

## **BIOLOGY DEPARTMENT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL**

Approved by department 4/28/2010

Approved by the Office of the Provost 6/25/2010

The Department of Biology Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements 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 primary review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe the 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 understand the criteria, requirements, and procedures contained in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In the event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, Department.

The Biology department's faculty evaluation process is intended to: enhance faculty 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 both performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations.

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College has several components including: the letter of appointment, annual assignments, the faculty personnel file, annual performance reviews, and written feedback. Letters of appointment for tenure track, and promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include conditions for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are reviewed by the Dean in their fourth-year to determine if the individual is making clear progress toward tenure.

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

### **A. Professional Expectations**

Faculty responsibilities in the Biology Department are usually defined in terms of activities undertaken in teaching, in research (or equivalent scholarly activity), and in service; therefore, faculty evaluation is based primarily upon a review of performance in these areas. Scholarship is an important indication of activity in each of the three areas; it occurs in a variety of forms, and need not be restricted to the research area. The extent to which scholarship is recognized depends upon one's areas of expected significant contribution. Publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields and should be able to demonstrate such currency.

In weighing the faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service, the relationship of the faculty member's expected role at the institution is to be considered. New and continuing activities in all three areas, as defined in the appointment letter and subsequent Memoranda of Understanding, shall support both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the Department, the College, and the University.

### **B. Faculty assignment**

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to research, teaching, and service. The Department of Biology formally recognizes eight categories of faculty assignments, but recognizes that special cases may exist that necessitate a different percent effort toward research, teaching and service.

The assignment categories are as follows:

- (1) Teaching Emphasis (Research:Teaching:Service percentages of 10:70:20)
- (2) Intermediate Emphasis (R:T:S 30:50:20)
- (3) Research Emphasis (R:T:S 40:40:20)
- (4) Research Intensive (R:T:S 60:20:20)
- (5) Clinical Faculty (normally R:T:S of 10:20-30:60-70)
- (6) Teaching Faculty (normally a 1.0 FTE, R:T:S of 0:80:20)
- (7) Lecturer or Senior Lecturer (normally a maximum 0.80 FTE, 100% teaching)
- (8) Research Faculty (100% research)

These percentages are used in performance-based salary calculations and as a means to adjust criteria, as appropriate, to expectations of the 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 an 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 formal annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process. Shifts in assignment may be made as appropriate *via* a Memorandum of Understanding between the faculty member, Chair, and Dean of the College. Memoranda of Understanding are to be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation. Tenure and promotion decisions require consideration of conditions set forth and expectations detailed in the appointment letter and subsequent formal agreements.

For faculty categories 1-4 (Tenure track faculty), faculty are typically hired under Category 3. Promotion and/or tenure decisions are normally based on "significant contributions" in research and teaching (and "reasonable contributions" in service) that meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure at WVU and at peer research institutions. Subsequent shifts in proportions among categories after the award of tenure may occur via Memoranda of Understanding in order to optimize the faculty member's ongoing contributions to the department and so that they can be appropriately rewarded in performance-based evaluations for continued productivity. In annual evaluations, quantitative criteria (e.g., number of scholarly publications) for evaluating research, teaching and service will be adjusted as appropriate to the assignment. Regardless of the proportions among categories, however, promotion and tenure decisions must be consistent with the "meet or exceed" criterion.

For Clinical faculty at WVU, the majority of the assignment must be service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. Expectations considered in annual evaluations, and possible promotion or performance-based salary increases, will be as defined in the appointment letter and possibly as modified by subsequent Memoranda of Understanding.

Evaluation in a Teaching faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research productivity will be expected, but there is an expectation of systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

The objective of the Research faculty category is to promote investigators to achieve independent funding through collection of preliminary data and submission of extramural grants. The workload expectations are typically 100% research, but may include other expectations defined through negotiations with any faculty member financially supporting this faculty member. Depending on the circumstances of the Research Faculty's hire and funding source, there may be a time line for becoming self-supporting, and there is an expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding. Research faculty may teach, but the primary focus of the appointment is to develop an externally funded research program. Classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary and teaching must be supported separately from internal funding and restricted to the extent defined by funding agencies. Annual review of faculty in this category is performed by the faculty member supporting their research efforts and/or by the Chair.

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. The evaluation metrics for any type of leave 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 and follow-up report are to be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

### **C. The Faculty Personnel File**

Faculty must annually update personnel files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. The annual review period for the Department of Biology is from August 16<sup>th</sup> to August 15<sup>th</sup>. All materials must be in the file by September 15<sup>th</sup> when the file will be closed for the review period. When this deadline falls on a weekend, the file will be closed on the previous business day. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date. Exceptions will be allowed for faculty under consideration for promotion and tenure who will be permitted to add materials to their files until the last working day of the calendar year.

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 into four separate inventories for (1) the administrative file, and for (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service documentation. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

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

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify the file to which each piece of documentation is submitted. The inclusion of a narrative placing material in context is highly recommended.

Each document should be tagged with its own 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 Biology Department administrative office suite unless they are required by the Dean. These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

### **D. Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback**

The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at West Virginia University. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members, provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, serve as an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and document support of recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. The primary purpose of these annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the role and mission of the university. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary, however, in accord with the type of appointment, rank, and, where appropriate, tenure status.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance, and should be both formative and summative. The review is not limited to events of the immediately-previous one-year

period; it is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, and, if positive, as a basis for any available performance-based salary adjustment. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity for developmental changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the university. For tenured faculty, changes to the areas of significant contribution must be negotiated prior to the review year in which promotion will be requested and approved by the Dean and Provost. See university guidelines for specific applications for varied appointment, rank, and status types.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Clinical faculty, Research faculty, Teaching faculty, and Tenure track faculty should participate in formal annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers and Research Assistant Professors 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.

The process for rebuttal or appeal of the annual evaluation letters written by the departmental committee or by the Chair is described in Section H, Rebuttal or Appeal of Evaluation.

### ***Faculty Evaluation Committee***

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and 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 Biology FEC for the following academic year will be elected at the last faculty meeting of the academic year according to the following rules: (1) six faculty shall be elected by secret ballot; (2) at least one member, but not more than two, must be from the assistant professor rank; (3) one member (but not more than one) must be from teaching professor rank (category 6); (4) individuals may not be elected for more than two consecutive years unless insufficient faculty are available in a given rank or category; (5) no faculty member under consideration for promotion and/or tenure may serve on the committee; and (6) faculty members who serve on the college evaluation committee may not serve concurrently on the departmental evaluation committee.

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

### ***Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee Procedures***

1. Each committee shall choose its own chairperson. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC.
2. Each committee will take into consideration department procedures and criteria.
3. No committee member may vote on his/her own recommendations in the annual review.
4. Members will 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 such a deliberation.
5. Each year, the committee will familiarize themselves with operating definitions of required qualifiers "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory", "good" and "excellent" in teaching, research, and service. In consideration of promotion and tenure, the committee will review operating definitions of "significant" contributions in each area relevant to the assignment.
6. Only Tenure track or tenured FEC members (Categories 1 – 4) may vote on the recommendation for tenure of critical-year faculty members.
7. All FEC members may vote on recommendations for promotion in rank.
8. The committee will make and report its recommendations on faculty tenure, promotion, continuation, and appeals to the department Chair based on evidence in the faculty personnel file.

9. The deliberations of the committees and all information contained in evaluation files shall remain strictly confidential.

### ***Role of the Department Chair***

The Chair reviews and evaluates each faculty member and makes an independent recommendation providing a written rationale for each decision. The Chair reports both his/her and the Faculty Evaluation Committee's recommendations to each faculty member and to the Dean for continuation of the process at the college level. The Chair will recuse himself/herself when evaluating his/her partner, spouse, or other member of her/his immediate family in the annual evaluation process. Under such circumstances, the Dean of the College executes said evaluation.

### ***Performance Descriptors for Annual Review***

The annual review of one's performance in each area to which one is assigned shall be assessed as Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but not necessarily sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or Unsatisfactory. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" ratings, particularly in an area in which a significant contribution is required for promotion and tenure, would not qualify for promotion or tenure.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide evidence for the file that (1) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses only on evidence located in the personnel file. In order to be considered meritorious, work should be well documented.

Research, teaching and service expectations are defined in the faculty member's appointment letter and may be modified via subsequent Memoranda of Agreement. Criteria for attaching performance descriptors (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, excellent) to annual performance evaluations will be adjusted accordingly.

The assessments provided by annual reviews should be a basis for those periodic recommendations forwarded to the Provost that relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must be supported both by (a) a preponderance of meritorious reviews, and (b), beyond those reviews, by performance which is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" (see below). Additionally, all appropriate guidelines must be met.

### ***Evaluation of Research/Scholarship***

Research involves the discovery or synthesis of knowledge, the development of new approaches to understanding and explaining phenomena, the development of new insights, the critical appraisal of the past, and the application of knowledge and expertise to address needs in society and in the profession. Research is a critical component of the mission of the university, college, and department, contributing to the general body of knowledge and thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work may be documented in a variety of ways for evaluation as well as for comparison with peers at WVU and other institutions of higher learning.

Refereed publications of high quality and successfully funded grant proposals are the most important, but not sole, evidence of scholarly productivity. While writing grant proposals and peer-reviewed publications may be important considerations for performance based raises, each faculty's letter of appointment, with possible subsequent modifications documented in a Memorandum of Understanding, identifies research expectations for purposes of tenure and promotion.

Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be a single work of considerable importance (such as a book) or a series of studies (articles in refereed journals) constituting a program of worthwhile research. Success in graduation of students with M.S. or Ph.D. degrees, scientific awards, non-peer-reviewed

publications and grant proposal submissions, patents, development of a technique or product which advances science, invited talks, invited chapters, and presentations at scientific meetings and within the department are also important evidence of research or scholarly activity. Non-tenured faculty may include unsuccessful grant applications, along with scores and/or evaluations, as evidence of development of their research program. Faculty members are expected to undertake and demonstrate evidence of a continuing program of studies or investigations. Invitations to serve as peer reviewers for national / international publications / award applications will be taken as an indication of national / international recognition of the high quality of research performed and reported by the faculty member and be evaluated under 'Research'. The act of servicing as a reviewer in these capacities is evaluated under the heading of 'Service'.

### ***Evaluation of Teaching***

Teaching involves the dissemination of knowledge and the stimulation of critical thinking. Teaching includes not only traditional modes of instruction such as the classroom lecture, but also laboratory and practicum instruction; thesis and dissertation direction; various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction; advising, which is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process; and evaluation and critique of student performance.

Prime requisites of an effective teacher include intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer knowledge, acceptance with courtesy of differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest of students.

The Department will evaluate the quality of the teaching by each faculty member based upon his/her assigned teaching duties. Three types of information can be used to evaluate course offerings: (1) self-evaluation of courses taught by a faculty member, (2) evaluations by other faculty members, and (3) student evaluations. Self-evaluations could include: analyses of the syllabus and tests, revisions made, and measures taken to improve teaching effectiveness; responses to student and peer review; provision of data such as class size, class grade point average, and percent of students receiving As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs. Written peer evaluations could include an analysis of classroom performance, course goals, student population, grade distribution, and effort involved in teaching the course. Self and peer evaluations are recommended to supplement student evaluations. Student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, must be included in the file for annual review.

Additional documentation of teaching could include: evaluation of products produced by faculty such as textbooks and videotapes, the development or use of instructional technology and/or computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, the development of new courses, submission and funding of teaching grants, the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate research, the presentation of guest lectures and seminars. Although teaching quality is of paramount importance, quantity may be a factor contributing to meritorious evaluation when it exceeds the workload assignment.

Invitations to serve as peer reviewer for national and international education-related publications or grants will be taken as an indication of national / international recognition of the high quality of teaching-related scholarship performed and reported by the faculty. The act of servicing as a reviewer in these capacities is evaluated under the heading of 'Service'.

The quality of teaching expected of non-Tenure track faculty (e.g., Clinical faculty, Teaching faculty Lecturers, Senior Lecturers) is the same as for Tenure track faculty.

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component but these faculty are expected to engage in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the university's teaching

mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing department-, college-, and university-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

### ***Evaluation of Service***

Service activities involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society and the profession. These activities include service to the university, state, region, and at national and international levels. Service to the university includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college.

In keeping with the university's tradition as a land grant institution, the department is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities on the part of its faculty as essential components of its mission. Enlightened perspectives, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable resources in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Service by faculty members to West Virginia is of special importance to the university mission. Paid consulting, while obviously dependent upon a person's professional qualifications, knowledge and experience, will be excluded from consideration of a person's service activities by the department.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients, induces positive change, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified. The nature and extent of acceptable service to society includes, but is not limited to, invited presentations to off-campus groups, tours, field trips, talks to professional and service groups, and professional advice to individuals. Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, service as a committee member or chair at the departmental, college or university level. Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, grant and manuscript reviews, committee and chair service to professional societies and panels.

Faculty in categories 1 – 6 all have service as a component of their assignments and must document their service contributions in their files. Faculty with the preface 'Clinical' in their title in the Department of Biology have service as the major component of their assignment. Clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate a high quality of service in order to receive recognition for significant, meritorious contributions. Evidence for quality of service could include but is not limited to such things as (a) service grant submission and funding, (b) conducting special events for the department, university, or general public, (c) obtaining favorable publicity for departmental facilities, (d) self- and peer-evaluations of service contributions, as well as other documentation of superior contributions to the service mission of the department.

### **E. Performance-Based Salary Policy**

The Chair must consider both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair's annual evaluations when awarding performance-based salary increases. The intent of this policy is to recognize those faculty who are exceeding the normal expectations associated with their position and have been rated good or excellent.

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. Performance-based salary increases are intended to reward professional contributions that are truly meritorious.

In determining performance-based raises, the assignment of a faculty member as well as his/her performance in that assignment guides the amount of the award. For example, a faculty member whose

primary assignment is in teaching and whose performance in that area is exemplary should receive a merit increase comparable to that of a faculty member whose primary assignment is in research or scholarship and whose performance is also exemplary, assuming that the performance in other areas is also comparable. In the Department of Biology, performance-based salary increases will be awarded when available using the following formula, which explicitly weights the score in research, teaching and service (2 for excellent, 1 for good, 0 for satisfactory, -1 for unsatisfactory) by the individual's assignment:

$$\text{Merit Score} = (\text{Score for research}) * (\text{Proportion of assignment in research} + (\text{Score for teaching}) * (\text{Proportion of assignment in teaching} + (\text{Score for service}) * (\text{Proportion of assignment in service}))$$

Individuals will be rated Excellent (2), Good (1), Satisfactory (0), or Unsatisfactory (-1) in each of the three categories by the departmental FEC and separately by the Chair. The proportion of one's assignment in research, teaching, and service is the product of negotiations between the faculty member and the Chair in accord with the approved faculty workload model, and must be explicitly stated in a written agreement signed by both parties to be placed in the relevant personnel file. The merit score will range from 0 to 2 (while a negative score is theoretically possible, any negative total merit score will be assigned a 0). A sample calculation is included here for Professor X, whose assignment is 20% research, 70% teaching and 10% service, and whose performance in those three areas was judged to be Satisfactory, Excellent, and Good, respectively:

$$\text{Merit Score} = [(0) * (.20)] + [(2) * (.70)] + [(1) * (.10)] = 1.50$$

If the FEC and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors, the merit score is an average of the two evaluations.

The receipt of a performance-based salary increase in one or several years does not guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted and/or tenured. If an exemplary record in teaching is not matched by an appropriate record in research or service, such a faculty member would not be promoted or tenured although he/she may have received performance-based increases in each of several years. This distinction also makes it possible to reward behaviors that may be important to the unit but that, without other equally important behaviors, may not justify promotion and tenure. Final performance-based decisions will not be made until five working days after the faculty have received their annual evaluations from the Department FEC and from the Chair to allow for appeal and rebuttal of these evaluations as described in section H, Rebuttal or Appeal of Evaluation.

#### **F. Fourth-Year Review**

Tenure track faculty are carefully reviewed during their fourth-year to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, tenure track faculty should be making substantial progress toward a level of teaching and research that would be judged as making significant contributions. "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.

Department FEC 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 also 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.

#### **G. Tenure and Promotion Review**

In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must be awarded by the end of the individual's sixth year, 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 at the time of their hire may be offered the option to request a specified number of years credited toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

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

Tenure track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may during the fourth year of employment (by May 15<sup>th</sup> 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.

Senior Lecturers, Lecturers, Clinical faculty, Research faculty and Teaching faculty (categories 5-8) are not eligible for tenure. 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.

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. 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.

### **Criteria for Tenure**

In order to be recommended for tenure a faculty member will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and in teaching in the classroom or other settings and reasonable contributions in service. Expectations in research, teaching and service are outlined in each faculty member's appointment letter and may be modified in a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding specifying different areas of emphasis or terms.

Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for tenure, significant contributions must be made in teaching. In the teaching context, "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. In some cases, external reviews of teaching contributions may be appropriate.

Significance of contributions in the area of research will be evaluated by several criteria, the most important of which will be the quality of the faculty member's peer-reviewed publications and history of extramural funding. Significant contributions in the area of research require a peer-reviewed publication record. Refereed publications of high quality are the most important, but not sole, evidence of scholarly productivity. There is recognition that different disciplines, and even different research directions within a discipline, entail different publication rates and levels of extramural funding. Publications literally "in press" or unequivocally accepted for publication are appropriate to count for the tenure decision. Other criteria (as outlined in Section D, Evaluation of Research/Scholarship) are also considered. All faculty are encouraged to present periodic departmental seminars on their research, so that the faculty may understand and evaluate their work. Significant research contributions are those which meet or exceed the quality and quantity of researchers recently obtaining tenure and /or promotion at WVU and at peer university departments, which will be selected with input from the faculty of the Biology department and tailored to provide an appropriate basis for evaluating the individual.

In service a candidate for tenure normally will be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions, defined here as comparable to that of recently tenured colleagues who have similar assignments in the Department of Biology.

### ***Criteria for Promotion***

In order to be recommended for promotion, a promotion-eligible faculty member normally will be expected, unless there is a Memorandum of Understanding to the contrary, to demonstrate significant contributions in two of these areas: research, teaching in the classroom or other settings, and service. In the third area of endeavor, the faculty member will be expected to make reasonable contributions. The areas of significant contribution in which each faculty member is expected to perform will be as identified in the letter of appointment, or as modified in a subsequent document. Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for promotion, significant contributions will have been made in teaching.

For Tenure track faculty, research will normally be the primary area in which significant contributions are expected for promotion. In general, a Research faculty member seeking promotion will produce research of equal or better quality and of greater quantity than a Tenure track faculty member for whom research is one of two areas in which significant contributions are expected. For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with publications actually in print.

For Tenure track faculty, promotion to the rank of Professor is recognition of the attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation in a recognized field of learning in addition to the achievement of effective teaching skill and a continued record of satisfactory service. For promotion to Professor, consideration should be given to the candidate's cumulative record since his or her last promotion as it is expected that different candidates may attain significant recognition in their field at different times in their tenure. However, 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. An external reviewer may 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.

For Clinical faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution, service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the state will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion or tenure purposes. While service to the university and professions are worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must have significant service activities, which can include the creation and direction of service-learning projects, directed to the citizens of West Virginia. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the university, profession, or on a national or international level. Such exceptions should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

Clinical faculty are expected to show evidence of research contributions at a satisfactory level. If assigned teaching, Clinical Faculty must demonstrate quality teaching contributions, in the same manner as other faculty. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor entails compiling a multi-year record of delivering service of high quality. Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor is considered when an individual provides evidence of a sustained record of quality service, as well as a continued record of quality teaching (when assigned) and publication appropriate to the assignment.

For Teaching faculty, promotion to Teaching Associate Professor or Professor requires significant contributions in teaching. Promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor is based on teaching accomplishments. It requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. While not all Teaching faculty may attain the Professor rank,

annual evaluations should guide Teaching faculty toward that achievement. The term “significant contributions” in teaching means performance that meets or exceeds that of Teaching faculty and Tenure track faculty recently promoted in the Department of Biology and in Biology departments at peer universities. It is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the university’s teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing department-, college-, and university-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Teaching faculty (categories 6 and 7) are expected to show evidence of service contributions at a reasonable level. Evidence of significant contribution in service include advances to education in the Biology Department, such as participation in orientation, outreach, advising, instructional meetings to discuss the progress and coordination of the courses being taught.

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the one in which the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or tenure, should have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the department in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost.

#### ***Promotion and Tenure Administrative Procedures***

The Biology Department will adhere to university and college procedures for faculty evaluation. A copy of these procedures is provided to each faculty member each year. The department will use the following procedures and deadlines to implement the University Guidelines for External Evaluation of faculty members seeking promotion or tenure. When any of these deadlines falls on an official holiday or weekend, the documents are due on the previous business day.

September 1 is the *last* date for a faculty member to notify his/her Chair in writing if he/she wishes to be considered for discretionary promotion or to decline consideration for tenure in the critical year.

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.

The FEC and the faculty member will each prepare a list of at least six possible external evaluators. External evaluators should be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought and are normally faculty members at peer institutions. A short statement describing each evaluator should be submitted by the faculty member and the FEC indicating why each evaluator is qualified to serve as an evaluator. Any personal or professional relationship between the evaluator and the faculty member should be noted.

These lists of potential evaluators must be forwarded to the department Chair by September 10. The Chair will then share the faculty evaluation committee list with the faculty member within two working days. The faculty member has the right to review the list and to comment on persons who may not provide an objective evaluation or should be excluded for other reasons. The faculty member’s acknowledgement of such review, together with his or her appropriate comments, should be forwarded in writing to the department Chair by September 15.

The department Chair will select the names of a sufficient number of appropriate external evaluators from each list to ensure receipt of at least four evaluations. This selection process may take into consideration any comments of the faculty member regarding potential evaluators whose names appear on the faculty evaluation committee list. The faculty member is not informed of the names in the final list of external evaluators. The final list, and the evaluation solicitation letter, should be forwarded to the Dean for approval by September 20.

Both candidate and the FEC are encouraged to determine an evaluator's willingness to evaluate a candidate prior to submitting names and in advance of sending evaluation materials. October 1 is the *last* day for the department Chair to mail letters soliciting external evaluation and supporting materials for *all* faculty under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The Dean-approved letter will state that the evaluation must be received by the last working day of the calendar year. The letter should state clearly that returning evaluations to the Office of the Dean is University procedure and that a copy of the evaluation will be forwarded to the department to be used in its evaluation. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations should be included in the faculty member's file with identifying information removed.

The Office of the Dean will provide clerical support and self-addressed envelopes for return of the evaluation letters. The Office of the Dean will also monitor the receipt of the evaluation letters and facilitate receipt of overdue evaluations. If four evaluations are not received by the last working day of the calendar year, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended through the written consent of the faculty member, Chair, and Dean. A copy of the written consent letter should be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

The Dean will forward to the department Chair, by the first working day in January, a complete set of evaluations for review at the department level. These evaluations will be returned to the Dean upon completion of the departmental review process. The Dean will provide the faculty member with the opportunity to review copies of the external evaluations with identifying information removed upon written request.

Please note there is a 5-working day deadline for rebuttals of evaluations and petitions for review of negative recommendations (outlined in the next section).

#### **H. Rebuttal or Appeal of Evaluation**

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

Errors of fact should normally be addressed and corrected 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/](http://pegboard.state.wv.us/) or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 293-9203.

#### **I. 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.