifications
 - A. Appointment Letters
 - B. Tenure-track Faculty
 - C. Teaching-Track Faculty
 - D. Assignment Adjustments and Leaves
- V. Digital Faculty Evaluation File and Required Documentation
 - A. General Requirements
 - B. Minimum Contents
 - C. Responsibility, Access, and Confidentiality
- VI. Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback
 - A. Purpose of Annual Review
 - B. Review Process
 - C. Fully Promoted Faculty
- VII. Performance Descriptors and General Evaluation Principles
 - A. Performance Descriptors
 - B. General Evaluation Principles
- VIII. Annual Evaluation of Teaching
 - A. Documentation and General Standards
 - B. Annual Teaching Descriptors
- IX. Annual Evaluation of Research and Scholarship
 - A. Documentation and General Standards
 - B. Annual Research Descriptors
- X. Annual Evaluation of Service
 - A. Documentation and General Standards
 - B. Annual Service Descriptors

- XI. Cumulative Pre-Promotion (Fourth-Year) Review
 - A. Purpose and Timing
 - B. Materials and Scope of Review
 - C. Outcome of the Review

- XII. Promotion and/or Tenure Standards
 - A. General Standards
 - B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
 - C. Promotion to Professor
 - D. Promotion Standards for Teaching-Track Faculty

- XIII. Promotion and/or Tenure Review Procedures
 - A. Candidate Responsibilities
 - B. Faculty Evaluation Committee Responsibilities
 - C. Director Responsibilities
 - D. External Evaluations

- XIV. Responses, Rebuttals, Petitions, and Grievances
 - A. Responses to Annual Evaluations
 - B. Rebuttals and Petitions Regarding Promotion, Tenure, or Continuation
 - C. Grievances and Appeals

- XV. Performance-Based Salary Policy
 - A. General Policy
 - B. Merit Calculation

- XVI. Amendment and Periodic Review
 - A. Amendment of this Manual
 - B. Periodic Review

I. Preamble and Governing Authority

The Washington Center for Civics, Culture, and Statesmanship (the “Center”) is a statutory academic unit of West Virginia University established by West Virginia Code §18B-11-8. The Center was created for the purpose of creating and disseminating knowledge about classical western history and culture and American constitutional thought and forming future leaders of this state through research, scholarship, teaching, collaboration, and mentorship.

This manual supplements the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure and applicable Board of Governors rules. It sets forth the Center’s mission and, in the context of that mission and the mission of the University, the Center’s criteria and procedures for faculty appointment, annual evaluation, promotion, tenure, continuation, and related personnel matters. Where this manual is silent, University Procedures and applicable Board rules govern. If those higher authorities are amended, the Center shall follow the amended requirements unless and until this manual is revised and reapproved.

This manual is drafted in recognition both of the Center’s distinct statutory structure and of the statute’s express requirement that the Center, its personnel, and its financial operations adhere to institutional policies and procedures. It notes that the Director has statutory authority, exercised in consultation with the President and the Provost, over the recruitment and hiring process for Center faculty and staff, tenure decisions affecting the Center’s professors and teachers, the Center’s curriculum, the Center’s budget and expenditures, and the scheduling of conferences, speakers, and presenters relevant to the Center’s mission.

Because the Center reports directly to the President and the Provost and no college layer sits between the Center and the Provost, this manual shall be applied in a manner consistent with that structure. For purposes of annual evaluation and routine unit administration, the Director serves as the chairperson or equivalent unit leader of the Center. Where University Procedures contemplate a decanal input that does not naturally exist in the Center’s structure, the matter shall be handled by the Director unless required by University Procedures and applicable Board rules.

This manual must be approved by the Office of the Provost before it may be implemented. In approving it, the Office of the Provost approves the Center-specific criteria and standards set forth herein and recognizes that it is the responsibility of all parties to the evaluation process to apply rigorous standards in evaluating faculty in relation to the Center’s mission and criteria. The criteria and standards specific to the Center, as approved, shall be the criteria and standards by which Center faculty are evaluated at all levels of review.

Nothing in this manual shall be construed to diminish the authority, nor grant further authority given by West Virginia Code §18B-11-8 to the Center and its Director. In particular, the statute authorizes the Center to house tenure-track faculty whose appointments are in the Center; requires that not fewer than five tenure-track faculty positions be allotted to the Center; provides that Center-appointed faculty need not hold joint or courtesy appointments elsewhere in the University; authorizes the Center, in consultation with the University, to develop and offer courses and academic programs; and gives the Director authority over tenure decisions affecting the Center’s professors and teachers, exercised in consultation with the President and the Provost. The Center, its personnel, and its financial operations, including how personnel are hired and reviewed, must adhere to all institutional policies and procedures.

Subject to available funding, any employment contract made pursuant to West Virginia Code §18B-11-8(i) for tenure-track faculty appointed to the Center shall guarantee reappointment elsewhere in the

University, at the same rank and compensation, if the Center is discontinued, together with comparable office space to the extent practicable.

II. Center Mission and Statutory Principles

The Washington Center for Civics, Culture, and Statesmanship exists to create and disseminate knowledge concerning classical western history and culture and American constitutional thought, and to help form future leaders of West Virginia through research, scholarship, teaching, collaboration, and mentorship. The Center advances that mission by enriching the study of core texts, major thinkers, and great debates of western civilization; educating students in political philosophy, constitutional governance, economic thought, western history and culture, and the principles of republican self-government; and cultivating responsible leadership, informed citizenship, open inquiry, and civil discourse across the University community.

In carrying out its mission, the Center is committed to free, open, and rigorous intellectual inquiry aimed at truth; to equipping students with the habits of mind needed to reach their own informed conclusions on questions of social and political importance; to fostering a community marked by civil and free inquiry and respect for the intellectual freedom of each member; and to strengthening intellectual diversity within the University. Consistent with those commitments, the Center supports scholarship, teaching, public programming, lectures, debates, symposia, and visiting speakers that deepen understanding of the western tradition, the American founding, and the constitutional order, while encouraging serious reflection on the moral, intellectual, and civic foundations of a free society.

III. Definitions and Governance

A. The Director

The Center is led by a Director who reports directly to the President and the Provost, as provided by West Virginia Code §18B-11-8. The Director has authority over tenure decisions affecting the Center's tenure-track faculty, exercised in consultation with the President and the Provost. The Director is responsible for annual workload planning, annual evaluations in the role assigned by University Procedures to the chairperson or equivalent, the forwarding of recommendations and files required by University Procedures, and the administration of Center processes described in this manual.

B. The Academic Council

The Center shall maintain the Academic Council required by West Virginia Code §18B-11-8(g). The composition, terms, quorum, and statutory functions of the Academic Council shall be governed by that statute. The Academic Council is not a Faculty Evaluation Committee, is not the eligible faculty, and does not perform any role in annual evaluation, promotion, or tenure review except as may be expressly required by higher governing authority.

C. Faculty Evaluation Committees

Faculty Evaluation Committees ("FEC") serve as evaluating bodies for annual review and for recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, and non-continuation. Their responsibility is to ensure that review processes are fair and that recommendations are based on sound documentation. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the digital faculty evaluation file. All

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

Per University Procedures, any FEC will normally include at least five members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure may not serve on the committee reviewing that file. A majority of those serving on a Center FEC must be tenured faculty members. Committee composition should include categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g., Tenure-track and Teaching-track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases.

For annual reviews and promotion/tenure reviews, the FEC shall be constituted in accordance with University Procedures and this manual.

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

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will keep committee deliberations and all information contained in electronic faculty evaluation files strictly confidential.

D. Conflict of Interest and Recusal

To protect the fairness and integrity of Center reviews, any member of a Faculty Evaluation Committee, any member of the eligible faculty, and the Director shall disclose promptly any actual conflict of interest or any circumstance that would cause a reasonable person familiar with the facts to question the reviewer's impartiality.

A conflict of interest includes, but is not limited to, the following circumstances: the reviewer is the candidate's spouse, domestic partner, immediate family member, or person in a comparably close personal relationship; the reviewer is or has been the candidate's dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, formal mentor, or corresponding mentee; the reviewer has a financial, supervisory, or other relationship of dependence with the candidate outside the ordinary structures of Center review.

Any reviewer who believes that such a conflict may exist shall report it promptly to the FEC chair and the Director, preferably before deliberations begin and, if that is not possible, immediately upon becoming aware of the issue. A reviewer with a conflict of interest must recuse from deliberation and voting in the affected review. The recusal and resulting abstention shall be recorded in the written recommendation.

If a question arises as to whether a conflict of interest exists for a member of the FEC or the eligible faculty, the FEC chair shall decide the matter in the first instance. Any appeal shall be made to the Director, who shall serve for this purpose in the role otherwise assigned to the Dean by University Procedures. If the question concerns the FEC chair, the Director shall decide the matter in the first instance. If the question concerns the Director, the Provost or the Provost's designee shall decide the matter.

If the Director has a conflict of interest in a particular annual review, promotion review, or tenure review, the Provost or the Provost's designee shall designate an appropriate person to perform the Director's review function for that case only.

E. Quorum and Voting

For ordinary annual reviews conducted by a Faculty Evaluation Committee, quorum shall consist of a majority of the members appointed to the committee for the case and participating.

For promotion and tenure reviews, quorum shall consist of a majority of faculty participating in the case; provided, however, that the number of participating reviewers shall be no fewer than five, unless supplemented pursuant to subsection G below. Faculty on approved leave shall not be counted for quorum unless they have provided advance written notice of their intention to participate in the proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave period. Faculty recused because of conflict of interest shall not be counted in determining quorum.

In all votes taken on faculty evaluation recommendation matters, only “yes” and “no” votes shall be counted. Abstentions and recusals shall be recorded but shall not count as votes cast. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. Participation in discussion and voting by remote two-way electronic connection is permitted. A positive recommendation requires more than half of the votes cast.

The written recommendation shall record the number of positive votes, negative votes, and abstentions or recusals.

F. Supplemental Membership

When leave, recusal, or other disqualifying circumstances reduce the number of available reviewers below the minimum required by University Procedures or this manual, the Director, after consultation with the Provost, may appoint additional qualified faculty from related West Virginia University units to serve for that review only. Any faculty so appointed must be of appropriate rank and, where applicable, appropriate appointment category, and otherwise eligible to participate in the case.

If necessary to constitute an annual-review FEC in conformity with University Procedures and this manual, the Director may likewise appoint additional qualified faculty for that purpose after consultation with the Provost.

IV. Appointments and Classifications

A. Appointment Letters

Appointments in the Center shall be made consistently with West Virginia Code §18B-11-8, the University Procedures, BOG Faculty Rule 4.2, and other applicable University policies. All appointments must be in writing and shall contain the terms and conditions of appointment.

The appointment letter defines the broad expectations of the position, including academic rank and classification; assigned areas of responsibility in teaching, research, and service; the ordinary allocation of effort among those areas; any approved prior-service credit; and, where applicable, the year by which tenure must be awarded. Any later modification of those expectations must be documented in writing through an annual workload plan, memorandum of understanding, or other approved amendment consistent with University Procedures and approved by the Provost. Faculty performance shall be evaluated in light of the faculty member’s appointment letter, approved workload, and any later approved written modification of duties.

B. Tenure-track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty may be appointed at any rank in accordance with West Virginia Code §18B-11-8, BOG Faculty Rule 4.2, and University Procedures. Faculty appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor shall undergo mandatory tenure review in the critical year identified in the appointment letter, subject to any approved prior-service credit or approved extension of the tenure-track period. Unless otherwise

provided in the appointment letter or a later approved written modification of duties, tenure-track appointments in the Center shall carry a standard profile consisting of a 3:3 teaching load and an allocation of effort of 30% research, 50% teaching, and 20% service. The Center's annual evaluation, promotion, and tenure standards for tenure-track faculty are calibrated to this standard profile.

The Director may approve temporary course reassignment or other adjustment of duties for a tenure-track faculty member whose documented record, over time, demonstrates research productivity materially exceeding the level expected under the Center's standard 3:3 profile, or when other Center needs so warrant. No faculty member is entitled to a reduced teaching load absent an approved written workload adjustment. Any such adjustment shall be documented in writing through the annual workload plan, a memorandum of understanding approved by the Provost, or another approved workload document and shall govern the faculty member's evaluation for the period in question.

C. Teaching-Track Faculty

The Center may appoint teaching-track faculty when needed to support its instructional mission and subject to BOG Faculty Rule 4.2 and University Procedures. Teaching-track appointments are not tenure-track and do not create any presumption of a right to appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty.

Teaching-track faculty may hold academic rank as provided by University rules. Upon appointment or promotion to the rank of Teaching Instructor or Teaching Assistant Professor, a single term may not exceed three years; upon appointment or promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, a single term may not exceed six years; and upon appointment or promotion to Teaching Professor, a single term may not exceed nine years.

Unless otherwise stated in the appointment letter or an approved workload document, teaching-track appointments in the Center shall be 80% teaching and 20% service (corresponding to a teaching load of 4/4). Research expectations shall apply only to the extent expressly assigned in writing.

D. Assignment Adjustments and Leaves

Faculty assignments in the Center may be adjusted in writing, consistent with University Procedures and applicable Board rules, to reflect approved leaves, modified duties, enrollment fluctuations, scheduling changes, major Center responsibilities, or other legitimate institutional needs. Any such adjustment shall be made through the annual workload plan, a memorandum of understanding approved by the Provost, or another approved written workload document and shall represent a full-time equivalent assignment unless otherwise expressly approved under applicable University rules.

When enrollment fluctuations, course cancellations, or scheduling changes reduce a faculty member's assigned teaching for a review period, the Director may assign other duties consistent with the faculty member's appointment and the needs of the Center, including additional work in research, service, advising, mentoring, assessment, curricular development, public programming, or comparable Center responsibilities. The annual evaluation shall take account of the adjusted written assignment rather than the originally projected course schedule.

Sabbaticals shall be governed by BOG Faculty Rule 4.3 and applicable University Procedures. Modifications of duties and extensions of the tenure-track period shall be governed by BOG Faculty Rule 4.5 and applicable University Procedures. For any approved sabbatical, leave, modified-duty arrangement, or tenure-clock extension, the faculty member's annual evaluation shall reflect the workload

and objectives established in the approved written plan for the affected period together with the faculty member's regular assignment for any portion of the review period not covered by that plan.

V. Digital Faculty Evaluation File and Required Documentation

A. General Requirements

Each faculty member shall maintain a digital faculty evaluation file in accordance with current University Procedures. The digital faculty evaluation file shall be updated annually and shall close on the deadline established by the University for the applicable review cycle. After the file closes, only materials generated as a consequence of the review may be added.

B. Minimum Contents

At a minimum, the digital faculty evaluation file shall contain the materials required by University Procedures, including the letter of appointment and any subsequent documents that describe, elaborate upon, or modify the faculty member's assignment; the annual workload plan or other approved workload document; any memorandum of understanding, approved leave plan, or other approved written modification of duties affecting the review period; a current curriculum vitae and bibliography; records of courses taught, syllabi, University-approved student feedback of instruction, graduate supervision if applicable, committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's work; copies of prior annual evaluations and any written responses; and other materials bearing on the quality, quantity, and impact of the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service.

When required by University Procedures or this manual, the file shall also include the narrative statements and other contextual materials necessary to evaluate the faculty member's record in light of the faculty member's appointment, approved workload, and any later approved written modification of duties. Where the Director has adjusted a faculty member's assignment during the review period because of approved course reassignment, enrollment fluctuation, course cancellation, scheduling needs, leave, or other legitimate Center needs, the approved written assignment for that period shall be included in the file and shall govern evaluation for the period to which it applies.

The Center shall maintain a single digital faculty evaluation file for each faculty member. That file shall be organized so that materials relevant to teaching, research, and service are clearly identified and readily reviewable at each level of evaluation.

C. Responsibility, Access, and Confidentiality

The faculty member is responsible for supplying the materials that document the faculty member's own performance. The Director shall ensure that those administrative materials for which the Center is responsible under University Procedures are included in the file. Faculty members shall have access to

their own digital faculty evaluation files in accordance with University Procedures, and all persons granted access to such files shall respect their confidentiality.

VI. Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

A. Purpose of Annual Review

The annual review serves as both an evaluative and a developmental tool for faculty at all ranks and in all appointment categories covered by this document. Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to assess a faculty member's performance during the review period in light of the faculty member's appointment, approved workload, and assigned areas of contribution; to assess progress toward promotion, tenure, or salary enhancement where applicable; and to guide future goals, assignments, and professional development. Annual evaluations shall include a recommendation regarding continuation consistent with University Procedures and applicable Board rules.

The annual review shall be related to the faculty member's written assignment and performance and shall be both formative and summative. In addition to evaluating the review period itself, the annual review may consider prior evaluation statements to determine the faculty member's response to earlier suggestions for improvement and the faculty member's cumulative progress toward promotion, tenure, salary enhancement, or continued post-promotion productivity, as applicable. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental, goal-oriented, and readily understandable to colleagues. Every evaluation must indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward, and expectations for, tenure and/or the next promotion.

B. Review Process

Faculty members may include, in the materials submitted for annual review, a brief statement explaining or contextualizing their activities, accomplishments, workload, or any circumstances relevant to the review period. In ordinary cases, the Center Faculty Evaluation Committee shall conduct the annual evaluation and provide its written evaluation to the Director. The Director shall then conduct an independent annual evaluation in the role assigned by University Procedures to the chairperson or equivalent and shall place the evaluation in the faculty member's file and provide it to the faculty member.

Annual evaluation shall take account of any approved written modification of duties, including approved course reassignment, leave, enrollment fluctuation, course cancellation, scheduling adjustment, or other approved change in assignment reflected in the faculty member's workload plan, memorandum of

understanding, or other approved workload document. The annual evaluation shall assess the faculty member's performance in light of that written assignment for the period to which it applies.

The handling of Unsatisfactory ratings, any required higher-level review, and any resulting performance improvement plan shall be governed by University Procedures, with the Director serving as the unit leader for the Center.

C. Fully Promoted Faculty

A fully promoted faculty member may be evaluated annually only by the Director, serving as chairperson or equivalent, unless the faculty member requests in writing, at least ninety (90) days before the file-closing date, that the Faculty Evaluation Committee also conduct an annual review. Any such request must be renewed for each review year in which the faculty member seeks committee review.

VII. Performance Descriptors and General Evaluation Principles

A. Performance Descriptors

The annual review of performance in each area to which a faculty member is assigned shall use the following descriptors: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. Only the ratings of Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation and reflects performance that meets expectations under the faculty member's assigned workload, but not, if merely sustained in an area of expected significant contribution, performance sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. Unsatisfactory is reserved for cases in which the faculty member is not meeting the Center's minimal standards for job performance.

For purposes of annual review, Satisfactory is the baseline rating for meeting expectations. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must be supported not merely by sustained satisfactory performance in areas of expected significant contribution, but by a record above the satisfactory level together with performance and output that satisfy the more rigorous standards set forth elsewhere in this manual. In annual evaluation, the distinction between Satisfactory and Good turns on whether the record shows merely competent fulfillment of baseline expectations under the assigned workload or instead shows clearly meritorious performance beyond that baseline.

B. General Evaluation Principles

The annual review normally covers performance during the year under review. Prior evaluations may also be consulted to assess the faculty member's response to earlier suggestions for improvement and the faculty member's progress toward promotion, tenure, salary enhancement, or continued post-promotion productivity, as applicable. At all levels of review, evaluative statements should be developmental and written in terms that can be readily understood by colleagues.

All evaluation under this manual shall be conducted in light of the faculty member's appointment letter, approved workload, and any later approved written modification of duties. How the Center's criteria apply to a faculty member's duties must be understood in relation to the faculty member's assigned responsibilities for the review period. For tenure-track faculty, unless a different allocation of effort has been approved in writing, the Center's annual evaluation, promotion, and tenure expectations are

calibrated to the ordinary tenure-track appointment, which normally consists of a 3:3 teaching load and an allocation of effort of 30% research, 50% teaching, and 20% service.

Meritorious work must be sufficiently documented in the digital faculty evaluation file. If the file does not contain sufficient information to support a meritorious rating in an assigned area, an independent judgment resulting in a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory, as appropriate, is warranted. If a faculty member fails to provide evidence sufficient to document performance in an assigned area, the appropriate conclusion is that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, performance in that area must be rated Unsatisfactory.

In evaluating the quality and significance of work in any mission area, reviewers may consider, as appropriate, the work's significance or impact, the faculty member's engagement, and the context in which the work was undertaken.

- **Significance or Impact:** To what degree do the faculty member's activities in teaching, research, or service benefit or affect students, the Center, the University, the profession, or other relevant communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities reflect originality, development, or meaningful contribution within a body of work?
- **Engagement:** To what degree do the faculty member's activities in teaching, research, or service generate, advance, apply, and/or use knowledge and insight in the relevant field? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate thoroughness, reliability, responsiveness, and intellectual rigor.
- **Context:** To what degree are the faculty member's activities in teaching, research, or service consistent with goals important to the Center, the University, or the profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities rely upon and reflect knowledge of the Center, the institution, or relevant professional organizations? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the Center, institution, or profession and keep current with changes?

VIII. Annual Evaluation of Teaching

A. Documentation and General Standards

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways sufficient to demonstrate the faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the Center. The digital faculty evaluation file must include University-approved student feedback of instruction for courses taught during the review period, together with other materials that permit a holistic evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Such materials may include syllabi, assignments, assessments, evidence of course development or revision, peer evaluations, advising and mentoring activity, supervision of independent studies, theses, or dissertations, direction of internships or other experiential learning, teaching awards, and other relevant evidence the faculty member wishes to submit. A teaching narrative addressing the review period is required in all annual reviews. When teaching is an area of significant contribution, the file shall include the materials required by University Procedures, including a syllabus for each course where appropriate, University-approved student feedback, at least one peer evaluation prior to the cumulative pre-promotion review or promotion review, and a teaching narrative summarizing activities and accomplishments during the review period.

In light of the Center's statutory mission, teaching in the Center includes not only effective classroom instruction but also the formation of students through serious study, advising, mentorship, civil discourse, and intellectual engagement inside and outside the classroom. Relevant teaching contributions may therefore include, as appropriate to assignment, undergraduate and graduate advising, supervision of independent work, curricular development, new course preparation, substantial revision of existing courses, guest lectures, direction of reading groups, student preparation for fellowships, conferences, or public presentations, and other forms of serious pedagogical mentorship consistent with the Center's mission.

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the full record in the file and in light of the faculty member's assigned teaching responsibilities during the review period. Student feedback is important but not dispositive. Consistent with University Procedures, performance evaluations shall be based on a holistic assessment of the evidence in the file rather than over-reliance on student feedback of instruction alone. Particular attention may be given to the prompts most directly related to instructor effectiveness in presenting concepts, using effective methods, and responding to student questions. Written student comments may also be considered. Student feedback results with unusually low response rates may be given reduced weight. Peer observation and review of teaching materials are important parts of the evaluation process, especially where they illuminate strengths, identify areas for improvement, or provide context for student feedback.

B. Annual Teaching Descriptors

- **Excellent.** The faculty member meets the Good standard and, in addition, demonstrates teaching of distinctly high merit during the review period. Evidence may include a strong record of effective classroom teaching; especially strong peer evaluations; a thoughtful and reflective teaching narrative; substantial innovation or improvement in pedagogy; significant course or curricular development; exceptional advising or mentorship; supervision of high-quality student work beyond ordinary expectations; or other evidence that the faculty member has made an outstanding contribution to the Center's teaching mission.
- **Good.** The faculty member meets the Satisfactory standard and, in addition, demonstrates teaching of merit during the review period. Evidence may include consistently effective classroom teaching; sound course design and execution; constructive engagement with student learning; good peer evaluations; meaningful course development or revision; serious advising or mentorship; effective supervision of independent or experiential learning; or other evidence that the faculty member has contributed materially and well to the Center's teaching mission.
- **Satisfactory.** The faculty member has competently discharged assigned teaching responsibilities during the review period. This includes adequate preparation and conduct of courses; maintenance of appropriate syllabi and course materials; fair and timely evaluation of student work; availability to students; a teaching narrative that reflects constructive engagement with teaching and student learning; and evidence, taken as a whole, that the faculty member is meeting the Center's legitimate expectations for instruction, advising, and mentorship as assigned. Satisfactory performance is sufficient to justify continuation but is not, if merely sustained, sufficient to justify promotion or tenure in teaching as an area of significant contribution.
- **Unsatisfactory.** The faculty member has failed to meet the Satisfactory standard. Evidence may include serious deficiencies in course performance, neglect of assigned teaching responsibilities, failure to provide required materials or student feedback data, failure to respond adequately to

prior evaluative feedback, or a record that, taken as a whole, does not demonstrate competent fulfillment of the faculty member's assigned teaching duties.

IX. Annual Evaluation of Research and Scholarship

A. Documentation and General Standards

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways sufficient to demonstrate the faculty member's overall contribution to the research mission of the Center. Evidence may include books, monographs, peer-reviewed articles and chapters, critical editions, translations, edited volumes, substantial review essays, scholarly databases or digital projects, grants and fellowships, invited scholarly lectures, documented works in progress, and other research products appropriate to the faculty member's field. Research shall be evaluated in light of the faculty member's appointment, approved workload, and assigned responsibilities during the review period.

In light of the Center's mission, research may include both traditional scholarly work and public-facing intellectual work. Public-facing work shall be evaluated as research rather than as service when it constitutes a durable, substantive, original intellectual product that advances understanding in the faculty member's field or contributes in a serious way to informed public discourse on questions within that field. In evaluating such work, reviewers may consider, as appropriate, its intellectual rigor, originality, documentation, quality and selectivity of venue, editorial standards, scope of audience, dissemination, durability, adoption, citation, awards, external reviews, and other evidence of scholarly or public impact. Consistent with University Procedures, review by relevant external communities or knowledgeable stakeholders may, where appropriate, be regarded as meaningful evidence of quality. Work whose primary value lies in outreach, advocacy, administration of events, advising, or media appearance without a durable intellectual product shall be evaluated as service rather than research.

Published work, accepted work, and substantial work in progress may all be considered, but accepted work may be counted only once, and a piece of work may not be counted more than once for the same purpose. Faculty members seeking research credit for collaborative or public-facing work must document the nature of the project, their specific role in it, and the basis on which the work should be regarded as a research contribution under this manual.

For tenure-track faculty, unless a different allocation of effort has been approved in writing, annual evaluation of research is calibrated to the Center's ordinary tenure-track appointment, which normally consists of a 3:3 teaching load and an allocation of effort of 30% research, 50% teaching, and 20% service. *The annual descriptors below are intended to guide annual evaluation under that standard profile; more precise cumulative standards for promotion and tenure are set forth in Section XII.*

B. Annual Research Descriptors

- **Excellent.** The faculty member meets the Good standard and, in addition, demonstrates research of distinctly high merit during the review period. For a faculty member on the Center's ordinary 3:3 tenure-track profile, Excellent should be reserved for research performance materially above what is required for Good. Evidence may include a published peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph; multiple peer-reviewed outputs or multiple public-facing research outputs of comparable originality, rigor, documentation, and substantive intellectual contribution; a publication or project of unusual quality, visibility, or influence; major external recognition; major competitive fellowship or funded research support; or another combination of achievements that clearly exceeds ordinary meritorious progress for the assigned workload.

- **Good.** The faculty member meets the Satisfactory standard and, in addition, demonstrates clearly meritorious annual progress in a coherent scholarly or public-intellectual program. For a faculty member on the Center's ordinary 3:3 tenure-track profile, Good requires more than continuing baseline progress and is demonstrated by at least one of the following during the review period: a peer-reviewed publication; an accepted peer-reviewed publication; a public-facing research product that is original, intellectually rigorous, well documented, and substantial in its contribution; a competitive fellowship, grant, or equivalent external recognition tied to the faculty member's research agenda; or a combination of documented outputs and substantial project advancement that clearly demonstrates more than the requirements for satisfactory performance. Mere activity, reading, conference attendance, or plans for future work, without documented substantial progress or qualifying output, is not sufficient for a rating of Good.
- **Satisfactory.** The faculty member has demonstrated competent and continuing research activity appropriate to the faculty member's assignment during the review period. For a faculty member on the Center's ordinary 3:3 tenure-track profile, Satisfactory means documented continuing engagement in a serious research or public-intellectual program, together with evidence that the faculty member is meeting baseline expectations for a 30% research assignment. Such evidence may consist of a qualifying publication or accepted publication, a public-facing research product of comparable seriousness, or comparably substantial documented progress on a longer-term project such as a book manuscript, article, translation, edition, or edited volume. In applying this standard, reviewers may consider progress over a rolling two-year period so that normal variation in the pace of research does not unfairly penalize faculty engaged in longer-arc projects. Satisfactory is sufficient to justify continuation but does not, if merely sustained in an area of expected significant contribution, suffice for promotion or tenure.
- **Unsatisfactory.** The faculty member has failed to meet the Satisfactory standard. Evidence may include absence of meaningful documented progress in a research or public-intellectual program; failure to provide required documentation; repeated reliance on activity that does not qualify as research under this manual; or failure to respond adequately to prior evaluative feedback regarding research productivity.

X. Annual Evaluation of Service

A. Documentation and General Standards

Service consists of activities that draw upon the faculty member's professional expertise and bear a substantial relation to the Center, the University, the profession, or the public. Service may include contributions to institutional governance and program administration, service to the profession, and public- or community-engaged work that applies disciplinary knowledge or professional competence for the benefit of audiences beyond the University. Service shall be evaluated holistically in light of the faculty member's appointment, annual assignment, the nature of the responsibility undertaken, the level of initiative or leadership involved, and the extent to which the activity advances the mission of the Center, the University, the profession, or the public.

Because West Virginia Code §18B-11-8 expressly calls upon the Center to offer university-wide programming related to open inquiry and civil discourse, expand intellectual diversity, support scholarship, promote collaboration within and beyond the University, and host lectures, debates, symposia, speakers, teachers, and thinkers, public-facing and civic work are especially important forms of service for Center faculty. Relevant service may therefore include, as appropriate to assignment, Center and University committee work; academic advising when treated as service; student recruitment and

mentoring outside ordinary teaching duties; organization of lectures, debates, conferences, reading groups, and other Center programs; manuscript and grant review; journal or press service; leadership in professional organizations; expert testimony; advisory work for civic, governmental, educational, or nonprofit bodies; media or public engagement that is primarily service rather than research; partnership-building with schools, institutes, nonprofits, and civic organizations; and Director-assigned or Director-approved external-relations, development, or donor-stewardship activity that materially advances the Center's academic mission.

A faculty member seeking service credit for public-facing, civic, or external-relations work must document the nature of the activity, the faculty member's role, and the basis on which the activity should be credited as service under this manual. Relevant indicia may include leadership responsibility, frequency and duration of service, institutional reliance on the work, audience reached, continuing partnerships established, funds or resources generated for approved academic purposes, work product completed, or other evidence that the activity substantially benefited the Center, the University, the profession, or the public. Work that is compensated externally must comply with all applicable University policies concerning outside activities, conflicts of interest, and reporting. Compliance with those policies permits, but does not itself guarantee, service credit.

For purposes of annual review, ordinary faculty citizenship alone is not generally sufficient for a rating above Satisfactory. Routine attendance at meetings, nominal committee membership, or occasional informal collegial assistance, without documented contribution, should not be treated as meritorious service. This distinction should be made in light of the faculty member's workload and assigned service responsibilities.

B. Annual Service Descriptors

- **Excellent.** The faculty member meets the Good standard and, in addition, demonstrates sustained, high-value, or high-visibility service leadership during the review period. For a faculty member with the Center's ordinary 20% service assignment, Excellent should be reserved for service performance materially above meritorious expectations. Evidence may include chairing major committees; directing significant recurring Center programs; leading major lecture, debate, conference, or speaker series; substantial leadership in professional organizations; major public-facing or civic service with regional, state, or national significance; or substantial Director-assigned or Director-approved external-relations, partnership-building, or development activity that materially advances the Center's statutory mission, institutional standing, or programmatic capacity.
- **Good.** The faculty member meets the Satisfactory standard and, in addition, demonstrates clearly meritorious service beyond ordinary baseline expectations. For a faculty member with the Center's ordinary 20% service assignment, Good requires either sustained responsibility in at least one substantial service role or a combination of service activities that clearly exceeds routine participation. Evidence may include sustained committee work or project leadership at the Center or University level; substantive professional service such as manuscript reviewing, conference organization, or ongoing journal or press review; student-recruitment or outreach work beyond baseline expectations; organization of public events that advance the Center's mission; advisory service to civic, governmental, educational, or nonprofit bodies; partnership-building with external organizations; or Director-assigned or Director-approved external-relations or donor-stewardship work in support of the Center's academic mission. Mere attendance, nominal membership, or isolated minor service tasks is not sufficient for a rating of Good.

- Satisfactory. The faculty member has competently discharged assigned service responsibilities during the review period. For a faculty member with the Center's ordinary 20% service assignment, Satisfactory includes reliable participation in Center business; attendance at required faculty meetings and Center events; competent completion of assigned committee, advising, assessment, or related service responsibilities; and at least one identifiable, documented service responsibility or contribution performed with reasonable diligence during the review period. Satisfactory performance is sufficient to justify continuation but is not, if merely sustained, sufficient to justify promotion or tenure in service as an area of significant contribution.
- Unsatisfactory. The faculty member has failed to meet the Satisfactory standard. Evidence may include failure to carry out assigned service responsibilities; repeated non-participation in Center or University obligations that are part of the faculty member's assignment; failure to document service on which credit is sought; or failure to respond adequately to prior evaluative feedback regarding service expectations.

For faculty whose appointment or annual assignment places special emphasis on service, including public programming, outreach, recruitment, partnership-building, or external relations, expectations shall be calibrated accordingly. For faculty with minimal service assignments, service shall be evaluated in proportion to assignment. All service evaluations under this section shall be conducted holistically and in light of the faculty member's assigned duties and the evidentiary record in the file.

XI. Cumulative Pre-Promotion (Fourth-Year) Review

A. Purpose and Timing

Tenure-track faculty are subject to a more rigorous cumulative review no later than two years prior to the critical year in order to determine the extent to which the faculty member is making clear progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor under the standards of this manual. This review is intended both to assess the record to date and to provide timely guidance for the remainder of the probationary period. It supplements, but does not replace, the ordinary annual review for that year.

Unless a different allocation of effort has been approved in writing, the review shall be conducted in light of the Center's ordinary tenure-track appointment, which normally consists of a 3:3 teaching load and an allocation of effort of 30% research, 50% teaching, and 20% service.

B. Materials and Scope of Review

The faculty member shall submit a cumulative dossier drawn from the digital faculty evaluation file and covering the period from appointment through the close of the review file for the year in question. At a minimum, the dossier shall include a current curriculum vitae; a cumulative narrative addressing teaching, research, and service to date and anticipated objectives for the remaining probationary period; representative teaching documentation required by this manual and University Procedures; research materials or other evidence of scholarly progress appropriate to the faculty member's assignment; and any appointment letter, annual assignment, memorandum of understanding, or other approved written modification of duties relevant to the review.

The review shall assess the record to date in light of the faculty member's appointment letter, annual assignments, and any later approved written modification of duties. The central question is whether the

faculty member's performance to date demonstrates a trajectory that, if sustained, is likely to satisfy the Center's approved standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. For a faculty member on the Center's ordinary tenure-track appointment, that inquiry asks whether the record shows clear progress toward significant contributions in teaching and research, together with at least reasonable service appropriate to rank and assignment, and whether the faculty member is developing an independent scholarly or public-intellectual program of the kind required for long-term faculty membership in the Center.

C. Outcome of the Review

The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall prepare a written cumulative review, and the Director shall then provide an independent written evaluation in the chair-equivalent role. The written evaluations shall identify the faculty member's strengths, any significant deficiencies or areas of concern, and the specific improvements or achievements that will be necessary for a successful tenure and promotion review. The review letters should provide sufficiently concrete guidance to serve as a basis for mentoring during the remainder of the probationary period.

Failure to demonstrate clear progress toward the applicable tenure standards, failure to satisfy the expectations of the appointment letter or other approved workload documents, or failure to develop an independent scholarly or public-intellectual program where required by the appointment may lead to a recommendation of non-continuation before the critical year, consistent with University Procedures and applicable Board rules. However, the absence of such a recommendation at the cumulative pre-promotion stage does not guarantee a favorable tenure decision in the critical year.

Because promotion of teaching-track faculty is discretionary rather than tied to a critical year, a cumulative pre-promotion review is not mandatory for such faculty. Upon request of a promotion-eligible teaching-track faculty member, however, the Center may conduct a cumulative pre-promotion review for mentoring purposes using the standards applicable to that faculty member's appointment and assigned workload.

XII. Promotion and/or Tenure Standards

A. General Standards

Promotion and/or tenure evaluations shall be based on the standards of this manual as applied in light of the faculty member's appointment letter, annual assignments, and any later approved written modification of duties. A positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must be supported both by the candidate's annual review record and by performance and output judged to meet the more rigorous standard of significant contributions in the area or areas identified in the appointment letter or subsequent approved memorandum of understanding. Where teaching is assigned, successful teaching is always expected. Where teaching, research, or service is not designated as an area of significant contribution, the candidate must nevertheless demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in that area to the extent it is assigned. Meeting the threshold criteria stated below is necessary but not by itself sufficient for a positive

recommendation; the Center must also judge, on the basis of the full file, that the quality, significance, consistency, independence, and trajectory of the record justify the personnel action under review.

The Center recognizes that faculty members may contribute to its mission in different ways. Accordingly, the weight and character of the evidence required in teaching, research, and service shall be assessed in relation to the faculty member's appointment and assigned areas of significant contribution. Work shall be judged in light of the Center's mission, including its commitments to serious teaching, research, scholarship, mentorship, open inquiry, civil discourse, intellectual diversity, and public-facing programming. Consistent with University Procedures, the Center recognizes that public and community-engaged research and creative scholarship, including public scholarship disseminated in print and digital forms reaching broad audiences, may constitute research where the work meets the standards stated in this manual. Public-facing or civic work may count as service where appropriate under this manual.

For purposes of this section, public-facing intellectual work shall count as research rather than service only when it constitutes a durable, substantive, original intellectual product that advances understanding in the faculty member's field or contributes in a serious way to informed public discourse on questions within that field. A work shall be treated as equivalent public-facing intellectual work only when the file permits reviewers to judge, and the external evaluations where required support, that the work is reasonably comparable in scholarly excellence and influence to a peer-reviewed article, chapter, edition, translation, or other conventional scholarly output. In evaluating such work, reviewers may consider, as appropriate, its intellectual rigor, originality, engagement with relevant scholarship, quality and selectivity of venue, editorial or curatorial standards, scope of audience, dissemination, durability, adoption, citation, awards, invited republication, documented response in scholarly or public discourse, and external evaluations. Consistent with University Procedures, review involving relevant external communities, knowledgeable stakeholders, or other qualified external readers may, where appropriate, be regarded as meaningful evidence of quality. Routine media appearances, isolated commentary, event moderation, ordinary outreach, or advocacy without a durable intellectual product do not by themselves satisfy the research standards of this section.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To merit tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must demonstrate a cumulative record that supports the judgment that the candidate is likely to make sustained and significant contributions to the mission of the Center, the University, and the candidate's field over the course of a continuing career. Tenure is not awarded merely for years of service, for satisfactory performance alone, or by mechanical

counting of items. It requires a record that meets the Center's approved standards for long-term faculty membership.

A positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall require all of the following:

1. A preponderance of annual ratings of Good and Excellent in each area of significant contribution during the review cycles that count toward the tenure clock.
2. Annual ratings of at least Satisfactory in the remaining assigned area of reasonable contribution during the pre-tenure period.
3. A record that demonstrates significant contributions in the areas of significant contribution identified in the appointment letter or subsequent approved memorandum of understanding.
4. Where research or another non-teaching area is an area of significant contribution and external evaluations are required by University Procedures, overall positive external evaluations of the quality, independence, coherence, and impact of the candidate's work.

For a tenure-track candidate on the Center's ordinary appointment, a successful case includes significant contributions in both teaching and research, together with at least reasonable service appropriate to rank and assignment. The teaching record must show sustained effectiveness in instruction, advising, and mentorship. The research record must show an independent and developing scholarly or public-intellectual program of genuine seriousness and future promise. The service record at this stage is supporting rather than primary, but it must show reliability and substantive contribution appropriate to rank and assignment.

Where research is an area of significant contribution, the minimum research record for consideration shall include one of the following:

1. A peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph published by, or firmly under contract with, a reputable press;
- or
2. five peer-reviewed scholarly articles, chapters, critical editions, translations, or equivalent scholarly outputs of substantial quality in venues of national or international reputation, published or formally accepted for publication by the close of the file;

For purposes of the preceding paragraph, a work shall be treated as equivalent public-facing intellectual work only when the file permits reviewers to judge, and the external evaluations where required support, that the work is reasonably comparable in scholarly seriousness and influence to a peer-reviewed article, chapter, edition, translation, or other conventional scholarly output. A scholarly book written for a broader educated audience, or another substantial long-form public-facing intellectual work, may satisfy

the book standard when the file and the external evaluations support its equivalence in rigor, originality, significance, and impact.

These thresholds are minimum qualifications for consideration and are not necessarily sufficient. A positive recommendation further requires persuasive evidence that the record, taken as a whole, shows high-quality work, intellectual independence, coherent development, and a trajectory consistent with long-term faculty membership in the Center.

C. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor recognizes distinguished achievement over time. A successful candidate for Professor must show a sustained record of high-level performance since promotion to Associate Professor, continuing professional growth, and a record warranting recognition as a mature and influential member of the faculty. Promotion to Professor is never automatic and is based primarily on achievement since the last promotion, with special weight placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period. The record must show more than continued competence; it must show sustained accomplishment and increased distinction.

A positive recommendation for promotion to Professor shall require all of the following:

1. A preponderance of annual ratings of Good and Excellent in each area of significant contribution during the period since promotion to Associate Professor.
2. In the three annual review cycles immediately preceding the review, ratings of Good or Excellent in each area of significant contribution.
3. Annual ratings of at least Satisfactory in the remaining assigned area during the post-Associate period.
4. A sustained record of significant contributions in the areas of significant contribution identified in the appointment letter or subsequent approved memorandum of understanding.
5. Substantial evidence of broader recognition, greater significance, or clearer intellectual, pedagogical, or institutional leadership than was required for promotion to Associate Professor.
6. Where external evaluations are required by University Procedures, external reviews supporting the quality and impact of the candidate's work.

For a tenure-track candidate on the Center's ordinary appointment, a successful case includes sustained and distinguished accomplishment in both teaching and research, together with service of appropriate significance, maturity, and leadership. The teaching record should reflect continuing excellence and meaningful contribution to the educational mission of the Center beyond what was required for promotion to Associate Professor. The research record should reflect continued productivity and increased stature, significance, or influence since promotion to Associate Professor. The service record should show more

than routine participation and should include substantive contribution, leadership, institution-building, professional citizenship, or significant public engagement consistent with the Center's mission.

Where research is an area of significant contribution, the minimum research record for consideration shall include one of the following since promotion to Associate Professor:

1. an additional peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph published by a reputable press and one (1) additional peer-reviewed scholarly article, chapter, critical edition, translation, or equivalent scholarly output of substantial quality in a venue of national or international reputation, published by the close of the file;

or

2. six additional peer-reviewed scholarly articles, chapters, critical editions, translations, or equivalent scholarly outputs of substantial quality in venues of national or international reputation, published by the close of the file;

For purposes of the preceding paragraph, public-facing intellectual work shall count toward these thresholds only when the file and the external evaluations where required support the judgment that the body of work, taken as a whole, demonstrates rigor, originality, seriousness, and influence reasonably comparable to the conventional scholarly outputs for which it is substituted. Promotion to Professor requires not merely continued productivity, but evidence that the candidate's work has achieved greater distinction, significance, or influence than was required for promotion to Associate Professor.

Evidence of broader recognition, greater significance, or clearer leadership may include, as appropriate to field and assignment, invitations to give significant lectures or keynote addresses; invitations to organize symposia or major public programs; invited contributions to major edited volumes, journals, or public forums; service on editorial boards or national review panels; leadership in professional organizations; significant outside reviewing or consulting; awards, fellowships, or other honors; substantial external uptake or adoption of the candidate's work; or other evidence that the candidate has achieved a level of standing beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor.

These thresholds are minimum qualifications for consideration and are not necessarily sufficient. A positive recommendation further requires persuasive evidence of a mature and influential body of work and a level of distinction exceeding that required for promotion to Associate Professor.

D. Promotion Standards for Teaching-Track Faculty

Promotion in the teaching track recognizes sustained excellence in teaching and significant contribution to the instructional mission of the Center. Because teaching-track appointments are not tenure-track,

promotion is discretionary and shall be based on achievement since appointment or the last promotion, not on a critical year.

A positive recommendation for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor shall require all of the following:

1. A preponderance of annual ratings of Good and Excellent in teaching during the period under review.
2. Annual ratings of at least Satisfactory in assigned service.
3. A sustained record of teaching effectiveness and pedagogical seriousness.
4. A record of significant contribution to the Center's teaching mission through such things as curriculum development, course design or redesign, assessment, advising or mentorship, supervision of independent work, program-building, or comparable instructional leadership.
5. Evidence of continuing intellectual engagement appropriate to the appointment, which may include pedagogical development, serious public-facing intellectual work, scholarly engagement bearing on teaching, curricular innovation, or other documented forms of intellectual contribution consistent with the role.

A positive recommendation for promotion to Teaching Professor shall require all of the following:

1. A preponderance of annual ratings of Good and Excellent in teaching since promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.
2. In the three annual review cycles immediately preceding the review, ratings of Good or Excellent in teaching.
3. Annual ratings of at least Satisfactory in assigned service.
4. A sustained record of distinguished teaching and broader instructional leadership than was required for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.
5. Evidence of substantial contribution to the Center's educational mission through advanced curriculum leadership, major program development, sustained mentorship, pedagogical innovation, institutional problem-solving related to teaching, or comparable leadership in instruction and student formation.

Promotion in the teaching track requires more than good classroom performance alone. It requires persuasive evidence that the candidate has made a substantial and continuing contribution to the Center's

pedagogical mission and has achieved a level of instructional maturity and leadership appropriate to the higher rank.

XIII. Promotion and/or Tenure Review Procedures

A. Candidate Responsibilities

The candidate is responsible for submitting a complete and accurate digital faculty evaluation file by the applicable deadlines and for ensuring that the file contains the materials required by University Procedures and this manual. The candidate bears responsibility for the completeness and accuracy of materials submitted by the candidate, including narratives, curriculum vitae, supporting documentation, and other materials required for review. In non-mandatory promotion cases, the candidate remains responsible for deciding whether to seek review if otherwise eligible under University Procedures and this manual.

When external evaluations are required, the candidate shall participate in the construction of the reviewer pool as provided in this manual and University Procedures. The candidate may propose potential evaluators, must identify personal or professional relationships or other circumstances bearing on objectivity, and may request deletions from the proposed reviewer list, but may not solicit evaluations or exercise a veto over the final selection of evaluators. Under no circumstances may the candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate review-related contact with external evaluators. If an evaluator initiates contact with the candidate concerning the review, the candidate must decline substantive discussion and promptly report the contact to the Director.

B. Faculty Evaluation Committee Responsibilities

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (“FEC”) shall review the candidate’s file under the applicable standards of this manual and University Procedures. The FEC shall prepare a written evaluation in each case with an unequivocal recommendation for or against the personnel action under review, as applicable. The committee shall record its vote, and all members participating in the review shall sign the committee statement verifying the recommendation. The committee’s written evaluation should be sufficiently specific to explain the basis for its recommendation with reference to the applicable standards and to the evidentiary record in the file.

In discretionary promotion cases, the FEC and Director must advise the candidate on whether they are making progress towards promotion and/or tenure. Such advice is formative only and does not preclude the candidate from seeking review if otherwise eligible under University Procedures and this manual. In cases requiring external evaluations, the FEC may suggest potential evaluators to the Director and may assist in confirming that the file contains the materials necessary for informed external review.

C. Director Responsibilities

The Director shall conduct an independent review of the candidate’s file and shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation in accordance with University Procedures. The Director’s evaluation shall address the applicable standards in this manual and the candidate’s record as reflected in the digital faculty evaluation file. The Director is not bound by the FEC recommendation or the eligible-faculty recommendation; where the Director’s recommendation differs from either, the Director should explain the basis for that difference in writing. The Director shall provide the written evaluation to the candidate

and shall forward the file and recommendations in accordance with University Procedures and applicable deadlines. If the candidate receives a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure from either the relevant faculty body or the Director, the file shall proceed to the next level of review. If all recommendations at the Center level are negative, further review shall proceed only as provided by University Procedures, including automatic review where required and petition by the candidate where permitted.

In cases requiring external evaluations, the Director shall make the final selection of evaluators from the proposed lists in accordance with University Procedures and this manual, shall request the evaluations using the form or format approved by the Provost, and shall ensure that all solicited external evaluations received are included in the file. The Director may solicit more letters than the minimum required in order to ensure that the file contains the required number of credible and useful evaluations by the close of the file.

The Director is also responsible for the Center's formal advisement conversations with faculty concerning progress toward tenure and/or promotion. That advisement shall occur annually, in connection with the written annual evaluation and the annual workload-planning conversation for the next review cycle. For tenure-track faculty, the Director's annual evaluation should address progress toward tenure and promotion and identify any concerns at the earliest possible time. For promotion-eligible teaching-track faculty, the Director's annual evaluation should likewise address progress toward the next promotion where applicable. Additional focused advisement should occur at the cumulative pre-promotion review stage and, in a discretionary promotion case, when the candidate informs the Director of the intention to seek review.

D. External Evaluations

In cases involving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, and in cases involving promotion to Professor, the digital faculty evaluation file must contain external evaluations of the candidate's area of significant contribution in accordance with University Procedures. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered in assessing the quality, independence, coherence, and impact of the candidate's work, but they do not displace the independent judgment of the FEC, the eligible faculty, the Director, the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel, or the Provost. Teaching-track faculty are not required to obtain external evaluations unless University Procedures or other higher governing authority require them in a particular case.

A minimum of four external evaluations is normally required. External evaluations shall be maintained in a separate section of the digital faculty evaluation file. The persons directly involved in the promotion and/or tenure review process shall be granted access to that section as needed. After the first level of review is complete, the candidate shall have the right to see the evaluations with identifying information removed, as provided by University Procedures. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall not be used in subsequent personnel actions.

The names of persons who will be asked to provide external evaluations shall be selected with participation by the candidate and the persons in the Center who will conduct the review. The candidate and the Center shall each propose a list of six appropriate evaluators, with proposed reviewers drawn from peer/Carnegie R1 institutions. A paragraph describing each proposed evaluator shall be included in the file indicating the evaluator's qualifications to serve in this capacity. The candidate has the right to review the list of potential evaluators, to comment upon persons who may not provide an objective

evaluation, and to request deletions. The candidate's written comments and requests shall be forwarded to the Director and included in the external-evaluation section of the digital faculty evaluation file. In selecting evaluators, the Director may consider the candidate's comments and requests, but the candidate does not have the right to veto any possible evaluator, nor is the final selection of evaluators to be achieved through obtaining the candidate's consent.

External evaluators shall be selected for their professional competence in the relevant field and shall be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought. Persons who have been closely associated with the candidate, such as co-authors, dissertation advisors, or advisees, may be asked for evaluations only to the extent permitted by University Procedures and only where the relationship is fully disclosed. Such persons should not comprise the core set of reviewers on which the Center relies. A credible and useful external evaluation is one written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's work and sufficiently free of compromising relationship to do so with independence, and one that provides analysis substantial enough to aid the review. "Useful" refers to the analytical quality of the letter, not to whether it is favorable or unfavorable. Because the Center cannot control who agrees to write or the analytical quality of the letters received, the Center may solicit more letters than the minimum required. All solicited external evaluation letters that are received shall be included in the file.

When requesting external evaluations, the Director shall state clearly the candidate's area of significant contribution under review and shall supply the materials necessary for informed evaluation under University Procedures and this manual. Where the candidate's significant contribution includes interdisciplinary, public-facing, creative, or other nonstandard scholarly work, the Director may seek evaluators demonstrably qualified to assess that body of work. In such cases, the file should make clear why the chosen evaluators are appropriate and what body of work they were asked to assess. Published reviews or informal testimonials may be supportive evidence, but they are not substitutes for solicited external evaluations under this section.

XIV. Responses, Rebuttals, Petitions, and Grievances

A. Responses to Annual Evaluations

A faculty member may submit a written response to an annual evaluation within ten (10) working days of receiving the evaluation. The response shall be forwarded to the Director and placed in the digital faculty evaluation file. Errors of fact should be corrected by the Director through an additional memorandum to the file.

If the faculty member disagrees with an annual evaluation or the assignment of descriptors, the faculty member may work informally with the Director. After working informally with the Director, the faculty member may ask the Provost or the Provost's designee to review the evaluation or descriptors. After considering the faculty member's request, the Provost or the Provost's designee may direct the Director or the Faculty Evaluation Committee to reconsider its action based on a written justification that shall be

placed in the digital faculty evaluation file. Any subsequent adjustment shall be documented through an additional memorandum to the file.

Informal efforts to resolve disagreement concerning an annual evaluation do not suspend or extend any otherwise applicable filing deadlines under the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure or other governing law or policy.

B. Rebuttals and Petitions Regarding Promotion, Tenure, or Continuation

When a recommendation regarding promotion, tenure, or non-continuation has been made at the Center level, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal within five (5) working days of receiving the relevant evaluations. Because the Center reports directly to the Provost and has no intervening college-level dean, any rebuttal that University Procedures would otherwise direct to the Dean shall, for the Center, be directed to the Provost or the Provost's designee. Any such rebuttal shall be included in the digital faculty evaluation file and handled in accordance with the University Procedures then in effect.

If a discretionary promotion case receives negative recommendations from both the relevant faculty body and the Director, the faculty member may petition the Provost or the Provost's designee for further review within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. Negative recommendations in tenure or non-continuation cases shall proceed to further review to the extent required by University Procedures.

C. Grievances and Appeals

Nothing in this manual limits any right a faculty member may have to request reasons for a decision, to pursue a grievance, or to pursue any appeal available under applicable law, Board of Governors rules, University policy, or University Procedures. Faculty members may utilize the grievance procedures set out in West Virginia Code §6C-2-1 et seq., as incorporated by applicable University policy.

XV. Performance-Based Salary Policy

A. General Policy

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations, consistent with Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.4, University Procedures, and any approved University or Center salary policy then in effect. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit. Only performance in assigned areas shall be included in the merit calculation.

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. Unsatisfactory does not constitute meritorious performance.

Performance-based salary recommendations shall be based on the faculty member's assigned workload for the review period as reflected in the appointment letter, annual workload plan, memorandum of understanding, approved leave plan, or other approved written modification of duties. When duties have

been modified in writing during the review period, merit shall be calculated in light of the approved assignment applicable to that period.

Nothing in this section guarantees a salary increase in any particular year. Any increase remains subject to available funding, governing Board rules, University and college policy, and applicable institutional approval. Faculty members at the rank of Professor or the equivalent remain eligible, where applicable, for Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement under governing Board rules and University policy.

B. Merit Calculation

Unless superseded by a later approved Center performance-based salary policy, the descriptor values for annual merit calculations shall be as follows: Excellent = 4.0; Good = 2.5; Satisfactory = 1.0; Unsatisfactory = 0.

A total merit score shall be calculated by multiplying the percentage distribution of the appointment in each assigned mission area, expressed as a decimal, by the descriptor value received in that area and then summing the results. For example:

$$0.30 \text{ research} \times 4.0 = 1.20$$

$$0.50 \text{ teaching} \times 2.5 = 1.25$$

$$0.20 \text{ service} \times 2.5 = 0.50$$

$$\text{Total merit score} = 2.95 \text{ (on a 4.0 scale)}$$

If the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Director assign different descriptor ratings, the merit score shall be the average of the two resulting calculations, unless a different method is required by governing University or Center policy then in effect.

If salary increases are awarded after one or more years in which no performance-based increases were distributed, the Center shall apply the then-governing University or Center rule for how merit is to be calculated across those years. Unless superseded by later governing policy, descriptor values assigned during the years without increases shall be averaged with the current year's descriptors for purposes of determining the faculty member's merit score.

XVI. Amendment and Periodic Review

A. Amendment of this Manual

The Director or any full-time faculty member whose primary appointment is housed in the Center may propose an amendment to this manual. A proposed amendment shall be submitted in writing to the Director and shall be circulated to the full-time faculty whose primary appointments are housed in the Center for consultation. After consultation with the full-time faculty, the Director may or may not forward

the proposed amendment to the Provost for approval, with or without revision. No amendment shall take effect unless and until it is approved by the Provost.

B. Periodic Review

This manual shall be reviewed periodically to ensure continued consistency with West Virginia Code §18B-11-8, applicable Board of Governors rules, and the University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure then in effect.

At a minimum, this manual shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years and also upon the appointment or reappointment of the Director. The manual may also be reviewed earlier if changes in governing law, Board rules, University Procedures, or the structure or mission of the Center make revision advisable.

If higher governing authority changes before this manual is formally amended, the Center shall follow the higher governing authority unless and until this manual is revised and reapproved.