

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES

Approved by department January 13, 2017; Revised and approved by department October 16, 2019
Approved by the Office of the Provost September 1, 2022.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. The Faculty Evaluation File.....	2
2.1 Documentation of Teaching	2
2.2 Documentation of Research.....	3
2.3 Documentation of Service.....	3
3. Annual Performance Reviews and Annual Report.....	4
3.1 Faculty Evaluation Committee.....	4
3.2 Evaluation of Teaching.....	5
3.3 Evaluation of Research	7
3.4 Evaluation of Service	8
4. Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation	10
5. Performance-Based Salary Policy.....	10
6. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report	10
7. Career Report.....	11
8. Criteria for Promotion or Tenure.....	11
8.1 Tenure-track Faculty	11
8.2 Service Faculty.....	12
8.3 Teaching Faculty	12
8.4 External Review.....	13
9. Procedure for modification of this document	14

1. Introduction

This manual supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* as well as the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*. Since the fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University, and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, the precedence is Board, University, College, and then Department.

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

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

2. The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must annually update their annual evaluation file via Digital Measures with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. At the close of business on the Tuesday after Labor Day, the file shall be closed for the review period ending August 15th. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

The annual evaluation file is a collection of electronic documents and data stored in Digital Measures by the faculty member and institutional officials, and contains the teaching, research, and service documentation for each respective area of responsibility, as well as administrative documents such as the letter of appointment and memoranda. The file also must include a current CV, the department workload form, the productivity report, and an annual narrative. The narrative should contextualize all work for the review period and comment on any relevant progress for work beyond the review period (such as long-term projects, long term goals, or developmental efforts). All parts of the annual file must be finished and submitted by the deadline. They must not be altered after the deadline.

It is highly recommended that new faculty meet with a mentor before submitting their annual file.

The following sections detail requirements and illustrate the ways in which faculty may document their professional activities, but these illustrations are not exhaustive. Please keep in mind that all evidence must be presented electronically in the annual file.

2.1 Documentation of Teaching

For every course taught during the review period, syllabi and student evaluations (with student comments) must be included in the file. 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.

Please note: Work on graduate committees (as a chair or a committee member) and student mentoring/advising (other than in the advising office) should be documented on the productivity report and in the annual narrative; no additional evidence is required for the annual file. Faculty are expected to update their syllabi regularly. Among the conventions of teaching in higher education, faculty are expected to write recommendations for students, and to informally caucus with colleagues about pedagogy. Such work does not need to be documented.

2.2 Documentation of Research

It is expected that published research and creative work go through a peer review process (open, closed, editorial, or otherwise) to be counted as part of a research profile. 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 works (books, textbooks, edited volumes, critical editions, films, multimedia projects, articles/chapters, creative works, review essays, digital works, grants, translations, etc.) must be published/produced by recognized, high-impact presses and/or digital venues, of national or international academic reputation. Publications must be included in the annual evaluation file. Works in progress and works accepted for publication but not yet published may be included in the file; copies of letters of acceptance and contracts should be included for accepted work that has not yet been published but that is being taken into consideration for the review cycle. Editorial work may also be submitted for research and can be documented by the final journal issue (or if not available, proofs). A copy of the award letter and the proposal are sufficient documentation for funded grants.

Other research activity might include awards, keynote addresses, book reviews, manuscript reviews, reference entries, works in progress, paper presentations/readings, and other publications and/or activities related to the faculty member's research.

Please note: To document collaborative work in these categories, a faculty member must identify the type of collaboration and contextualize collaborative work in your narrative. According to the taxonomy created by Ede and Lunsford, collaboration may involve co-creation (creators work together at every stage of the process including invention, outlining, drafting, revision, and seeing the work through the process of publication); co-writing (creators divide the work according to tasks or skill sets; each creator drafts a quantifiable amount of the finished project or one creator completes the research write up while another completes a statistical analysis); or group writing (projects with many creators who contribute various components; co-authors may work on pieces of the work over time before one or two members of the group compile those pieces for editing and proofreading). To contextualize collaborative work, faculty should fully describe their work. At times, faculty members may find it helpful to quantify their contributions by using a percentage. Faculty must explain their role in the collaborative project, the need for collaboration in the project, the significance of this project, and/or the results from participating in the collaboration.

2.3 Documentation of Service

Service activities internal to the department need only be listed on the report; documentation may be included but is not required. All other service approved by the chairperson should be documented.

Faculty in administrative positions must include a document in the file defining the parameters and expectations of their position.

Documentation of service to the profession may include letters and emails related to such service (invitations, evidence of committee memberships, evidence of duties performed, etc.).

Documentation of service to the college and university approved by the chairperson may include letters, emails, or documents related to membership, work, or chairing of College, Faculty Senate, or University committees outside of the Department.

Service to the community approved by the chairperson must reflect the faculty member's professional expertise and may be documented in any number of ways (invitations, correspondence, flyers, etc.).

Notice of honors, awards, and grants for service (in the profession, for the public, or for the department, college, or university) should be documented in the file.

Please note: Among the conventions of service in higher education, faculty are expected to write recommendations for colleagues and to read colleagues' work at their request. Such service does not need to be documented.

3. Annual Performance Reviews and Annual Report

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

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All faculty 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. Full professors must formally request an evaluation by the FEC and will otherwise only be reviewed by the Chair.

3.1 Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluation body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and non-continuation. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The committee's conclusions are based on the material in the faculty files.

The FEC will normally include seven members. A majority of the committee members must hold tenure. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure cannot serve on the committee reviewing their evaluation file. The committee composition will be inclusive of categories of full-time faculty in the unit who qualify for performance-based salary increases. Since the majority of the FEC must be tenured faculty, the FEC will consist of three full professors, two tenured associate professors, one assistant professor, and one non-tenure-track service or teaching faculty member. If this committee membership is not attainable, the chairperson may deviate from it as needed. Faculty will be assigned to serve on the FEC on a rotational basis with tenured full and associate professors serving for two years and assistant and non-tenure-track professors serving for one-year rotations.

Except for their own cases, all members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains (recused) from voting. If a member is recused from a case, however, that member does not sign the committee statement. Instead, "Recused" is written in the signature space.

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

Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process, and when committee members themselves are being

evaluated. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. Faculty members who serve on the College committee may not serve on departmental FEC.

Members of the FEC must keep all committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential.

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

The annual review covers performance only for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement, and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable to their appointment, or continuing to remain productive. Where applicable, the FEC must note in their annual review whether or not sufficient progress has been made towards promotion, tenure, salary enhancement, and graduate faculty status.

All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are appropriate.

Ratings affect salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. Both Excellent and Good are meritorious ratings. Work should be fully documented. If there is not enough information in the file to support a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to Satisfactory rating or lower is appropriate.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide for the annual file evidence that (1) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the FEC of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the annual evaluation file. If such evidence has not been provided, the FEC's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we must conclude that the faculty member's work is Unsatisfactory."

3.2 Evaluation of Teaching

As noted above, teaching can be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. Teaching is assessed by its quality, not quantity. While teaching more courses is valued, that is not in itself a criterion for a descriptor of Good or Excellent. The Eberly College requires that all student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. The College also requires that syllabi for all courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the evaluation file. As the FEC reviews files, they will assess the teaching documentation in the file in light of the faculty member's comments in the annual narrative.

Excellent. The profile of teaching excellence is evident from the materials in the file; work and materials related to instruction are of a consistently exceptional quality and deserve recognition with the highest level of merit. The quality of the pedagogy is evident in the rigor of course materials; syllabi are well-organized, creative, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. The profile of teaching excellence is often characterized by successful faculty mentoring of students, theses, and/or dissertations, but these activities in and of themselves are not sufficient for excellence in

teaching. The profile of teaching excellence includes a commitment to self-assessment, peer observation, and/or professional development. Documentation for a descriptor of Excellent will typically include multiple types of evidence, but it is the quality of teaching activities and not the quantity of activities or materials that will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award an Excellent for teaching.

Good. The profile of good teaching is evident from the materials in the file; work and materials related to instruction are of a consistently high quality and deserve recognition of merit. The quality of the pedagogy is evident in the rigor of course materials; syllabi are well-organized, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. The profile of good teaching may include faculty mentoring of students, theses, and/or dissertations, but these activities in and of themselves are not a criterion for a descriptor of Good in teaching. The profile of good teaching includes a commitment to self-assessment, peer observation, and/or professional development. Documentation for a descriptor of Good will typically include multiple types of evidence, but it is the quality of these teaching activities and not the quantity of activities or materials that will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Good for teaching.

Satisfactory. The profile of satisfactory teaching is evident from the materials in the file, which demonstrate that teaching meets departmental expectations and provides evidence of both responsibility and effort. The pedagogy maintains an instructional environment that enables student learning, but not one that is particularly rigorous; syllabi are organized, appropriate for the subject, and clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. The profile of satisfactory teaching includes some commitment to self-assessment, peer observation, and/or professional development. Documentation for a descriptor of Satisfactory will typically include evidence of teaching activities, but it is the quality of these teaching activities and not the quantity of activities or materials that will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Satisfactory for teaching.

Unsatisfactory. The profile of unsatisfactory teaching is evident from the file; the required documentation of unsatisfactory teaching may be missing or incomplete. The pedagogy does not maintain an instructional environment that enables student learning; syllabi are not organized, or not appropriate for the subject, or not clear about expectations, course goals, and criteria. Teaching materials in the file reflect pedagogy that is not yet developed or is disengaged. The teaching profile that emerges from the documentation provides little evidence of the faculty member's positive engagement with or positive effect on students. The teaching profile also provides little or no evidence of engagement in activities related to self-assessment and/or professional development for the improvement of teaching. There is little evidence that acceptable teaching has been performed. A descriptor of Unsatisfactory typically reflects a lack of evidence and/or evidence of the lack of quality of teaching.

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For teaching faculty, this effort is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing the needs, priorities, and initiatives of the Department, College, and University. See WVU guidelines section IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS, B. Faculty Categories, 4. Teaching-track faculty.

3.3 Evaluation of Research

As noted above, activities related to research can be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research mission of the Department. It is an expectation of the profession that successful research faculty are involved in a variety of research endeavors—not only in terms of quantity, but of type. The Department of English values interdisciplinary and collaborative work, and the FEC views them positively in evaluations. For the purpose of evaluation, works written collaboratively with other authors may be considered of equal importance with those written by a single author, depending upon the author's contextualization of the project, including the author's role, the scope of the project, and the project's outcomes.

Faculty can count an item accepted for publication (but not yet published) in an annual review, but that item must not be counted again unless it fits under one of the multi-year categories (as described below). Once an item is published, it must be counted in that year's annual review if it has not been counted previously.

The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who contribute 40% of their effort to research, since that is the most common allocation. Faculty members who devote a larger or smaller portion of their time to research and whose annual workload forms thus reflect a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 80%, 50%, or 20% teaching), should note that percentage in their narrative.

Excellent. The profile of research excellence is evident from the materials in the file; work and materials related to research are of a consistently exceptional quality and deserve recognition with the highest level of merit. Normally, the following works contribute to an Excellent research profile. The publication of a single-authored book will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for three consecutive years. The publication of a novel, a collection of poems, or a collection of short stories will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for three consecutive years. The editing of a collection of essays will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for two consecutive years. The co-editing of a collection of essays will receive research descriptor of Excellent for one year. The editing of a standard edition of a text will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for two consecutive years. The co-editing of a standard edition of a text will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for one year. The production of a feature-length film or multimedia project will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for three years. The publication of a textual or multimedia archive (including corpus-building projects) with critical apparatus such as introduction, metadata, etc. will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for two years. The publication of a codebase for platform, system, large-scale tool, etc., with user documentation will receive a research descriptor of Excellent for one year.

Funded research proposals that require substantial application and review processes contribute to a research descriptor of Excellent for the year in which they are awarded. In general, the profile of smaller funded research proposals are assessed by the status of the funding agency, the competitiveness of the grant competition, the amount of funding, and the duration of the funding.

The publication of one single-author article in a peer reviewed journal (online or offline) or its equivalent in creative writing will receive a research descriptor of Excellent. The publication of an article-length review essay will receive a research descriptor of Excellent if published in a venue of national or international reputation (established or new). The editing of a journal, the editing of an issue of a journal, and the co-editing of an issue of a journal each receive a research descriptor of Excellent for one year. The development of a database contributes to a research descriptor of Excellent for one year.

The presentation of work at conferences and readings on a regular basis, and the publication of book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, and other short research-oriented works, (which may or may not be peer reviewed) solely or in multitude, contribute to a research descriptor of Excellent but are not in themselves sufficient for a research descriptor of Excellent. Work in progress may add to the annual research profile but in itself does not constitute a criterion for a descriptor of Excellent.

Please note: The preceding examples of meritorious productivity are not exhaustive.

Good. The profile of good research is evident from the materials in the file; work and materials related to research are of a high quality and deserve recognition with merit. The evolution of a scholarly profile is ongoing and wide-ranging, and the profile of good research reflects a commitment to professional development even if those multiple research efforts have not yet come to fruition.

The presentation of work at conferences and readings on a regular basis, and the publication of book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, and other short research-oriented works, (which may or may not be peer reviewed) solely or in multitude, may contribute to a research descriptor of Good. Work in progress adds to the annual research profile, but in itself does not necessarily constitute a criterion for a descriptor of Good.

Please note: The preceding examples of meritorious productivity are not exhaustive.

Satisfactory. The profile of satisfactory research is evident from the materials in the file, which demonstrate both responsibility and effort to meet departmental expectations of research. The evolution of a scholarly profile may be ongoing, but the profile of satisfactory research reflects a more minor commitment to professional development. The profile of satisfactory research generally lacks publications but can involve work submitted for publication and work in progress. Presentations or brief publications may contribute to a research descriptor of Satisfactory.

Unsatisfactory. The profile of unsatisfactory research is evident from the file; the documentation of research may be missing or incomplete. The profile of unsatisfactory research reflects a lack of engagement with research activities, a lack of commitment to professional development, or a lack of quality of the research produced.

A service faculty appointment asks for only a reasonable contribution in research, and the annual file will be expected to include one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference. Other instances of scholarly activity such as peer-reviewed articles are welcome, but are not required, to meet the criterion of reasonable research contribution for the purpose of annual review and continuation in rank.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

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

Private consulting apart from the University shall 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.

As the FEC reviews files, they will assess the service documentation in the file in light of the faculty member's comments in the annual narrative.

The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who contribute 20% of their effort to service, since that is the most common allocation. Faculty members who devote a larger or smaller portion of their time to service and whose annual workload forms thus reflect a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 80%, 50%, or 10% service) should note that percentage in their narrative.

Excellent. There is evidence that service has been performed that is well above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Excellent service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: Activities that directly address department, college, university, or professional goals; extensive and continuing responsibilities in terms of organization, leadership or administration, documentation, etc.; work that clearly benefits our department, college, university, or profession; positive results and products of service efforts.

A descriptor of Excellent will typically include evidence of multiple activities. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not simply the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award an Excellent for service.

Good. There is evidence that service has been performed that is above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Good service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: Activities that directly address department, college, university, or professional goals; significant responsibilities in terms of organization, documentation, etc. (often as a contributing member of a committee or organization); work that benefits our department, college, university, or profession; positive results and products of service efforts.

A descriptor of Good will typically include evidence of multiple activities. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not simply the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Good for service.

Satisfactory. There is evidence that service has been performed that is at the level expected of faculty in terms of contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Opportunities to provide service have been pursued. Satisfactory service is typically characterized by: Activities that directly address department, college, university, or professional goals; service responsibilities that require little beyond attendance.

A descriptor of Satisfactory will typically include evidence of activities in at least one of the categories listed earlier in this section. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Satisfactory for service.

Unsatisfactory. There is little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed time or effort in terms of service. The faculty member interacts minimally with the department, college, university, profession, or community in a professional capacity.

Faculty members with administrative appointments must show evidence of their ability to create and maintain programs or activities that meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, or University. Such evidence may include assessment of program growth and/or impact, and/or examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and/or explanation of how program coordination or other service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, and University.

4. Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

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” in the general case and “rebuttals” in specific situations. Responses to annual reviews at the department level may be submitted at any time. When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or non-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.6, XIII.A.4, and XIII.A.5 about reactions to departmental evaluations (reactions to college-level evaluations are described in Section XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6).

A faculty member may also file a grievance. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at <http://grievanceprocedure.wvu.edu/>.

5. Performance-Based Salary Policy

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

The Department’s descriptors translate to points as follows: Excellent = 4; Good = 3; Satisfactory = 1; Unsatisfactory = 0. A total score is calculated from multiplying workload percentages by descriptor scores. For example:

40% teaching = 40 x 3 (rating of Good) = 120
40% research = 40 x 4 (rating of Excellent) = 160
20% service = 20 x 1 (rating of Satisfactory) = 20
Merit Score = 300

80% teaching = 80 x 3 (rating of Good) = 240
20% service = 20 x 3 (rating of Good) = 60
Merit Score = 300

If the FEC and the Chair present different ratings descriptors, the merit score is an average of the two evaluations. If a raise follows one or more years where no raises were awarded, then the descriptors assigned during those years are averaged with the new descriptors to determine a faculty member’s merit score. See the Eberly College guidelines, section X. PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES for more information.

6. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report

Tenure-track faculty are subject to a more thorough review two years prior to 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 must be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report. This evaluation is an addendum to the annual evaluation.

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 non-renewal prior to the critical year.

Because promotion of Teaching, Research, and Service faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory. As noted in Section IV. THE FACULTY EVALUATION FILE, C. Productivity Reports, 1. Types of Reports, b. Cumulative Pre-promotion Reports of the Eberly College guidelines, however, departments provide such reviews upon request, so that non-tenure track faculty members can obtain the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

7. Career Report

The career report summarizes accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion and/or promotion and tenure. The career report's end date is on December 31 of the faculty member's critical year. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, the credited work must be included in the career report.

Using the appropriate date ranges, the career report will automatically draw administrative materials, past evaluations, and all available documentation of research, teaching, and service. In addition, the faculty member should prepare a preface for the report that includes an inventory of the materials in the file; a narrative where the candidate makes a case for promotion and/or tenure by highlighting contributions to teaching, research, and service; and a complete curriculum vitae. Detailed narratives of the candidate's contributions should preface documentation for each of the three areas of evaluation. Responsibility for preparing the narratives and documentation lies solely with the candidate.

8. Criteria for Promotion or Tenure

A career evaluation normally is conducted when a faculty member seeks promotion or tenure. A career evaluation is conducted by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair in addition to the annual evaluation. See section VII, THE EVALUATION PROCESS, D. Career Evaluation and Standards for Promotion or Tenure, of the Eberly College guidelines.

8.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Persons in Critical Year. To be considered for promotion and tenure in the critical year, the candidate must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) by a reputable press or at least six scholarly articles or essays that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation, or their equivalent in digital humanities work.

A candidate seeking promotion and tenure in the critical year on the basis of creative writing must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) or at least six stories, six essays, or twenty-four poems that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation.

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

The evaluation of the amount of new material in a book is dependent on the expectations of that book's academic field.

Tenure-Track Persons seeking Discretionary Promotions. To be considered for a discretionary promotion, the candidate must present a book published by a reputable press or at least six scholarly articles or essays that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation, or their equivalent in digital humanities work.

A candidate seeking promotion on the basis of creative writing must present a book or at least six stories, six essays, or twenty-four poems that have appeared in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation.

The evaluation of the amount of new material in a book is dependent on the expectations of that book's academic field.

Faculty hired before 2011 or promoted to Associate Professor before 2011 may be grandfathered to the promotion criteria approved in the 2009 *Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual*.

For discretionary promotions, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

It is understood that the above quantities are the minimum qualifications for consideration for promotion, and are not to be construed as necessarily sufficient for promotion. The candidate must give evidence of a pattern of significant scholarly or creative activity. Ordinarily, in the case of promotion to Professor, the candidate should present a book; in the absence of a book at least six scholarly articles should be presented representing a significant and coherent body of work as determined by peers in the field. A positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of research if research is an area of significant contribution.

8.2 Service Faculty

Per Board of Governors Rule 4.2, a service faculty appointment must have service assignments of at least 50%, with classroom instruction or other assignment secondary. When research is part of the appointment, it typically represents 10% of the regular workload. Thus, expectations for service faculty normally include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and reasonable contribution in research. Within the Department, the criterion of "reasonable research contribution" for an annual descriptor of satisfactory for service faculty would normally be one example of ongoing productivity. This productivity level should be recorded with a series of annual reviews evaluating research at or above "satisfactory." For discretionary promotion, a service faculty member will be expected to demonstrate engagement with their research and scholarly community. A positive recommendation for promotion must be supported by a preponderance of Good or Excellent ratings on annual reviews of service.

8.3 Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty are the members of the Department who have teaching as their sole significant area of contribution (80% of their work). For teaching faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the file is expected to show evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include

systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing the defined needs, priorities, and initiatives of the Department, College, and University. A positive recommendation for promotion must be supported by a preponderance of Good or Excellent ratings on annual reviews of teaching.

8.4 External Review

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University. In addition, teaching associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of professor also need external evaluations of their teaching. See Section IX of the Eberly College Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises.

To allow the Department time to contact external reviewers (and to allow those reviewers ample time to read and evaluate materials), the Department begins the process of selecting external reviewers in the spring semester prior to the academic year in which the candidate will apply for promotion and/or tenure.

By April 1, candidates seeking promotion should notify the Chair in writing of the desire to be considered for discretionary promotion or of intent to be considered for tenure in the critical year.

By April 15, candidates seeking promotion should prepare a brief description of their areas of scholarly emphasis and methodologies to aid the FEC in creating a list of external reviewers.

By May 31, prior to the start of the faculty member's critical year or elective promotion year, the Chair of the Department will ask the FEC to prepare and submit a list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of the applicant's scholarship. At the same time, the applicant will be asked to submit to the Chair a similar list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of scholarship.

Assembling the Lists of Reviewers. Both lists should include the following information about the individuals listed: Name; rank; current affiliation; Carnegie rating of the reviewer's institution, and as much contact information, including addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses, as can be readily obtained. A brief description of the proposed reviewer's scholarly profile should also be provided. The applicant's list, furthermore, should include a statement concerning the applicant's professional and/or personal relationship (or the lack of any such relationship) with the reviewer.

By June 7, the candidate seeking promotion will view the FEC's list of proposed reviewers in the Chair's office and comment on each as needed. These comments will be recorded, and the record signed and dated by the applicant. These comments should be taken into account when selecting the final list of reviewers, and when the external reviews are read by the FEC and the Chair. The applicant will prepare a packet of materials for review according to instructions below.

By June 15, the Chair will consult with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences to draw up a final list of reviewers and gain the Dean's approval to undertake a review using this list.

Qualifications for Reviewers. The minimum qualifications to serve as an external evaluator require 1) that the individual so identified hold the academic rank to which the applicant aspires or a higher rank, and 2) that the individual be a member of an English Department with a Ph.D. granting program or its equivalent generally recognized to be at least the peer of our doctoral program, or (where creative work is being

evaluated) that the individual be a member of a Creative Writing program generally recognized to be at least the peer of our Creative Writing program. Please note: A “peer” institution is one that has the same Carnegie rating as WVU. In special cases, individuals from other institutions, individuals who do not hold an academic appointment, or individuals who are in departments other than English may serve as external reviewers if their areas of expertise are widely recognized in the profession and a strong case is made to the Dean for their ability to evaluate the work of an applicant for tenure and/or promotion.

Packet for External Reviewers. By July 1, candidates seeking promotion should have ready their packet of materials to be sent to external reviewers. The Department will share these materials with reviewers. The packet for review should contain only materials that contribute to the record for the current review. Materials considered in a previous review or proscribed for consideration in the letter of agreement should not be included in the packet. An inventory of the materials offered for review should be included, and if it is necessary to indicate certain information about a work of scholarship or creative writing (e.g., it corrects an earlier study or it follows from the work of another scholar, or it constitutes one of a sequence of short stories, etc.), such information may be noted on the inventory. The applicant should provide an up-to-date Curriculum Vitæ for the packet. Where it may be necessary to submit book-length studies for the review, the applicant must provide sufficient copies (usually 4-6) for reviewers’ packets. Such books should be considered gifts to the reviewers and their return should not be anticipated.

9. Procedure for modification of this document

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