

**DIVISION OF SOCIOLOGY and ANTHROPOLOGY
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL**

Approved by Division April 20, 2010

Approved by the Office of the Provost June 7, 2010

The Division of Sociology and Anthropology's Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure*. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the division, 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 division level. Department and division policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, and Division.

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

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

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

The Appointment Letter

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

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

For Teaching faculty, responsibilities are normally defined as 80% teaching and 20% service. For the Division of Sociology and Anthropology, Teaching Instructors who teach four courses per semester and advise premajors/majors may be defined as 100% teaching.

For Clinical faculty, Board of Governors Policy 2 stipulates the appointment must have the majority of the assignment be assigned service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary.

Research faculty may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as principal investigator in externally funded research. Per BoG Policy 2, classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary. Teaching must be supported separately on internal funding and

restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. There may be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are normally a maximum of .80FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

Annual Assignment

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and Chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Clinical faculty, Research faculty, Teaching faculty, and Tenure track faculty participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process.

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

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Clinical Faculty ¹	30-48%	5-10% max	50+%
Teaching Faculty	80%	---- ²	20%
Research Faculty		100%	
Senior Lecturer	100%		
Lecturer	100%		
¹ Expectations considered in annual evaluations and possible promotion or performance-based salary increases for Clinical faculty at WVU/ECAS will include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and reasonable contribution in research. In ECAS, the criterion of “reasonable research contribution” for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank is normally one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference, per year. However, for discretionary promotion, a record of publication in refereed journals normally will be expected. Teaching assignments for Clinical faculty are normally a maximum of 14 credit hours during the nine-month academic year.			
² Evaluation in a Teaching faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU P&T document, "Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For Teaching faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.			

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Division of Sociology and Anthropology is five three-credit courses or their equivalent (including advising of undergraduate majors, direction of independent studies, teaching practicums or professional field experiences, direction of graduate thesis research, etc.). “Research active” in this context is defined as engaged in ongoing scholarly work, pursuant to an approved research agenda, that leads to regular publication in peer-reviewed outlets. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to four or five three-credit courses per semester, or their equivalents. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the faculty member’s expectations for promotion.

The percentages of the appointment allocated to teaching, research, and service that are applied in annual reviews and calculation of performance-based salary increases remain as they are described in the appointment letter unless adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Dean.

For faculty members approved for sabbatical or professional development program leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the leave period.

Faculty on a full year's professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester's leave, a Tenure track faculty member's annual evaluation would typically be 60%-70% teaching, 20-30% research and 10% service. Teaching faculty would typically be 90% teaching and 10% service.

Faculty on a full year's sabbatical leave would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester's sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

Copies of the approved leave application and plan (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty File

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

Each faculty personnel file must have an inventory of its contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, all faculty files and file inventories in the Eberly College will be organized following a format that maintains four separate inventories for (1) the administrative file, and for (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service documentation. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

1. The administrative file includes: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, workload plans, subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; (d) annual CVs and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include.

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify which file each piece of documentation is submitted to. Ordinarily, a faculty member's work efforts are primarily placed in one category (i.e., either teaching or research or service). The Division of Sociology and Anthropology recognizes that the distinction between teaching and research, research and service, service and teaching are not always clear. Letters of appointment, workload documents, and/or the faculty member's narrative should be used to clarify where such "efforts" in question should be placed. Faculty must provide an annual report using the template which is established. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is required. Faculty are responsible for providing the information required for assessment of faculty performance.

Each document should be tagged with its inventory number.

Once an item is entered into the personnel file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. Generally speaking, files may not leave the administrative office suite where they are housed.

These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to university guidelines <http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4 faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the FEC and/or the Division Chair; the rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the chair. If decisions have been made that are construed as arbitrary or capricious, or in violation of a rule, then a grievance might be appropriate. In such cases, to be prudent, faculty should work informally with the chair while simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the fifteen-day window for filing a grievance will be met.

Appeal of a departmental descriptor (i.e., seeking action to have a descriptor changed) could be treated as described in the previous paragraph, and, if simultaneously grieved, must follow the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at pegboard.state.wv.us/ or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 293-9203.

Prior to such action, the Division of Sociology and Anthropology also allows a faculty member to communicate with the Chair of the division and/or the Chair of the FEC if the faculty member feels that there are inaccuracies, errors, or omissions in his or her annual evaluation(s). After reviewing the faculty member's concern, the Chair and/or the FEC can provide a corrected document if either the Chair and/or the FEC feel(s) a correction is warranted. Procedurally, the original evaluation letter must remain in the file, but a second evaluation letter will be written and added to the file to correct the error(s).

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

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

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

Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and (rarely) termination. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files.

The Division FEC will normally include a minimum of three members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his personnel file. When possible, the faculty evaluation committee shall be composed of faculty holding the rank of Associate or Full Professor. Untenured or un-promoted faculty may ask or may be asked to serve during their probationary period but no more than one term. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured or promoted faculty. Members shall be selected by ballot vote of all tenure-track or promotable faculty in the division in the April faculty meeting.

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

The chair of the 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. 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 the Division evaluation committee.

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

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

The annual review normally covers performance only for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement, and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable to their appointment, or continuing to remain productive.

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. **Context:** To what degree are the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *consistent with goals* important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on *knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations*? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or *keep current* with changes?

Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. Faculty should submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations.

In evaluating teaching and instruction, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall follow the guidelines below.

Teaching Evidence: Evaluation of teaching by the FEC shall be based on evidence concerning the organization and preparation of courses, effective communication in the classroom (as indicated by student evaluations of instruction, peer evaluations, etc.), and the overall contribution of the teaching to the Division's program. Both quantitative and qualitative aspects of contributions will be considered.

Teaching Priorities: Evaluations of teaching shall be conducted in terms of two overarching categories.

Priority One: competence in basic and elective courses within the Division's curriculum. In addition to teaching regular three-credit courses, this shall include directing independent study projects and teaching practicums, overseeing internship placements, and chairing M.A. thesis committees.

Priority Two: competence in other teaching endeavors, including the advising of premajors and majors in the Division, giving guest lectures in courses, participating in teaching workshops and special events, serving on M.A. or Ph.D. committees, and similar activities.

Teaching Portfolio: All faculty members are encouraged to utilize a teaching portfolio approach in the presentation of their teaching activities. Such portfolios might include written comments based on class visitation by faculty peers or others, as well as relevant teaching materials including assignment guidelines (e.g., for research papers), examples of student work (with personal identification removed), and written comments from students about the value of instructional activities.

Required Course Evaluations: In accordance with University policy, the Division of Sociology & Anthropology requires that all regular courses be evaluated every semester.

Exceptions Justified: Exceptions for courses which are not regular courses should be noted and justified; exceptions might include independent study, staff listings or orientation courses.

SEI Requirement: Generally, the Senate Evaluation Instrument (SEI) must be used to evaluate all courses. Exceptions and other formats (e.g., open-ended questions) may be justified based on the nature of the course, its delivery format (e.g., small enrollment courses, graduate courses) or other pertinent factors. The Division recognizes that the SEI instrument is not a precise measurement of competence or effectiveness in teaching, and that its focus is primarily on student satisfaction rather than demonstrable educational outcomes. Nevertheless, the Division considers SEI results an important component of the evaluation of teaching because they provide a voice for students, especially with regard to such issues as the atmosphere in classrooms and the attitudes of instructors toward students (e.g., perceived fairness and respect).

Course Evaluation Period Covered: Ordinarily, the annual report should include the course evaluations for the Spring, Summer, and the Fall semester courses for the calendar year under review. . In the

eventuality that Fall semester reviews are not received in time for the annual report, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will make assessments for the modified time period rather than limit evaluation strictly to the calendar year in this regard.

Impact of No Course Evaluations: The absence of evaluations will ordinarily result in an “unsatisfactory” rating in teaching for the relevant year. Faculty may, however, explain special circumstances leading to missing SEI data for a particular course.

Evaluation Data to Submit: The summary sheet of course evaluation statistics is required. A typed formatted copy of student comments for each course is also encouraged. It is recognized that preparation of student comments may not be feasible in the annual report for large introductory and some other courses, but faculty are encouraged to review comments for personal use and course improvement. When student comments are included, they must be complete and not edited (except for inappropriate language or off topic comments). The individual rating sheets should not be included in the annual report or the personnel file, but should be retained in the faculty member’s personal file until the next annual report in the event there are questions or the chair or committee wishes to verify written student comments.

Course Syllabi Required: Course syllabi for all courses taught during the review year must be included in the annual report. Syllabi are an important indication of course organization, teaching practices and standards, currency of information and literature, student expectations and learning designs. To constrain duplication and file space, only one copy of the syllabus for a specific course should be included, even though the course may have been taught multiple times during the year. If there were major changes, the faculty may include either the latest syllabus or both the new and old versions.

All faculty members should be prepared for class, should teach courses reflecting the current state of the discipline, should have syllabi prepared according to the standards of the department and university, should be available to students outside the classroom, should give examinations that are well prepared and used effectively to encourage learning and critical thinking, should have their classes produce work products that align with stated learning outcome objectives, should have students achieve success, and should provide a positive learning environment. Meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) teaching contribution requires evidence of extensive and successful teaching effectiveness in both Priority One and Priority Two teaching categories.

Teaching faculty assignments (i.e., at least 80% teaching) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For Teaching faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University’s teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Division-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

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

Clinical faculty assignments (a minimum of 50% service) may include a 5-10% research component. A Clinical faculty appointment asks for only a reasonable contribution in research, and the annual file will be expected to include one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference. Other instances of scholarly activity such as peer-reviewed articles are

welcome, but are not required to meet the criterion of reasonable research contribution for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank. However, should Clinical faculty wish to stand for promotion, a record of publication is expected.

Assessment Factors for Research: The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall consider the following factors in assessing the research and scholarly productivity of colleagues:

- Active and ongoing program of research in an area of expertise, including evidence of regular submissions of manuscripts for publication and grant proposals
- Weight to non-refereed publications that make positive contributions
- Faculty collaboration as co-authors and demonstration of one's contributions
- Publication in journals of reputation and relevance for sociology/anthropology
- Weight of book chapters, monographs, consulting reports, etc.
- Pedagogical scholarship in some cases may be considered as research
- External funding (if appropriate to faculty appointment letter and research agenda) as an indicator of quality
- Research done at WVU

Research Priorities: Reviews of research will be conducted in terms of the following overall categories:

Priority One: refereed (i.e., peer reviewed) journal articles, books, book chapters, externally funded grants, competitive fellowships, etc. Peer reviewed externally funded grant support and high status fellowships where a faculty member plays a central role indicate the importance and value assigned to a colleague's research program by peers within her/his scientific community and thus **one** may be defined as an article equivalent during a faculty member's probationary period. Faculty members may also request that some invited articles or chapters be counted as Priority One research, especially when these appear in prestigious outlets and when such invitations reflect national and international recognition of the work of colleagues.

Priority Two: applied research, conference papers, and funding proposals.

Standards: There may be different standards and expectations for research in the different faculty assignments. At the same time, however, there is the expectation of ongoing research for all faculty who have research as at least 10% of their assignment.

Larger Research Publications: Ordinarily a book is the equivalent of 2-4 peer reviewed publications. Generally books will be given credit for a period of three years for the purposes of performance-based pay. Additional credit may be given, as appropriate, depending on the complexity, length and significance of the work. Less credit may be provided if the book is edited and/or a revised edition of the original work depending on the original work involved. And, some publications (such as a well evaluated book) may make acceptable fewer publications than the number required for promotion.

Book Reviews: Books reviews will generally be assessed as Priority Two publications. A longer review essay, if peer-reviewed, however may be counted as a Priority One publication.

Collaborative and Individual Scholarship: Faculty collaboration is encouraged and faculty are expected to identify their contributions to such work and such can be utilized in review for promotion and tenure. At the same time, a research portfolio is strengthened when it includes some work and type of publications that show the competence and ability of the individual faculty member and separate contributions as a scholar. While both single and multiple authored work can be evaluated for promotion and tenure, it is wise counsel, particularly to Assistant Professors, that their work include single authored research as well as publications in which they are the first author.

Research Credit in Individual Year: A research publication (except books, as noted above) should normally be credited only once. Faculty members should designate whether credit would be assigned in

the year of acceptance for publication or when the item appears in print. If credit is assigned in the year of acceptance, documentation of acceptance (e.g., a letter from a journal editor) must be provided. The annual report template supplies information to the Faculty Evaluation Committee about work in progress, acceptance and publication lag. If the research publication is presented towards research accomplishment during the annual report but has not appeared during that period, the report should include a full explanation. In any event, if a work is listed for credit during a particular year, it may not be listed for credit in an ensuing year even if it appears in print during that year. It may be listed for information, but not toward the research expectation.

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) research contribution normally requires evidence of continuous and successful research activities and products in both Priority One and Priority Two research categories.

Evaluation of Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, college, university, or profession. Service should thus be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, or profession. Faculty should submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment.

Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Faculty are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

The Division of Sociology and Anthropology understands "service" as comprised of two related components. (1) "Citizenship" denotes the contributions arising out of shared governance and the operation of academic degree programs. These include such activities as attending faculty meetings, serving on committees within the academic unit, participating in reviews of faculty performance, participating in searches for new faculty, participating in the assessment of departmental programs, and participating in special departmental events (e.g., retreats, presentations by visiting scholars). (2) Application of Expertise refers to activities that draw on a faculty member's specialized professional knowledge. These include such efforts as reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, serving on committees in professional associations, holding offices in professional associations and editing professional journals. Likewise, pursuant to the land-grant mission of West Virginia University, applications of expertise refer to a broad range of activities that make specialized knowledge available to broader publics (e.g., local communities or the State as a whole), policy making groups (e.g., the West Virginia Division of Health and Human Services, cultural resource management groups, urban planners) and service agencies (e.g., the Rape and Domestic Violence Information Center).

All faculty whose appointments include a service component are expected to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Division of Sociology and Anthropology in the operation of its academic programs. Such a contribution is a minimal expectation for an annual evaluation of "Satisfactory."

Consistent with long-established practice in the Division, meritorious evaluations ("Good" or "Excellent") require contributions at multiple levels, one of which must be the Division level. The particular combination of service contributions can vary among individual faculty members, in accordance with their specialized areas of competence, personal interests, letters of appointment and annual workload documents. Some may be more active in service to local communities, while others may provide external service to professional associations, and still others to national or international groups. The Division does not demand that faculty make contributions in service at every possible level, but wishes to see both internal and external service contributions.

For most faculty whose appointments include service expectations, this activity will be governed by the norm of a "reasonable" contribution. In such cases, letters of appointment will ordinarily designate service as 20% of faculty effort, which is approximately equivalent to one day per week. For purposes of

promotion, in keeping with College and University guidelines, a “reasonable” contribution will be understood as “satisfactory or above,” as indicated in a series of annual reviews.

In other cases, especially those of Clinical faculty, service will be governed by the norm of a “significant” contribution, and will ordinarily be designated as 40% or more of total faculty effort. In such cases, more of a leadership role will be expected, as stipulated in letters of appointment and annual workload documents. Colleagues having such positions will be responsible for successful program coordination and administration. Evidence of this type of contribution will include such indicators as assessments of program growth and/or impact, examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and explanations of how the service activities meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College and/or the University. For purposes of promotion, in keeping with College and University guidelines, a “significant” contribution will be understood as a preponderance of meritorious descriptors (either “Good” or “Excellent”) in a series of annual reviews. “Significant” contributions are further understood by the College and University as contributions that meet or exceed those of recently promoted and/or tenured peers with comparable service obligations.

Performance-Based Salary Policy

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

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

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

The Division of Sociology and Anthropology uses the College’s descriptor values. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: “Excellent” = 4.0; “Good” = 2.5; “Satisfactory” = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating; e.g.

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

80% teaching = 80 x 2.5 (rating of “Good”) = 200
20% service = 20 x 2.5 (rating of “Good”) = 50
Merit Score = 250

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

If the Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations, unless the unit’s approved guidelines provide for a different resolution.

Fourth-Year Review

Tenure track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. “Significant contributions” in teaching are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving

similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. "Significant contributions" in research are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Department/Division committee and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. For Tenure track faculty at the fourth year point, the Dean reviews the set of annual evaluations to date. Where concern arises regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the Dean will follow up with a request that the entire file be forwarded for assessment by the college committee.

Promotion and/or Tenure Review

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

If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University must be included in the personnel file.

Tenure track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may during the fourth year of employment (by May 15th of the fourth year) request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean's approval of such request, the new critical year will be confirmed. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in Clinical, Research, or Teaching faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing Tenure track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a Clinical, Teaching, or promotion-eligible Research faculty member and her/his Chair may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

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

For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a "continuous program" of scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

According to University guidelines, “[t]he decision to accept a recommendation for or against retention or the awarding of tenure shall rest on both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the department, college, and the university, and on the strengths and limitations of the faculty member as established in the annual evaluation process.” The responsibility of the Division Faculty Evaluation Committee is to recommend tenure or non-tenure based primarily on the strengths and limitations of the faculty member.

As recognized by the University guidelines, criteria for the granting of promotion and tenure must be informed by College and Division of Sociology and Anthropology criteria. These criteria will take into account the distinctive character of the disciplines and the rank and status being sought by the faculty member under review. Included herein are definitions and descriptions pertinent to "research," "teaching" and "service" criteria. These definitions and descriptions are intended to incorporate, clarify, and expand university and college promotion and tenure guidelines.

Ordinarily, the recommendation to tenure a faculty member will be coupled with a recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Thus, faculty members applying for tenure will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and in teaching and reasonable contributions in service. Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty members who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for tenure, significant contributions will have been made in teaching.

The term “significant contributions” in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities. In service a candidate for tenure normally will be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions.

Research & Publication as Significant Area of Contribution (40% or more)

Faculty members under review for the award of tenure (essentially, the same as review for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor) will be expected to have made a substantial beginning toward establishing their professional standing as productive scholars. This will be reflected in a cumulative body of published work during the course of their probationary period ordinarily totaling, at a minimum, six (6) Priority I publications or equivalents. Peer reviewed externally funded grant support and high status fellowships where a faculty member plays a central role may be defined as one article equivalent during a faculty member’s probationary period. Ordinarily a book is the equivalent of 2-4 peer reviewed publications. The six (6) Priority I publications or equivalents is a minimum number with which it may be possible for a faculty member to be considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The publications would need to be quality products of importance for this minimum to be sufficient. In such instances, the publications will need to be of significant importance. There must also be clear indication that the faculty member will continue to be a productive scholar, as evidenced by an ongoing research agenda and work in progress, possibly in association with the acquisition of grant funds related to his or her interests. Work literally “in press” or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print.

Although there are many pathways to achieve the rank of Professor, the expectation is that the faculty member will attain and maintain a distinguished record of research and publication. "Distinguished record" means a body of work of quality receiving professional and peer recognition on a regional, national, or international basis in a particular field of specialization. Tangible evidence of significant contributions to the discipline must include the following: quantity of publications, the prestige of publishing outlets, the number of authors and primacy of authorship, and impact on the field (e.g., number of article citations, nomination and awards, reviews of published work, innovation, etc.). For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print. There must also be a continued record of distinguished teaching. The faculty member should also have a reasonable record of service.

Research as Reasonable Area of Contribution (20% or less of appointment)

Clinical Faculty. Per Board of Governors Policy 2, a Clinical 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 Clinical faculty include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and *reasonable* contribution in research. Within the Division of Sociology and Anthropology, the criterion of “reasonable research contribution” for an annual descriptor of satisfactory for Clinical faculty would normally be one example of ongoing productivity, such as one of those items listed in the departmental guidelines under “other scholarly activities” (e.g., book reviews, grant applications, articles or papers in progress, professional conference participation, etc.). This productivity level should be recorded with a series of annual reviews evaluating research at or above “satisfactory.” However, for discretionary promotion, a *record of publication will be expected*. A Clinical faculty member will normally present at least two scholarly articles or essays that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

Teaching as Significant Area of Contribution (40% or more)

A positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure should be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of teaching, and by a performance that is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of significant contributions. “Significant contributions” are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently tenured and/or promoted to the same level who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University.

Teaching Faculty. Teaching faculty are the members of the Division of Sociology and Anthropology who are most likely to have teaching as their sole significant area of contribution (80% or more of their work), although this category might also apply to tenured faculty members who have had a permanent assignment adjustment approved.

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 Division-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Service as Significant Area of Contribution (40% or more)

Clinical faculty members are the members of the Division of Sociology and Anthropology who are most likely to have service as a significant area of contribution, although this category might also apply to tenured faculty members who have had a permanent workload adjustment approved. Per Board of Governors Policy 2, a Clinical faculty appointment must have a service assignment of at least 50%, with classroom instruction or other assignment secondary. For Clinical faculty, teaching has been defined as maximum of fourteen (14) credit hours during the nine-month academic year.

For Clinical faculty in who wish to stand for promotion in the Division of Sociology and Anthropology, the file is expected to show evidence of significant contribution to service in the form of successful program coordination and administration. Such evidence will normally include assessment of program growth and/or impact, examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and explanation of how the service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the Division, College, and/or University.

A positive recommendation for promotion should be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of service and by a performance that is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of significant contributions. “Significant contributions” are normally those which meet or exceed

those of peers recently tenured and/or promoted to the same level who are respected for their contributions in service at West Virginia University.

Service as Reasonable Area of Contribution (20% or less)

A reasonable contribution in service, unless otherwise stipulated in a letter of agreement between the candidate and the Chair of the Division and approved by the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, will be indicated by a series of annual reviews evaluating service at or above “satisfactory.”

External Review

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

Tenure-line faculty who have research as an area of significant contribution and Clinical faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution both require external evaluations of their work as one component of their promotion file. These reviews are maintained in a separate section of the personnel file in the office of the Dean. (**Note:** Teaching faculty do not require external evaluations of teaching.) Outside reviewers should be experts in the relevant research or service area for each candidate. That is, evaluators of research should be able to judge the significance of presses and journals in which candidates have published; evaluators of service should be able to assess the scope and impact of the administrative work for which Clinical faculty are being reviewed.

To allow the Division time to contact external reviewers (and to allow those reviewers ample time to read and evaluate materials), the Division begins the process of selecting external reviewers in the summer prior to the candidate's critical year or elective promotion year.

- By April 1, candidates seeking promotion notify Chair in writing of 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 and/or tenure should prepare a brief description of their areas of scholarly emphasis and methodologies to aid the Faculty Evaluation Committee in creating a list of external reviewers.
- By May 1, prior to the start of the faculty member's critical year or elective promotion year, the Chair of the Division will ask the Faculty Evaluation Committee 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 prepare a similar list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of his/her scholarship, and to submit the list to the Chair.
- By May 31, the FEC and the candidate seeking promotion will each provide the Division Chair a list of eight names, as detailed below.
- By June 7, the candidate seeking promotion will view the Faculty Evaluation Committee's list of proposed reviewers in the Chair's office and comment on each as he/she feels necessary.
- By the end of June, the Chair will consult with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences to draw up a list of reviewers and gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.
- By October 1, the candidate's packet of the materials will be sent to external reviewers.

Qualifications for Reviewers. The minimum qualifications to serve as an external evaluator require that the individual so identified hold the academic rank to which the applicant aspires or a higher rank from the

list of approved peer institutions. In special cases, individuals from beyond the list of approved peer institutions, individuals who do not hold an academic appointment, or individuals who are in departments other than Sociology or Anthropology may be consulted if their areas of expertise are widely recognized in the profession and a strong case can be made for their ability to evaluate the work of an applicant for tenure and/or promotion, but these rare cases are always subject to special approval.

Assembling the Lists of Reviewers. Both lists should include the following information about the individuals listed: Name; Rank; Current affiliation; 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 the first week in June, the applicant will view the Faculty Evaluation Committee's list of proposed reviewers in the Chair's office and comment on each as he/she feels necessary. These comments will be recorded, 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 Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair. The applicant will prepare a packet of materials for review according to instructions below.

By the end of June, in consultation with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, the Chair will draw up a list of reviewers, gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.

Packet for External Reviewers. By October 1, candidates seeking promotion should have ready their packet of materials to be sent to external reviewers. The Division will mail these materials to reviewers the same week.

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 as well as a narrative about those materials. 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 six) for reviewer's packets at his/her expense. Such books should be considered gifts to the reviewers and their return should not be anticipated.

Materials for the packet for review must be supplied to the Chair by September 15. In rare circumstances, candidates may be granted additional time up until September 30.

EMERITUS STATUS

When seeking emeritus status, a faculty member must make a formal request to the committee. This request typically consists of a letter addressed to the Division Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee, which outlines the highlights of the faculty member's career at WVU. This letter is typically accompanied by a current C.V.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee is charged with making recommendations concerning Emeritus Status, an honor awarded selectively to faculty members upon retirement in recognition of their meritorious service to the Division and to West Virginia University.

To be recommended for Emeritus Status, a faculty member must have a distinguished record in teaching, in research and publication, in service, or in administration and must have held a faculty rank at West Virginia University for at least ten years.

After the review, the Committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Chair, to the Dean, and then to the Provost of West Virginia University for a final decision. The award is usually conferred at the end of the academic or fiscal year in which the faculty member retires, except in cases where plans to retire are not announced until after December 31. In such cases, the review for Emeritus Status will take place during the next annual review cycle.

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 Division. 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.

<<< end >>>

For Reference

Sample Chronological Inventory of Personnel File Entries

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Administrative and Other Entries

(The letter "A" precedes the number of administrative and other entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
See search files for this position for letter of application, reference letters, etc.			
A-01	4/15/08	Offer letter from Dean Sotope	4/12/08
A-02	10/14/08	Curriculum vitae	10/1/08
A-03	12/29/08	Faculty Productivity Report	Fall, 2008
A-04	1/8/09	Annual review letter from Promotion and Tenure Committee	1/8/09
A-05	1/11/09	Annual review letter from Chair	1/10/09
A-06	5/18/09	Summary sheet from application for Faculty Development Grant funding to attend ASEA meeting	5/15/09
A-07	10/20/09	Faculty Productivity Report	10/20/09
A-08	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Personnel Committee	11/3/09
A-09	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Chair	11/5/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Teaching Entries

(The letter "T" precedes the number assigned to teaching entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
T-01	8/24/08	Syllabus for SE 240	Fall, 2008
T-02	8/24/08	Syllabus for SE 340	Fall, 2008
T-03	10/14/08	Report of Professor Trumble of classroom observation	10/12/08
T-04	12/3/08	Report of Professor Trumble of classroom observation	12/1/08
T-05	12/15/08	24 Student evaluations of SE 240, Section 1 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-06	12/15/08	26 student evaluations of SE 240, Section 2 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-07	12/15/08	10 student evaluations of SE 340 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-08	1/11/09	Syllabus for SE 62	Spring, 2009
T-09	1/11/09	Syllabus for SE 340	Spring, 2009
T-10	2/20/09	24 Senate evaluation forms for SE 240, Section 1 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-11	2/20/09	27 Senate evaluations forms for SE 240, Section 2 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-12	2/20/09	10 Senate evaluation forms for SE 340 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-13	3/10/09	Report of chairperson's observations of classroom instruction	3/7/09
T-14	3/15/09	Memo from S. Smart to Chair McKee clarifying some issues raised in report of teaching observations	3/14/09
T-15	6/22/09	30 Senate evaluations for SE 62, Summary sheet and summarized student comments	6/18/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart _____
Faculty Member

Research Entries

(The letter "R" precedes the number of research entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
R-01	11/5/08	Application for Senate Research Grant	11/1/08
R-02	3/6/09	Notification of award of Senate Research Grant	3/1/09
R-03	3/20/09	Letter indicating acceptance of article in <u>The Social Ecology Reporter</u> and copy of article	3/14/09
R-04	3/22/09	Memo of congratulations from Chair on article acceptance	3/22/09
R-05	4/2/09	Copy of article submitted to <u>The Professional Ecologist</u> for possible publication with cover letter	3/29/09
R-06	7/30/09	Letter from Dr. P.C. Bees to Editor of <u>The Social Ecology Reporter</u> commenting on Smart's article	7/10/09
R-07	9/3/09	Report on research conducted in summer on Senate Research Grant	8/30/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Service Entries

(The letter "S" precedes the number of service entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
S-01	9/15/08	Memo from Chair appointing to Departmental Curriculum Committee	9/10/08

For Reference

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University
[11-08-07]

- A. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to teach must be able to:
1. Communicate effectively with students;
 2. Provide feedback to students, including but not limited to the timely return of assignments, papers, and examinations;
 3. Maintain an instructional environment that is conducive to student learning, based upon open communication and mutual respect;
 4. Disseminate knowledge and information at a level appropriate to the level at which the subject is taught;
 5. Stimulate critical thinking;
 6. Demonstrate intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students.
- B1. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to conduct research must be able to:
1. Disseminate their research findings in appropriate venues;
 2. Prepare grant proposals that can be understood by the potential reader;
 3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
 4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
 5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
 6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in research activities;
 7. Engage in research that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.
- B2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in scholarly activity must be able to:
1. Disseminate their scholarly findings in appropriate venues;
 2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
 3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
 4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
 5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
 6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in scholarly activities;
 7. Engage in scholarly activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.
- B3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in creative activity must be able to:
1. Disseminate the results of creative activity in appropriate venues;
 2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
 3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
 4. Undertake a continuing program of creative activity;
 5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary projects when possible;
 6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in creative activities;
 7. Engage in creative activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.
- C1. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the institution must be able to:
1. Contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college;
 2. Take part in the department, college, and institutional shared governance process;
 3. Assume an obligation to the unit's future;

4. Accept the expectation to help solve problems and respond to special needs in order to help with the future of the degree granting program.

C2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the profession must be able to:

1. Seek opportunities to serve appropriate professional organizations at a variety of levels, including but not limited to state, regional, national, and international organizations;
2. Represent the interests of West Virginia University in ways that reflect positively upon the institution.

C3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the external community must be able to:

1. Make contributions that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified;
2. Seek opportunities that apply the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society.

D. Faculty members at West Virginia University should strive to integrate all aspects of their assignment so that each dimension of the mission affects and informs the other dimensions.

NOTE: Some of these expectations could have ADA implications regarding providing accommodation.