

GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL OF PHARMACY FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Approved 3/6/1998 – SoP Faculty and Dean (G. Spratto),

Approved, HSC Vice President R. D'Alessandri

Revised and Approved 3/22/2002 – SoP Faculty

Revised and Approved 4/29/2009 – SoP Faculty

Revised and Approved 7/12/2012 – SoP Faculty

Revised and Approved: 9/17/2018 – SoP Faculty

Approved, Office of the Provost: July 17, 2019

Revised and Approved: 7/13/2021 – SoP Faculty

Approved, Office of the Provost: August 4, 2021

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. GUIDELINES.....	3
A. Faculty Categories and Focus of Evaluations	4
1. Tenure-Track Faculty, Not Yet Tenured:.....	4
2. Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted:	4
3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted:	4
4. Clinical-Track Faculty:	4
5. Teaching-Track Faculty:.....	5
6. Service-Track Faculty:.....	5
7. Research-Track Faculty:	5
8. Part-Time Faculty:	6
B. Faculty Activity Reporting.....	6
C. Confidential Faculty Documents	7
D. Required and Discretionary Personnel Actions	8
1. Required Actions for Tenure-Track Faculty:.....	8
2. Fourth-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty:	9
3. Discretionary Actions:	9
E. Levels of Internal Review of Teaching, Research, and Service.....	9
1. Department Faculty Evaluation Committee:.....	9
2. Department Chair:.....	10
3. Schoolwide Faculty Evaluation Committee:.....	10
4. Dean, School of Pharmacy:.....	11
5. Provost:	12
F. External Reviews	12
G. Annual Reviews of Secondary Appointments	13
H. Options for Faculty Response to Reviews	13
1. Informal Faculty Response to Annual Reviews:.....	13
2. Formal Faculty Response to Recommendations for Tenure, Promotion, or Termination of Appointment:	13
3. Petition for Review of Departmental Recommendations:.....	14
4. Petition for Review of School Recommendations:	14
5. Denial of Tenure, Nonretention, or Termination during Tenure-Track Period:	14
6. Denial of Promotion, Other Negative Personnel Decisions:.....	14

III. FACULTY PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED (MERIT) SALARY CONSIDERATIONS.....	15
A. Introduction.....	15
1. General Considerations:.....	15
2. Descriptors for Annual Review:	15
3. Criteria for Promotion or Tenure:	15
B. Teaching.....	17
1. Expectations for Teaching:	17
2. Evaluation of Teaching Quality:.....	17
3. Evaluation of Teaching Quantity:.....	19
4. Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based (Merit) Salary Considerations:.....	20
C. Research/Scholarship.....	20
1. Expectations for Research/Scholarship:.....	20
2. Evaluation of Research/Scholarship:	21
3. Promotion, Tenure and Performance-Based (Merit) Salary Considerations:.....	24
D. Service.....	26
1. Expectations for Service:	26
2. Evaluation of Service:.....	27
3. Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based (Merit) Salary Considerations:.....	29
E. Work Assignments for Full Professors	31
F. Administrative Appointments	31
G. Emeritus Status	31
H. Endowed Chairs and Professorships	32
IV. ADJUNCT FACULTY WITH COURTESY APPOINTMENTS: CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION	32
A. Introduction.....	32
B. Initial Appointment.....	32
C. Criteria for Reappointment	33
D. Criteria and Process for Promotion.....	33

GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL OF PHARMACY FACULTY EVALUATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

All School of Pharmacy faculty members are required to undergo annual performance review. Annual review is important because: 1) it provides cumulative evidence that supports decisions about continuance, promotion, and tenure; 2) it is a tool for faculty development at all ranks; and 3) it is used as the basis for performance-based (merit) salary raises (when available). The review is therefore of critical importance for the individual faculty member, the School of Pharmacy, and West Virginia University. Faculty and administrators share important responsibilities unique to their respective positions in this process.

In the spirit of fairness and equity, all faculty and administrators involved in the evaluation process are expected to offer appropriate recommendations for the faculty member's further development, as well as to acknowledge faculty achievements and successes, based upon information contained in the faculty evaluation file. Guidance and constructive criticism are particularly important during the first few years to ensure that beginning faculty establish themselves as productive members of the academic community. Consistent with University policy, discrimination is prohibited due to race, color, national origin, ancestry, age, physical or mental disability, marital or family status, pregnancy, veteran status, service in the uniformed services, religion, creed, sex, sexual orientation, genetic information, gender identity, or gender expression.

This document applies to all full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty who contribute to the mission of the School in the areas of research/scholarship, teaching, and service at any campus of the WVU Health Sciences Center. The term service may include patient care for clinical track faculty in the School of Pharmacy. The nature and the extent of review varies as a function of the faculty member's appointment, assignment, rank, and title as delineated herein.

II. GUIDELINES

These guidelines are intended to complement the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure and to provide more detailed descriptions, interpretations, and standards that apply to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy. University guidelines will be followed for any issues not specifically addressed in this document, and University guidelines supersede School guidelines in any areas of conflict or ambiguity. School guidelines are permitted to be more rigorous than University guidelines but not less so. Faculty should become thoroughly familiar with the current University documents (<https://faculty.wvu.edu/>) and these School of Pharmacy Guidelines.

In a letter of appointment, the Dean shall define the general terms of the faculty member's major responsibilities and identify the year by which the faculty member must be reviewed for tenure, if applicable. The terms of the appointment are to be reviewed periodically (normally in consultation with the Dean) and may be changed by mutual consent, consistent with University guidelines. Any changes must be documented in writing by amendment to the letter of appointment and included in the digital reporting system (see Section II.B.) for review by faculty evaluators.

The performance of all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members is evaluated annually while employed by West Virginia University. Adjunct faculty with courtesy appointments should receive periodic reviews appropriate to their assignment. The annual evaluation is based on one's assignment and performance in light of the initial letter of appointment, any subsequent modifications to the appointment letter, review of annual goals, and documentation in the evaluation file. The review is not limited to the previous one-year period; it is also a review of annual evaluations from previous years to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed.

Reviews should be both formative and summative and provide guidance to the faculty member about areas in which improvement is needed or expected and areas where performance is at or above the level expected. Faculty evaluations are conducted at the levels of the department, School, and Health Sciences Center/Provost's Office.

A. Faculty Categories and Focus of Evaluations

Faculty members in all categories have full citizenship in the School of Pharmacy and University, which comes with the rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty, Not Yet Tenured:

This includes faculty who are in a tenure-track appointment but are not yet tenured. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and information about progress toward promotion and tenure. It communicates areas of strength and informs the faculty member of performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time to enhance the likelihood of achieving promotion and tenure.

2. Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted:

The annual evaluation of tenured faculty members who are not fully promoted should emphasize qualitative and quantitative expectations and progress toward the rank of professor.

3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted:

Promotion to the highest rank of professor requires a consistent record of achievement with many strengths and few weaknesses. The primary purpose of evaluating faculty members at this level is to describe performance in the context of appropriate expectations, which is important for reappointment, performance-based salary adjustments, and encouragement to continue to perform at exemplary levels.

4. Clinical-Track Faculty:

This category generally includes clinical faculty members with substantial effort percentages allocated to service that includes the provision of direct or indirect patient care as well as teaching. These appointments are not eligible for tenure and may be full-time or part-time. The annual evaluation focuses on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Faculty members may initiate consideration for first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. Promotion to

senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment to the individual and their career stability.

5. Teaching-Track Faculty:

These non-tenure track faculty may have renewable term appointments in which the principal assignment is teaching as described in WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.2. The title has the prefix “teaching” accompanying a traditional rank (e.g., teaching assistant professor). Normally, an assignment involves at least 80% teaching, with the balance addressing other needs of the department and School. Appointments may be continued indefinitely based on need, performance, and funding. Faculty members may initiate consideration for first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For purposes of promotion, there must be a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence as well as evidence of significant curricular or programmatic development. Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment to the individual and their career stability.

6. Service-Track Faculty:

These non-tenure track faculty have renewable term appointments which the principal assignment is service designed to respond to program, unit, or departmental needs. The title has the prefix “service” accompanying a traditional rank (e.g., service assistant professor.) Annual evaluations are based on the assignments described in the letter of appointment and should focus on strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement and professional development. These assignments involve at least 80% service with the balance addressing other needs of the department and School. Appointments may be continued indefinitely based on need, performance, and funding and may have a renewable term appointment of up to three years at the rank of service instructor or service assistant professor. Service-track at the rank of associate may have a renewable term appointment of up to six years and service-track faculty at the rank of professor may have a renewable term appointment of up to nine years. Faculty members may initiate consideration for first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For service-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of service excellence, the evaluation file is expected to show evidence of ongoing contribution to adding value to the unit and addressing unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives. Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment to the individual and their career stability. Nonrenewal of external funding may result in nonrenewal of appointment despite positive evaluations. These appointments are not subject to consideration for tenure and are only for the periods and purposes specified, with no other interest or rights obtained by the faculty member.

7. Research-Track Faculty:

These non-tenure track faculty have a term appointment which the principal assignment is research, under the conditions outlined in [WVU BOG Rule 4.2 for Other Non-Tenure Track Faculty](#). The title has the prefix “research” accompanying an academic rank (e.g., research assistant professor.) These assignments normally involve at least 80% research with the balance addressing other needs of the department and School. If the faculty member is promotable, the faculty member may initiate consideration for first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. Annual evaluation will

generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. Annual evaluations are based on the assignments described in the letter of appointment and should focus on strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement and professional development. Research-track faculty positions are typically funded by a grant, contract, or other source that is not a part of the regular and on-going source of operational funding. Nonrenewal of grants or other external funding may result in nonrenewal of appointment despite positive evaluations. These appointments are not subject to consideration for tenure and are only for the periods and purposes specified, with no other interest or rights obtained by the faculty member. The renewal of research-track appointments shall not create any presumption of a right to appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty.

8. Part-Time Faculty:

Evaluation of continuing part-time (less than 1.0 FTE) paid faculty is based on assignments in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and should focus on strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement and professional development.

B. Faculty Activity Reporting

As a unit of West Virginia University, the School of Pharmacy uses a secure web-based faculty activity reporting system for the digital collection and storage of faculty activity in teaching, research/scholarship, and service, as well as biographical and credential information. The faculty member is responsible for entering, maintaining, and updating the information in their profile. Information related to the quality of performance in all areas should be included, as described later in this document. Users can update their activity at any time from any computer with an internet connection. Faculty are encouraged to update their activity regularly throughout the year. At the end of the calendar year, an annual Faculty Productivity Report (FPR) is generated. The sections below summarize important elements of the annual FPR. Faculty members are expected to review other School and University documents for detailed instructions on entering information and reporting their activity in the digital reporting system. Faculty members can also obtain assistance from the School administrator responsible for managing the reporting system.

Pre-populated information: Some sections of the faculty member's digital profile are pre-populated based on information in the University system (e.g., scheduled teaching including summaries of Student Evaluation of Instruction [SEI], research/grants information). The School may also pre-populate some sections (e.g., permanent and yearly data, workload information). This information is "read only" for the faculty member and cannot be modified. Faculty members should verify the accuracy of this information and notify the School administrator of any necessary corrections or changes to these pre-populated sections.

Faculty productivity information: Apart from the information pre-populated by the University and School of Pharmacy, the only data stored is information entered by the individual faculty member. In addition to entering descriptive reports of activity, faculty must upload supporting documentation that serves as evidence of the quantity and quality of the activity. Faculty members should refer to departmental, School, and/or University guidelines for the type and amount of supporting documentation to enter into the system.

Goal statements: Annual goal statements help faculty members focus their efforts for the upcoming year and assess the extent to which goals from the previous year were accomplished.

For each reporting year, two to four goal statements are to be created in consultation with the department chair for the two areas of significant contribution (normally teaching and either research or service). Goals should be consistent with the goals of the department, School, and University. The faculty member also must assess the extent to which goals for the previous year were met. Goal statements are included in the digital reporting system as a supporting document.

Report narrative: Faculty being considered for promotion or tenure must include a report narrative in the digital reporting system. The purpose of the narrative is to describe the faculty member's major accomplishments within the context of their overall appointment. The contents of the narrative should focus primarily on the expectations outlined in the letter of appointment and the area of significant contribution to be evaluated by external reviewers (normally research or service). The narrative should include descriptions of the evidence supporting promotion to the rank sought by the candidate. Brief summaries of the other two areas of contribution may be included to provide evaluators with an overview of the candidate's other activities and achievements for the period under consideration. External reviewers do not have access to the digital reporting system; if faculty candidates want external reviewers to see the narrative, they must include it in the promotion dossier sent to external reviewers. Faculty members not being considered for promotion may upload a report narrative for annual review and continuance in rank at their discretion, but it is not required. A brief narrative would be helpful to explain situations that affected faculty productivity during the reporting year, such as maternity or extended medical leaves, sabbaticals, or temporary work assignments or appointments outside the School of Pharmacy.

Faculty Productivity Report (FPR): After entering all faculty activities and uploading supporting documents for the review period (January through December), faculty must run and submit an FPR in the digital reporting system before the reporting deadline (December 31 at 11:59 pm). The FPRs are used as the basis for annual faculty evaluations. Each faculty member is responsible for ensuring that their FPR is accurate, complete, and submitted by the deadline. After the reporting deadline, the submitted FPR is locked and no further changes can be made to the report. The FPR includes live links to the supporting documents that are accessible only to the department and schoolwide evaluation committees and administrators who have been given security privileges and are logged into the system.

Curriculum vitae: All faculty members are required to upload a current curriculum vitae in the appropriate section of the digital reporting system by the reporting deadline each year.

C. Confidential Faculty Documents

A Confidential Documents section of the digital reporting system contains information not visible to the faculty member. This information includes the original external review letters for promotion/tenure that identify the reviewers and the related lists of potential reviewers. At the end of the review cycle, this section is purged and all information is permanently removed from the system.

The Dean's Office retains the original external review letters and redacted copies (with all identifying information removed) in a separate confidential file; redacted letters may also be uploaded to the digital reporting system. Faculty members may request to review the redacted letters after completion of the review cycle.

The Dean's Office also maintains a separate confidential faculty file external to the digital reporting system that contains other information and records that the department chair or Dean may wish to add. Faculty members are to be notified of any materials added by the chair of Dean or chair to their personal file and may provide written responses to such material within 10 working days. Faculty members may request access to their personal file at any time without giving reasons. All others shall have access to the file only on the basis of a need to know. The department chair may provide faculty evaluation committees with specific information that is relevant to the evaluation. In other situations, the chair or Dean shall determine whether an individual has a need to know and what material is necessary to fulfill the need to know. All persons must treat the material from the file as confidential, and the security of all files is to be assured.

D. Required and Discretionary Personnel Actions

A personnel action is required annually for each faculty member that generally involves reappointment, promotion, tenure, or nonrenewal. Ordinarily, the interval between promotions will be at least five years. In addition, at least three years as a full-time employee at the School of Pharmacy is generally required for promotion to any rank. Evaluations for promotions after the first promotion are based on achievements since the previous promotion. For faculty hired from positions at other institutions, evaluations for promotion or tenure are based primarily on achievements since the faculty member's appointment to the WVU School of Pharmacy, unless otherwise specified in the letter of appointment.

Faculty candidates seeking promotion or tenure must communicate in writing to the Dean no later than July 1 preceding the annual review and evaluation period. The Dean then notifies the department chair, who in turn informs the chair of the department evaluation committee of the faculty member's intent and uploads the written request to the digital faculty evaluation file.

1. Required Actions for Tenure-Track Faculty:

For tenure-track faculty, the letter of appointment contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful candidacy for promotion and tenure. The appointment letter normally identifies the sixth year of employment as the "critical year" in which a tenure decision must be made. A tenure-track faculty member in the sixth year (or the year specified as the critical year in the letter of appointment) must be reviewed for tenure and must either be awarded tenure or given notice of termination and a one-year terminal contract. In the fourth year, a tenure-track faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the critical year forward one year. If a faculty member petitions successfully to bring the critical year forward and tenure is not awarded in that year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued.

Faculty whose initial appointment begins after the normal academic year (starting date of July 1) but on or before January 1 may choose to include or not include the first partial academic year toward the critical year clock. For initial first-year appointments after January 1, this fraction of the academic year will not count toward the critical year. After discussion with the candidate, the critical year will be specified in the initial appointment letter.

For faculty members who join the School at the rank of associate or full professor in the tenure stream but without being granted tenure, the maximum period for obtaining tenure shall be specified in the letter of appointment.

2. Fourth-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty:

After the end of the third year, tenure-track assistant professors shall undergo a more extensive review by the department chair and the department and schoolwide evaluation committees. The purpose of this interim review is to assess whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress which, if sustained, is consistent with eventual promotion and tenure, and to identify any problem areas that may preclude the granting of promotion or tenure. Department chairs or the evaluation committees may seek additional assessments from outside the department and the University regarding a candidate's accomplishments, stature as viewed by peers, and scholarly potential. All evaluations should identify any problem areas that may preclude the granting of tenure. The review may also recommend issuing a terminal contract.

3. Discretionary Actions:

These actions are not required to be taken at specific times and include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Promotion in rank when the critical year does not apply
- b. Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member¹
- c. Nonrenewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member
- d. Termination of the appointment of a tenure-track-faculty member prior to the critical year
- e. Termination of the appointment of a tenured faculty member for cause, reduction or discontinuation of a program, or financial exigency as defined by the University. To the extent financially feasible, termination due to financial exigency occurs at the end of the contract year.

Non-tenure-track faculty are not subject to the critical year review required for tenure-track faculty. Promotion of non-tenure-track faculty to a senior level is not a requirement for institutional commitment to the individual and their career stability. Consideration for discretionary promotion must be initiated by the individual faculty member.

E. Levels of Internal Review of Teaching, Research, and Service

The quality and quantity of teaching, research/scholarship, and service is reviewed by faculty peers and appropriate administrators in the internal review process.

1. Department Faculty Evaluation Committee:

- a. Function: All faculty except those who are fully promoted (i.e., professors) and department chairs are required to be evaluated annually by this committee. The University requires that fully-promoted faculty be evaluated by the department chair. However, such faculty who wish to be reviewed by this committee must notify the department chair, who in turn notifies the committee chair by Dec. 31 of the reporting year. After review and evaluation of each faculty member's file, the committee prepares a written evaluation that includes an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, promotion, and/or the award of tenure and indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations

¹ In the School of Pharmacy, the Dean's Office sends to all faculty, FEAPs, and non-classified employees a Notification of Appointment memo in July each year.

for tenure and/or the next promotion. The total number of positive and negative votes and abstentions must be recorded. The evaluation must be signed and dated by all committee members and then forwarded to the department chair.

- b. Composition:² Each department shall choose by election a minimum of five faculty members (or at least three with the Dean's concurrence) for the committee. The committee must have an odd number of members to avoid tie votes. Any department unable to provide the minimum number of members may choose members considered to be peers from related disciplines within or outside the School with the prior approval of the department faculty, chair, and Dean. The committees are composed of faculty at the assistant professor to professor ranks. If promotion decisions are being made for a non-tenure-track faculty member, at least one non-tenure-track faculty member at the associate or professor rank should serve on the committee. Exceptions to the committee's composition may be made with the approval of the departmental faculty, chair, and Dean. The Dean appoints the committee chair after consultation with the department chair. Appointment of department committees should occur in a timely manner consistent with the School of Pharmacy promotion and tenure calendar.

2. Department Chair:

Chairs should meet with each part-time and full-time department faculty each year to discuss goals, scope of work, professional development opportunities, and progress toward promotion and tenure. All departmental faculty are required to be evaluated annually by the chair. The chair reviews the evaluation file and the department committee's evaluation and recommendations for each faculty member and makes a written assessment with unequivocal recommendations and indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chair of the evaluative comments and recommendations of both the department committee and the chair. The department chair (or an appropriately trained departmental or school staff member) must upload both letters to the digital system as soon as possible (and in no event more than five business days) after the chair's review is completed. Faculty members must be notified promptly (e.g., via e-mail) that the reviews are available in the digital reporting system. Departments may also provide print or electronic copies of reviews directly to the faculty member and must follow applicable University procedures for negative reviews, including reviews recommending termination. The time period for faculty to respond to the reviews (see section H. Options for Faculty Response to Reviews) begins with faculty notification that the reviews are available. This ensures that faculty have adequate opportunity to respond to the reviews and have that response considered at the next levels (i.e., schoolwide committee and Dean).

3. Schoolwide Faculty Evaluation Committee:

² Faculty holding administrative appointments should not have an opportunity for dual input; therefore, those with the designation dean in their title or department chairs should not serve on either the department or schoolwide faculty evaluation committee. However, assistant/associate chairs may serve on their department evaluation committee if they do not provide input into the evaluation process. Assistant/associate chairs can also serve on department evaluation committees outside their department. Faculty members being evaluated for promotion or tenure may not serve on their department committee or the schoolwide committee but may serve on a department evaluation committee other than their own.

- a. Function: The committee reviews individual faculty in these situations: 1) annually for tenure-track faculty prior to a tenure decision or department chairs (excluding the chairs' administrative efforts); 2) when the department chair or department faculty evaluation committee recommends the faculty member for personnel action other than continuance in rank and title; 3) when the chair and faculty evaluation committee make differing recommendations with regard to continuance, promotion, or tenure; 4) when the Dean requests a review; 5) when the faculty member requests discretionary consideration for promotion; or 6) at the written request of a faculty member for other reasons. The committee reviews evaluations from the department evaluation committee and chair as well as the evaluation files and prepares a written evaluation that includes an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, promotion, and/or the award of tenure and indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The total number of positive and negative votes and abstentions must be recorded. The evaluation must be signed and dated by all committee members and then forwarded to the Dean.
- b. Composition: The committee shall be composed of five members with at least one member elected from each department and two additional members from within or outside the School in relevant disciplines appointed by the Dean after consultation with the department chairs. The committee shall include members at the associate professor to professor ranks, with the majority being tenured. If promotion decisions are being made for a non-tenure-track faculty member, at least one non-tenure-track faculty member at the associate or professor rank should serve on the committee. The Dean appoints the committee chair after consultation with the department chairs.

4. Dean, School of Pharmacy:

The Dean reviews evaluations and recommendations of all faculty received from the department evaluation committee, chair, and schoolwide committee and makes a written assessment with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, promotion, and/or the award of tenure and indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The Dean annually evaluates all department chairs for scholarly activity, teaching, service and administrative efforts, in addition to the administrative efforts of associate/assistant Deans. The Dean's reviews involving promotion, tenure, or termination decisions are addressed to the Provost. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Dean of the evaluations and recommendations of both the schoolwide committee and the Dean. The Dean (or an appropriately trained school staff member) must upload both letters to the digital reporting system as soon as possible (and within five business days) after the Dean's review is completed. Faculty members must be notified promptly (e.g., via e-mail) that the reviews are available in the digital system. The Dean's Office may also provide print or electronic copies of the reviews directly to the faculty member and must follow applicable University procedures for negative reviews, including reviews recommending termination. The time period for faculty to respond to the letters (see section H. Options for Faculty Response to Reviews) begins with faculty notification that the reviews are available. This ensures that faculty have adequate opportunity to respond to the reviews and have that response considered at the next level (i.e., Provost).

5. Provost:

If either the schoolwide evaluation committee or the Dean makes a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the School of Pharmacy Dean's Office makes the secure digital faculty evaluation file and all evaluation letters (including external reviews) available to the Provost. If a request for discretionary promotion (i.e., elective promotion consideration initiated by the faculty member) receives negative recommendations from both the schoolwide committee and Dean, the faculty evaluation file is not normally sent forward. However, the faculty member does have the right to request a review by the Provost. The Provost makes final decisions after review of the recommendations at previous levels and the findings of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. The Advisory Panel reviews all recommendations and faculty appeals to determine whether: 1) each recommendation is supported by objective evidence in the evaluation file, 2) review procedures were followed at all levels, 3) recommendations are consistent with both University and School policies and objectives, and 4) recommendations are consistent with University and School criteria for promotion and tenure. The Provost's Office notifies the faculty member and Dean in writing of the decisions rendered.

F. External Reviews

When faculty members are being considered for promotion and/or tenure, external reviews are required of the quality of either research or service, depending on which one is defined as an area of significant contribution. For teaching-track faculty, external reviews are required for promotion to teaching professor.

The faculty candidate and the department evaluation committee independently submit a list of five to six potential external reviewers to the Dean, along with a brief description of each evaluator's qualifications to serve in this capacity. Proposed reviewers should be selected based on their recognized competence in the candidate's discipline. Any personal or professional relationships between evaluators and the faculty candidate should be identified.

Reviewers affiliated with peer institutions are preferred and must be at or above the rank to which promotion is being sought. If external reviewers from non-university settings are used, there should be an explanation of their unique qualifications that led to their selection over a reviewer from a university setting. In general, reviewers of research from non-university settings should be used only under exceptional circumstances and should be a minority of the reviewers selected. The list of reviewers submitted by the departmental committee will be provided to the faculty member, who may request in writing to the Dean or chair that certain individuals be excluded along with an appropriate explanation. The chair or Dean will consider the request but is not required to accept it.

The Dean and chair should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from at least two persons on each list. The department chair contacts individuals to perform reviews, and the Dean's Office is responsible for sending instructions and deadlines for completing the review to those who accept the invitation. External reviewers are asked to limit their evaluations to the quality of the candidate's research/scholarship or service, stressing that the standard should be the quality of the work and the impact or potential impact on the field. Reviewers may also be asked to assess whether the quality is comparable to or better than that of persons recently promoted at the reviewer's institution. For non-tenurable faculty, the standard should be the faculty candidate's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment. The assessment of whether the *quantity* of work is sufficient for

promotion or tenure is best left to the local department, School, and University. A copy of the correspondence used to request external reviews must be included in the digital reporting system after redacting information identifying the reviewers. Reviewers are asked to return letters directly to the Dean. Deadlines for completion of these activities are included in the annual School of Pharmacy faculty evaluation calendar. The faculty candidate is prohibited from contacting reviewers about the process at any time.

Responses from at least four evaluators are ordinarily required; however, all external evaluations received (maximum of six) must be considered. If four evaluations are not received by the time the file is closed, the deadline for adding evaluations may be extended with the written consent of the faculty member, chair, and Dean. The letters are to be marked with the date received and uploaded to digital reporting system. The Dean's Office is responsible for tracking the requests and receipt of letters, initiating appropriate follow-up, and uploading the letters.

After completion of the review process, the faculty candidate may request in writing to the Dean to review the external reviewer letters. To ensure reviewer confidentiality, identifying marks, institution names, and signatures must be redacted before such review. A log of mailings, return dates, and other correspondence shall be maintained and made available on a need-to-know basis. After the review process has been completed, the external review letters are filed securely in the Dean's Office and may not be used for any subsequent personnel action.

G. Annual Reviews of Secondary Appointments

For faculty who hold secondary appointments in other departments or schools, the primary School of Pharmacy department affiliation shall be designated in their appointment letter or in a subsequent letter of agreement. If annual reviews conducted by other departments/school or letters of evaluation from other department chairs/section chiefs are uploaded to the faculty member's digital file by those departments/schools, they may be considered during the School of Pharmacy faculty evaluation process.

H. Options for Faculty Response to Reviews

1. Informal Faculty Response to Annual Reviews:

Responses to annual reviews that do not involve promotion, tenure, or termination decisions may be submitted at any time and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. The department chair should normally correct errors of fact with an additional memo to the file. A faculty member who disagrees with specific elements of an evaluation may work informally with the chair or ask the Dean to review the evaluations. After considering the faculty member's request, the Dean may direct the chair or relevant committee to reconsider their action, based on a written justification that would be placed in the evaluation file. However, any informal efforts to resolve such issues will not serve to suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances.

2. Formal Faculty Response to Recommendations for Tenure, Promotion, or Termination of Appointment:

When a negative recommendation for tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment has been made in department-level evaluations (either the department committee or chair evaluation), the faculty member may submit a rebuttal for review at the school level. The rebuttal must reach the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluation(s). A faculty member may write a rebuttal to the school-level evaluations (either the schoolwide committee or Dean evaluation) for review at the Provost level. The rebuttal must reach the Office of the Provost within five working days of receipt of the evaluation(s).

3. Petition for Review of Departmental Recommendations:

A faculty member may petition the Dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations for a discretionary promotion (i.e., when both the department evaluation committee and the chair render negative recommendations). The petition must reach the Dean within five working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendation. The Dean shall forward the petition to the schoolwide evaluation committee for its recommendation.

4. Petition for Review of School Recommendations:

A faculty member may petition the Provost for a review of negative recommendations for discretionary promotion from the School level (i.e., when both the schoolwide committee and Dean render negative decisions). The petition must reach the Office of the Provost within five working days of receipt of notification by the Dean of negative recommendations at the School level.

5. Denial of Tenure, Nonretention, or Termination during Tenure-Track Period:

Within 10 working days of receipt of such notification from the President, the faculty member may request, in writing, the reasons for the decision. Within 15 days of receipt of the reasons, the faculty member may appeal the decision by filing a grievance with the President's designee using West Virginia Code §6C-2, in accordance with University rules.

6. Denial of Promotion, Other Negative Personnel Decisions:

A faculty member may appeal denial of promotion or other personnel decisions not included above by using West Virginia Code §6C-2. The written appeal must reach the office of the President's designee within 15 working days after receipt of the written decision.

III. FACULTY PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED (MERIT) SALARY CONSIDERATIONS

A. Introduction

1. General Considerations:

Although the types of activities in teaching, research/scholarship, and service may differ among faculty in the various departments and between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, contributions to the overall mission and goals of the School and University should be comparable. Faculty activities should also be compatible with the unique expectations of their individual departments. As per University rules, there shall be no practice of granting promotion routinely or because of length of service, or of denying promotion capriciously.

The information below contains a description of the expectations for School of Pharmacy faculty members and evaluation guidelines for purposes of faculty reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions, and performance-based (merit) salary considerations. Departments may develop documents further clarifying the guidelines; such documents must be approved by a majority of voting faculty members in the department, the department chair, and the Dean. Faculty are encouraged to consult both the University and department guidelines (if available) in addition to this document.

2. Descriptors for Annual Review:

The annual review of performance in each mission area to which a faculty member is assigned must be assessed using one of the following four descriptors:

- a. Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit)
- b. Good (characterizing performance of merit)
- c. Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure in an area of significant contribution)
- d. Unsatisfactory

For purposes of promotion and tenure, a faculty member must have a preponderance of ratings of Good or Excellent in each of the two areas of significant contribution, based on letters from all evaluators during the promotion period. Positive recommendations for promotion and tenure also require performance judged to meet the more rigorous standard of “significant contributions” as described below.

3. Criteria for Promotion or Tenure:

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate “significant contributions” in two of the three areas of the University’s mission – teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Faculty are expected to make at least “reasonable contributions” in the third area. The areas of significant contribution for each faculty member shall be identified in the letter of appointment, or as modified in a subsequent document.

- a. Teaching: Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty who are assigned to teach. In order to achieve promotion or tenure, the faculty candidate must provide evidence that significant contributions have been made in teaching. In this context, significant contributions are normally those that meet or exceed those of peers recently (normally within the previous two years) achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their teaching contributions at West Virginia University.
- b. Research/Scholarship: The term significant contributions in research means research performance that meets or exceeds that of peers who recently (normally within the previous two years) achieved similar promotion and/or tenure and who are respected for their research contributions at West Virginia University and at peer or aspirational peer research universities (as determined by the department with approval of the Dean).
- c. Service: When designated an area of significant contribution, service provided for the benefit of the citizens of the state receives primary emphasis for promotion purposes. Service to the university and profession are also considered, especially for extraordinary and extended service to the University, the profession, or on a national or international level.

4. Changing Areas of Significant Contribution:

When a faculty member achieves tenure, the usual criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching and research/scholarship and at least reasonable contributions in service may be modified on an individual basis to require significant contributions in two different areas, with at least reasonable contributions required in the third area. A modification should be initiated primarily to assist the department or the School in achieving its mission and goals as it addresses the three areas of university concern. The modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, department chair (in consultation with the department evaluation committee), the Dean, and the Provost and must be stipulated in a letter of agreement (see University Guidelines). The agreement should specify a time period that must elapse after approval before the individual could be considered for promotion using the new areas of significant contribution. Typically, after Provost approval of the agreement, at least two full annual evaluation cycles must be completed before the faculty member can be considered for promotion.

A tenured associate professor can achieve promotion to professor with service as one of the two areas of significant contribution; such assignments have traditionally focused on service provided to the citizens of West Virginia externally to the University. The University offers two alternate pathways to promotion to professor: 1) via high quality administrative service, and 2) via outstanding contributions in one area with important contributions in a second area. See University Guidelines for more detailed information.

When a faculty member is fully promoted to the rank of professor, significant contributions in two areas with satisfactory contributions in the third are no longer required unless tenure is yet to be achieved. Many professors will continue to have assignments in all three areas, but expectations for others may change based on the needs of the School and University and the expertise of the faculty member.

B. Teaching

1. Expectations for Teaching:

The faculty member's letter of appointment shall define the individual's general teaching responsibilities and the teaching expectations required for promotion and/or tenure. Examples of the types of teaching activities undertaken by School of Pharmacy faculty include, but are not limited to:

- a. Classroom instruction (either in person or through distance learning) for professional degree students, graduate students, and pharmacy resident or fellow trainees
- b. Practicum, active learning, and laboratory instruction for professional degree or graduate students
- c. Experiential instruction for professional degree students and resident or fellow trainees in the health professions
- d. Serving as major advisor or committee member for graduate student theses and dissertations
- e. Supervising research projects of professional degree students and pharmacy residents or fellows
- f. Participating in interprofessional teaching initiatives within the Health Sciences Center and University community
- g. Participating in off-campus and online learning
- h. Providing continuing education for practicing health professionals
- i. Advising and mentoring of professional degree students, graduate students and pharmacy residents or fellows

Components of effective instruction by faculty include, but are not limited to:

- a. Possessing a depth and breadth of knowledge in their specialty area and communicating this knowledge to others
- b. Keeping up with the most current developments in their field and relating them to their teaching
- c. Stimulating critical thinking among students
- d. Demonstrating respect for differences and diversity among students
- e. Cultivating intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students
- f. Enhancing problem-solving and lifelong learning skills of students
- g. Monitoring one's teaching continuously and implementing methods to improve delivery and content
- h. Serving as a role model for students during classroom, laboratory, or experiential learning interactions

2. Evaluation of Teaching Quality:

Assessment of quality is the most important consideration when evaluating teaching. Teaching is evaluated by a variety of methods that reflect the diversity of instructional strategies employed. Faculty are expected to include in the digital reporting system each course in which they have a teaching role, entering information into each section as appropriate. For instructors of record in the University system, the University pre-populates some cells (e.g., course name, number, semester, enrollment). Faculty should enter the number of contact hours taught and describe their particular role in the course, teaching

innovations, new materials developed, and any other activities that enhanced student learning. Examples of evidence that supports the quality of teaching include:

- a. Course syllabi and schedules (especially if course coordinator)
- b. Representative instructional materials (e.g., handouts, assignments, problem sets, lecture outlines, brief video recordings)
- c. Narrative descriptions or other documentation of course improvements and teaching innovations that improve learning, for example:
 - i. Development and implementation of a new course or part of a course
 - ii. Use of innovative strategies to improve learning in an existing classroom or experiential course, with evidence of their effectiveness
 - iii. Incorporation of creative methods of providing course information to students (e.g., recorded lectures, team-based learning)
 - iv. Development of creative interprofessional learning opportunities in either classroom or experiential settings

Faculty members should attempt to determine the success of changes, with the understanding that not all strategies may prove to be successful; some credit should be given for improvement attempts made on sound pedagogical principles.

- d. Representative student assessment tools (e.g., exams, quizzes, video recordings of student performance)
- e. Student evaluations of instruction in courses with significant teaching responsibility (both classroom and experiential settings)
- f. Peer and department chair classroom and clinical teaching evaluations:
 - i. A peer teaching evaluation of classroom instruction shall be conducted for each non-tenured tenure-track and non-promoted non-tenure-track faculty member (e.g., assistant professors) every-other-year and for tenured faculty or promoted non-tenure-track faculty at least once every three years. All faculty members, department chairs, and other administrators are evaluated. Faculty may select an appropriate School of Pharmacy faculty evaluator from within or outside their department. The session to be evaluated should be representative of the faculty member's overall teaching assignments. The evaluator shall use the School form developed for this purpose and provide positive feedback as appropriate, constructive criticism where needed, and specific suggestions for improvement. Completed evaluation forms are returned to the department chair, who reviews the information and forwards a copy to the faculty member for inclusion in the digital reporting system.
 - ii. Clinical faculty members shall also have a peer-evaluation of clinical (experiential) teaching of PharmD students performed using the same schedule and process described above. Evaluators should use the peer evaluation of clinical teaching form developed for this purpose. The evaluation should also describe any teaching materials used by the faculty member being evaluated and the time spent meeting with the student. Because HIPAA regulations may preclude an evaluator from directly observing preceptors and students in the patient care setting, patient case discussions or other clinical teaching activities may be used for the evaluation.

iii. The department chair or an assistant/associate chair shall also perform an evaluation of classroom teaching for each departmental faculty member. These evaluations will be conducted for each non-tenured tenure-track and non-promoted non-tenure-track faculty member (e.g., assistant professors) at least every-other-year and for tenured faculty or promoted non-tenure-track faculty at least once every three years. These evaluations may be performed in years when peer teaching evaluations are not scheduled.

- g. Seminars or professional meetings attended related to teaching
- h. Publications in peer-reviewed teaching journals
- i. Publication of textbooks or textbook chapters related to teaching
- j. Grants or other funds obtained to support teaching
- k. Awards received for exemplary teaching
- l. Invitations to speak, consult, collaborate, or conduct workshops related to teaching at other units within West Virginia University or at other institutions
- m. Description of assistance provided to colleagues on teaching
- n. Results of exit interviews with students or interviews with alumni regarding effectiveness of faculty teaching
- o. The degree to which teaching goals for the past year were achieved

3. Evaluation of Teaching Quantity:

Teaching quantity must also be considered as part of the overall assessment of a faculty member's achievements. Annual teaching assignments are made by the department chair in collaboration with the individual faculty member. The amount of teaching assigned depends on the expectations set forth in the appointment letter, the assigned effort percentage in teaching, teaching needs in the professional and graduate programs, and the particular expertise of the faculty member. As a result, there can be large differences in the amount of assigned teaching both within and among departments. Faculty with large teaching assignments should be recognized and rewarded for those efforts. Those with smaller assignments are expected to show commensurately greater accomplishments in either service or research/scholarship, depending on the nature of their position and their declared areas of significant contribution. These factors should be considered when assessing teaching quantity as part of the overall assessment of a faculty member's teaching achievements. Examples of teaching quantity include the following items:

- a. Total number of classroom teaching hours provided
- b. Serving as coordinator or co-coordinator for a course
- c. Serving as the major contributor to the teaching of a course
- d. Use of student assignments and assessments that require a large amount of grading time outside class (e.g., written assignments or projects by individual students or groups, verbal student presentations, video recordings of student learning activities such as simulation exercises, written essay exams)
- e. Time spent reviewing and grading student portfolios
- f. Number of Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience (APPE) rotation blocks assigned, number of students precepted each block, and approximate number of weekly teaching contact hours
- g. Service as an advisor for a service learning student group for Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experiences (IPPE)
- h. Managing or participating in an Area of Emphasis in the professional degree program

- i. Number of pharmacy residents or fellows precepted
- j. Number of graduate students supervised
- k. Number of professional degree students supervised for research or other projects
- l. Number of hours spent teaching in other schools of the health sciences (e.g., Medicine, Nursing)
- m. Number of continuing professional development programs presented and time spent providing education and training to pharmacists and other healthcare professionals

4. Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based (Merit) Salary Considerations:

Teaching is an area of significant contribution for all faculty members unless the letter of appointment specifies otherwise. Evaluation of teaching should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence in the file, including the qualitative and quantitative items described in sections 2 and 3 above.

C. Research/Scholarship

1. Expectations for Research/Scholarship:

All faculty members are expected to engage in research/scholarship, although the extent to which this occurs depends upon whether the faculty member is within or outside the tenure stream and with consideration of other responsibilities as outlined in the letter of appointment. Scholarship can take several forms, including discovery, integration, application, and teaching. *A key component of the definition of scholarship is that it results in publications in peer-reviewed journals or other products that can be readily evaluated and compared with those from peers at other schools/colleges.* Activities encompassed by each type of scholarship are as follows:

- a. Scholarship of discovery: The creation of new knowledge constitutes the scholarship of discovery. Faculty members have responsibility for both the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. Regardless of whether the research involves laboratory, field-based, or practice-related projects, faculty should engage in research that has applicability to health care. Some examples include:
 - i. Drug design and discovery: Drug development, elucidation of the biochemical causes of disease, drug metabolism and pharmacokinetics, biopharmaceutics, pharmacodynamics, drug delivery, and the design of drug delivery systems
 - ii. Health services research (e.g., delivery, access, quality and cost): Social and behavioral aspects of therapeutics relative to pharmacy practice, patient outcomes research, innovations in patient-centered care, pharmacoeconomics research, health promotion and disease management research
 - iii. Outcomes research: Research into methods for optimizing drug therapy or drug delivery, with an emphasis on the treatment of conditions prevalent in West Virginia and the region; research into methods for enhancing patient care; research into methods for enhancing information provision to practitioners; research into new types of therapy for the treatment of conditions prevalent in West Virginia and the region
- b. Scholarship of integration: The sheer volume of newly-published information makes it difficult to differentiate important and valid original research findings from those

of minor importance or that contain serious methodological flaws. The scholarship of integration refers to the comprehensive, analytical review of the literature in a particular area or field, with critical interpretation of the results and conclusions. Some examples of this type of scholarship include:

- i. Preparation of instructional materials for workshops, short courses, or symposia; authorship of books, book chapters, and monographs
- ii. Comprehensive, analytical reviews of literature in a particular area published in a peer-reviewed journal, including meta-analysis
- iii. Publication of the development, implementation, and evaluation of practice guidelines based on the published literature

Publication of brief or less in-depth reviews, non-peer-reviewed review articles, case reports, letters, and similar materials will also be considered during the evaluation of scholarship.

- c. Scholarship of application: The provision of patient-centered care involves the application of research findings and other knowledge for the improvement of health. For this to be considered scholarly, the faculty member must apply knowledge in a manner that provides new insight or understanding. Knowledge application that can be critically evaluated by the beneficiaries of the service (e.g., patients, other healthcare professionals, the public) and colleagues is considered to be scholarly. Some examples include:

- i. Technology transfer of basic to applied science
- ii. Implementation of intervention programs in health care including patient-oriented services such as health promotion and disease management and the evaluation of these programs
- iii. Development and evaluation of new practice models for patient care or other health outcomes; assessing the effect of clinical pharmacy services on health practitioners' knowledge or care provision; evaluating the impact of practice guidelines on health care; and applying a practice model developed in one setting to a rural or remote site, with evaluation of the resulting impact.

- d. Scholarship of teaching: Publications about new or innovative teaching methods that are developed and can be critically reviewed and evaluated are considered to be scholarly. Some examples of this type of scholarship include:

- i. Evaluation of the effects of different teaching methods on student learning
- ii. Development of course materials using new or different technologies, and evaluation of these materials
- iii. Evaluation of different methods for providing continuing education

2. Evaluation of Research/Scholarship:

As described previously, all faculty members are expected to be scholars regardless of the type of appointment. Thus, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty who have teaching and service as their primary areas of responsibility are also expected to engage in scholarship, making either significant or at least reasonable contributions depending on the nature of their appointment or as specified in their letter of appointment. Evaluation of scholarship requires

evidence of work that can be assessed by colleagues both internal and external to the institution. The nature of the scholarship (e.g., discovery vs. integration) is not critical. However, the standard of significant contribution requires that a faculty member ultimately develops a body of work that results in recognition locally and nationally as an expert in the chosen field.

The School of Pharmacy recognizes the critical importance of multi-dimensional research programs that cross traditional disciplinary boundaries. Teams of scientists, often from multiple WVU schools/colleges, are uniquely positioned to tackle complex biomedical problems with the potential to have a significant impact on the health and wellness of West Virginians. Historically, faculty evaluation policies have focused primarily on individual scientific accomplishments of research-intensive faculty, therefore emphasizing the expectation for independent scholarly productivity. As a result, some faculty members have been hesitant to participate in team-based interdisciplinary initiatives. To remedy this situation, annual faculty review processes in the School of Pharmacy will appropriately recognize an investigator's documented substantive contributions to successful and impactful team-based, trans- and multidisciplinary research initiatives. When appropriate, Department Chairs will include effort allocation to such initiatives in faculty workload assignments. Furthermore, investigators must detail in the activity reporting system their role and specific intellectual and/or technical contributions to each interdisciplinary research project (and publication) in which they participate. Faculty members may request that team-science accomplishments are considered in subsequent promotion and/or tenure decisions, provided they thoroughly document in their promotion dossier the nature and quality of their efforts, including assessments from interdisciplinary team leaders and other team members. In many circumstances, external reviewers, whose expertise may be outside the faculty member's primary discipline, should be solicited to evaluate the significance and impact of the collaborative contributions.

Evaluation of research/scholarship should focus on the quality of the work (e.g., originality, impact on the field) rather than simply quantity of work. For promotion or tenure considerations, the quality and quantity of a faculty member's research and scholarship will be evaluated by the departmental and schoolwide faculty evaluation committees. The quality of the work will also be evaluated by external peers for faculty whose appointments require that they make significant contributions in this area. Further, both extramural funding and publications must be part of the evidence of research/scholarship by a tenure-track faculty member seeking to demonstrate that he/she has made significant contributions in this area. Evaluation of research/scholarship includes review of evidence in the following sections.

- a. Extramural Funding: All tenure-track faculty members must seek funding for their research/scholarship. Funding can be sought from a variety of sources, both intramural and extramural. Obtaining intramural funding to initiate projects or to change research directions is encouraged and should be recognized. However, success in attracting competitive extramural funding is required for promotion/tenure when research/scholarship is an area of significant contribution. Competitive awards are given greater weight than noncompetitive awards, and serving as a principal or co-principal investigator is given greater weight than other roles (e.g., co-investigator, consultant). Investigator-initiated grants/protocols are given more weight than those initiated by the funding source. Nationally-competitive awards are given more weight than state or local awards. It is not sufficient for a tenure-track faculty member to pursue only intramural grants or protocols developed by the sources providing the funding.

Although it is unrealistic to expect that all grant/contract applications will be funded, faculty with research as an area of significant contribution should have a record of continuing success in this area. Grants approved but not funded (e.g., an NIH application that is scored but not funded) are evidence that a faculty member's ideas are sound; even so, this is not an acceptable substitute for funded grants. The ability of a faculty member to obtain sufficient funding to be productive in their scholarly endeavors is more important than the absolute dollar amount of funding obtained.

The ability of a tenure-track faculty member to perform independent work is of critical importance. When serving as co-investigator on a grant/contract, faculty must provide evidence of his/her particular intellectual contribution to the project.

Non-tenure-track faculty are also expected to pursue grants, contracts, or other funding sources to support their scholarship, as outlined in the letter of appointment. However, unlike the weighting given to funding sources for faculty with research as an area of significant contribution, for faculty who have research as an area of at least reasonable contribution, the source of the funding (e.g., competitive vs. noncompetitive, intramural vs. extramural, investigator-initiated vs. sponsor-initiated) is not weighted. For example, although pursuing extramural sources is encouraged, it is acceptable for these faculty to seek only intramural, noncompetitive, or state/local funding (if this is an area of at least reasonable contribution). It is also acknowledged that some types of scholarship do not require supplemental funding.

- b. Publications: All full-time faculty are expected to publish the results of their research and scholarship in peer-reviewed journals. Factors to consider when assessing the value of each publication include sole or primary authorship, documentation of substantial contributions to the work, journal reputation (e.g., impact factor, if appropriate), citations by other authors (e.g. Web of Science, i10-index), best paper awards, and applicability to health care in West Virginia. When faculty members are not the primary author, they must describe their specific contribution to the publication. The majority of the publications should reflect achievements in the scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and/or teaching. The following relative ranking (*in approximate decreasing order of value*) of each type of publication should be used:
- i. Peer-reviewed articles of original research findings in national/international journals considered prestigious in the field
 - ii. Books (as sole author, editor, or co-editor)
 - iii. Book chapters
 - iv. Patents resulting from research/scholarship
 - v. Review articles in peer-reviewed national/international journals
 - vi. Case reports or case series in peer-reviewed national/international journals
 - vii. Non-peer reviewed articles of original findings, reviews, or case reports
 - viii. Published abstracts of presentations at scientific/professional meetings
 - ix. Publications in local, regional, or state journals or similar outlets
 - x. Local institution publications such as in-service education monographs and reports (such publications may be considered service activities rather than scholarship, at the faculty member's discretion)

Faculty with research/scholarship as an area of at least reasonable contribution are expected to publish their work in appropriate journals. These faculty might have a predominance of review articles or case reports rather than original research publications. In any event, faculty with scholarship as an area of at least reasonable contribution should strive for peer-reviewed publications.

- c. Professional/scientific presentations: These include platform or poster presentations of the results of research/scholarship at regional, national, or international meetings. This does not include oral presentations given at meetings for educational purposes, which constitute teaching activity. Faculty should not report both a presentation and published abstract of the same work as two separate activities in the Faculty Productivity Report. The weight of scholarly presentations (*in approximate decreasing order*) is as follows:
 - i. Invited research presentations at a professional/scientific meeting
 - ii. Non-solicited platform or poster presentations at professional/scientific meetings
 - iii. Research seminars at other institutions
 - iv. Internal (WVU) research presentations (e.g., research day, departmental seminar)
- d. Entrepreneurial activity: This involves research that leads to intellectual property resulting in public-private partnerships, patents, licensing, and other forms of commercial and entrepreneurial activity. To be considered as scholarship, evidence of the usefulness of the product must be provided.
- e. Research goals: If research is an area of significant contribution, the degree to which research goals for the past year were achieved should be assessed.

3. Promotion, Tenure and Performance-Based (Merit) Salary Considerations:

Evaluation of research/scholarship is focused on quality, not mere quantity. There is no exact number of publications or grants/contracts that constitute either reasonable or significant contribution because the comprehensiveness and quality of various research/scholarship can be quite variable.

- a. Tenure-track, full-time faculty with significant contributions in research: Evaluation of the research efforts of tenure-track assistant professors must take into account the time since initial appointment and progress made since the last evaluation. For merit considerations, assistant professors must demonstrate initiation of sound scholarship and document consistent efforts to obtain extramural funding to support scholarship. Collaborative efforts are increasingly important in research, but non-promoted faculty must develop a clearly-defined area of expertise such that their independence as scholars is evident to evaluators.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor and the award of tenure, assistant professors with research/scholarship as an area of significant contribution must have obtained extramural funding and published work of sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate to both internal and external reviewers that their research/scholarship is

independent, sustainable, significant to the field, and likely to lead to national recognition.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor and the award of tenure, assistant professors with research/scholarship as an area of at least reasonable contribution must publish work of sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate to their colleagues within West Virginia University that they have established themselves in an area of expertise.

For annual merit considerations as associate professors, faculty members must have demonstrated evidence of sustained scholarly achievement comparable to that required for promotion to this rank. Faculty with research/scholarship as an area of significant contribution should demonstrate sustained competitive extramural funding at levels sufficient to maintain their scholarly endeavors.

The rank of professor is among the highest honors that the University can bestow on its faculty and should be granted only to those who have distinguished themselves in their respective disciplines. For promotion to professor, faculty with research/scholarship as an area of significant contribution must have a sustained record of outstanding achievement with clear area(s) of focus apparent. The primary determinant for promotion to the rank of professor is national recognition of research/scholarship. Examples of such recognition include:

- i. Invitations to serve on editorial boards or as peer reviewers for established, reputable national/international journals
- ii. Invitations to serve on national/international research advisory or review panels
- iii. Election to office in national/international research or academic organizations
- iv. Serving as a consultant to national/international agencies
- v. Invitations to speak, organize symposia, or serve as moderator or session chair at national/international meetings
- vi. Invitations to serve as visiting professor at other institutions
- vii. Citation of the candidate's work by other authors in national/international peer-reviewed journals

For promotion to professor, faculty members whose appointments specify at least reasonable contributions in research/scholarship must demonstrate sustained scholarly productivity in their given area of expertise.

For annual merit considerations as professor, faculty members must provide evidence of sustained achievements in research/scholarship consistent with the nature of their appointments.

- b. Non-tenure-track, full-time faculty with at least reasonable contributions in research: There is no exact number of publications expected for non-tenure track faculty because of the variability of activities and expectations among faculty. Evaluation of the scholarship of assistant professors must take into account the time since initial appointment and progress made since the last evaluation. For annual merit considerations, assistant professors must demonstrate initiation of scholarship and should document efforts to obtain funding for their scholarly work as appropriate. To facilitate development of scholarship, these faculty are encouraged to participate in collaborative research, if appropriate.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor, a sufficient quality and quantity of publications should exist to establish expertise in an area. For merit considerations, associate professors should demonstrate evidence of sustained scholarly contributions. Funding at levels sufficient to maintain their scholarly efforts should also be demonstrated.

For promotion to the rank of professor, evidence of sustained contributions in the area(s) of expertise must be demonstrated. For annual merit considerations, professors must provide evidence of sustained achievements in scholarship consistent with the nature of the academic appointment.

D. Service

1. Expectations for Service:

The term service refers to 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 department, School, 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 school. High-quality service should be encouraged, recognized, and rewarded. Some examples of service activities include (not necessarily in order of importance):

- a. Appointment or election to offices in professional organizations
- b. Committee or task force memberships (Faculty holding appointments at the Assistant or Associate Dean level generally are expected to focus service at the School level and above.)
 - i. Departmental
 - ii. School
 - iii. Healthcare institution
 - iv. University
 - v. Local
 - vi. State
 - vii. Regional
 - viii. National
 - ix. International
- c. Consultant activities provided with minimal or no remuneration, typically related to one's role with the School of Pharmacy or University. (Paid consultant activities performed beyond School responsibilities and that require approval through the outside employment and consulting policy are not considered Service)
- d. Development or coordination of School continuing education programs
- e. Journal editor, editorial board, and manuscript referee activities

- f. Grant reviewer for funding agencies
 - i. National agencies (e.g., NIH, NSF, American Cancer Society)
 - ii. Professional organizations (e.g., AACP, AAPS, ACCP, ASHP, American Chemical Society)
 - iii. State organizations (e.g., WV Heart Association)
 - iv. Local sources (e.g., WVU Faculty Senate Grants)
- g. Mentorship of junior & mid-career faculty. The School of Pharmacy recognizes the critically important role of mentors in the professional development of junior and mid-career investigators. Participation in mentorship is an activity that should be shared by all senior faculty. These faculty members should be available and willing to provide advice, guidance, and assistance to junior faculty in their teaching, research/scholarship, and service tasks.
- h. Patient-centered care provision. The practice of pharmacy through the provision of patient-centered care is considered service to the School when it contributes to the overall mission of the University. Specific faculty responsibilities in this area are defined by the department chair and Dean and described in the letter of appointment.
- i. Presentations to lay public and community groups. Examples include health fairs, speaking engagements, “brown bag” medication review sessions, and media presentations/interviews. When the same presentation is provided multiple times to different public or community groups, such presentations will generally be considered as service if they contribute to the overall goals and mission of the institution and are performed for no, or minimal, remuneration. Presentations to professional organizations should generally be considered teaching activity (e.g., educational programs) or research/scholarship (e.g., presentation of research findings) as appropriate.
- j. Service on graduate committees and professional student committees. This activity should be considered as either teaching or service, depending on the extent to which the committee member is involved in actual teaching of the student.
- k. Special project assignments from the Dean, department chair, or other administrators
- l. Student advising of professional degree students or student organizations
- m. If service is an area of significant contribution, the degree to which service goals for the past year were achieved should be assessed.

2. Evaluation of Service:

Evaluation of service includes an assessment of the degree to which the activities benefit the University, society, or the profession. Of particular relevance 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 within the faculty member’s professional expertise and performed with one’s University affiliation identified. As with teaching and research, expectations for the amount and type of service vary among faculty members based on their effort percentages

and areas of significant contribution. Several criteria are used to assess various types of service activities:

a. Patient-centered care provision:

- i. Evaluation of the value of care provided by colleagues or others in a position to observe outcomes.
- ii. Contents of a practice portfolio. Faculty members who provide patient-centered care with service as an area of significant contribution, or faculty with service as an area of at least reasonable contribution with a relatively large percentage (30% or more) assigned to service, will include in the annual productivity report a written description of the practice-related activities provided. The description should include: a) the extent of their involvement in each type of activity provided; b) documentation of patient care innovations initiated; and c) documentation of assessments of patient care outcomes conducted. Clinical faculty are expected to provide evidence that the patient care services bring value to patients and other members of the healthcare team.
- iii. Scholarly publications and presentations describing service activities. Faculty should endeavor to engage in practice-related service activities that can also be considered scholarly in nature. Evidence of the development of unique or innovative service activities can be assessed by documentation of publications and presentations resulting from such efforts.

b. Obtaining grants, contracts, or other extramural funding to support service activities:

This includes both competitive and non-competitive funding and is of greater significance for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution. Documentation should include the type of funding received, the agency providing the funding, the amount received, the percent effort on the project, and a description of the faculty member's role in obtaining the funding.

c. Other service activities: These may include, for example:

- i. Elected office in national, state, and local professional organizations
- ii. Membership on federal and scientific organization grant review panels
- iii. Membership on the editorial boards of established, reputable journals
- iv. Manuscript referee activities for established, reputable journals
- v. Committee or task force appointments for national or state professional organizations
- vi. Committee memberships for the University, School, department, and healthcare institution
- vii. Membership on graduate student committees
- viii. Membership on residency or fellowship committees
- ix. Advising of students, pharmacy residents, and fellows
- x. Coordinating continuing education efforts
- xi. Consultant activities (volunteer or with minimal remuneration)
- xii. Mentoring of junior & mid-career faculty³

³ Department chairs will include effort allocation for peer mentoring in faculty workload assignments. Mentoring activities must be adequately documented in the faculty member's digital file and dossier.

xiii. Presentations to public and community groups

Regardless of the effort percentage allocated to service, faculty members should indicate in the annual productivity report the extent of their contributions to various committees, task forces and other groups; specific advising/graduate committee activities; professional offices held and specific responsibilities of these offices; the number and type of journal editorial or referee and consultant activities undertaken; and for each service-related presentation, the date and title of the talk, type of audience, number of attendees, and location.

- d. Special assignments from the Dean, department chairs, or other administrators: Special projects (other than those carried out as part of a committee assignment) that require a significant amount of time and effort from a faculty member should be evaluated by the administrator(s) responsible for assigning them.

3. Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based (Merit) Salary Considerations:

All faculty members are expected to meet their responsibilities with regard to School and University committee assignments, student advising, and any defined patient care activities. Doing so represents reasonable contributions in the area of service. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to actively participate in the other types of service activities listed above. The extent and level of service involvement (e.g., local vs. national) are generally expected to increase with increasing number of years as a faculty member.

The annual practice portfolio is used to evaluate provision of patient care. Faculty members with service as an area of significant contribution must provide evidence of high-quality, valuable services beyond those required of faculty with service as an area of at least reasonable contribution. Further definition and differentiation of the ratings of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory service is determined by each department and the Dean. Evaluation of the quality of service for promotion, tenure, and merit considerations can be more difficult than evaluation of teaching and research/scholarship. In general, faculty with service as an area of significant contribution must provide more evidence of the scope and quality of service activities than faculty with service as an area of at least reasonable contribution, and external review and evaluation of service activities is required for promotion consideration. The types of materials that can be evaluated by internal and external reviewers include, for example:

- a. Extramural funding received to provide service activities
- b. The practice portfolio, which includes evidence of the type and extent of contributions to patient care
- c. Letters or surveys that provide evidence of the important benefits that service activities have provided to clients (analogous to student evaluations of teaching)
- d. Measures of attitudinal change or improved performance of clients as a result of service activities

- e. Statements from informed sources in the State who, while not direct recipients of a service activity, are in a position to observe outcomes resulting from the service
- f. Data that allow a reasonable inference that improvements in specific areas have resulted from service activities
- g. Service-related honors or awards received
- h. Formal annual reports of a specific service activity
- i. Published manuscripts or abstracts describing or evaluating service activities, service-related newsletters or monographs, and documentation of any other service contributions that resulted in recognition outside the institution
- j. Description of changes made in service activities that resulted from identified areas of need

To assist faculty evaluation committees in determining service quality for faculty with service as an area of at least reasonable contribution but with a relatively large effort percentage (30% or more) assigned to service activities, the activities listed above as applicable should also be included in the annual faculty productivity report.

It is difficult to differentiate excellence in service for full-time tenure-track faculty compared to non-tenure-track faculty when service is an area of significant contribution. Tenure-track faculty in this situation are encouraged to provide evidence of items a. through j. above in addition to other activities as applicable. Evaluation of service for assistant professors with service as an area of significant contribution must take into account the time since initial appointment and progress made since the last evaluation. For performance-based salary considerations, assistant professors must demonstrate initiation of service activities with evidence of consistent efforts in the activities identified in the letter of appointment and as assigned by the department chair or Dean.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution, sufficient quality and quantity of service activities should exist to demonstrate to internal and external reviewers that the activities are sustained and beneficial to the intended recipients. For performance-based salary considerations, an associate professor must provide evidence of success in service activities consistent with that required for promotion to this rank.

For promotion to the rank of professor for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution, a sustained record of outstanding achievement and success in service activities must be evident. National recognition of the faculty member's service activities should be apparent. Examples of national recognition in service include:

- i. Invitations to serve on editorial boards or as peer reviewer for established, reputable national/international professional or academic journals
- ii. Election to office in national international professional or academic organizations
- iii. Invitations to speak, organize symposia, or serve as moderator or session chair at national/international meetings of professional organizations
- iv. Invitations to serve as visiting professor at other institutions

- v. Citations of the candidate's scholarship related to patient care or service by other authors in national/international peer-reviewed journals

For performance-based salary considerations, professors must provide evidence of sustained success in service activities consistent with their letter of appointment.

E. Work Assignments for Full Professors

Upon promotion to the rank of professor, a written work assignment must be established that is agreed upon in advance by the faculty member, department chair or other immediate supervisor, and Dean. The assignment is developed in the context of the School's mission and its current guidelines and expectations for promotion. The work assignment must indicate the effort percentage allocated to each area of university concern and may specify particular performance expectations in teaching, research, and/or service. Work assignments may be modified over time to reflect changing needs of the department or School. A work assignment must normally be in place for five full years in order for a professor to be eligible for the University's Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement program.

F. Administrative Appointments

Faculty members may have specific administrative appointments within the School of Pharmacy. Such appointments do not automatically carry modification of criteria for promotion and tenure. Administrative responsibilities should be clearly defined in writing by the Dean, including the effort percentage allocated to the appointment. The written assignment should be placed in the *Personal Documents* folder of the digital reporting system. Evaluation of administrative functions is the responsibility of supervising administrators. The faculty evaluation committees should consider the effect of administrative workloads on other areas of University concern during the evaluation process.

G. Emeritus Status

The University may recognize faculty members who have served honorably by awarding the honorary designation Emeritus. Faculty whose retirement is announced and who have met the requirements of meritorious contributions to the University are considered for Emeritus status. The term "meritorious contributions" is defined as contributions to the University and its mission that are highly exceptional and unusually outstanding and which are beyond or outside of the individual's job responsibilities and performance standards. Emeritus appointments are normally considered for faculty members on their retirement, and the faculty member must normally have served the University for at least 10 years.

Retiring faculty members in the School of Pharmacy who wish to be considered for Emeritus status must submit a written request and curriculum vitae to the department chair. The chair forwards the information to the department faculty evaluation committee for its consideration and recommendation. The committee's recommendation is submitted to the chair, who also makes a recommendation and forwards both recommendations to the Dean. If the candidate for Emeritus status is the department chair, the committee forwards its recommendation directly to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation and forwards it with the previous recommendation(s) to the Provost for approval. The Provost serves as the President's designee for this purpose.

Emeritus faculty members retain their professional titles with the word “Emeritus” following the rank and title (e.g., Professor Emeritus). Emeritus faculty have library privileges, regular faculty access to athletic events, and other privileges that may be designated by their department, School, and the University. There is no salary or other monetary payment associated with Emeritus status.

H. Endowed Chairs and Professorships

The endowment of chairs and professorships provides a means by which the University can recruit and retain outstanding faculty who make significant contributions in teaching, research, scholarship, the arts, or public service. The School of Pharmacy follows University rules for creation, recruitment, appointment, and evaluation of these appointments (see <https://faculty.wvu.edu>). The letter of initial appointment specifies the duration of and expectations for the endowed position, including performance criteria and performance review procedures. Holders of endowed and named chairs are expected to maintain exceptional levels of productivity that are characterized as excellent in order to retain the title and privileges. If such holders are not performing as expected, the Dean may forward a recommendation to revoke continuation of the title and its privileges to the Provost.

IV. ADJUNCT FACULTY WITH COURTESY APPOINTMENTS: CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

A. Introduction

This section applies to individuals who are unpaid volunteers and are granted a courtesy title; it does not apply to part-time paid faculty, who may also be granted an adjunct faculty title. Adjunct faculty assist in meeting the mission and goals of the School of Pharmacy. These individuals typically have academic appointments in other units within WVU or are employed outside the University. This includes volunteer preceptors for the experiential learning program.

B. Initial Appointment

Courtesy adjunct faculty appointments are non-tenure track positions that recognize the expertise of the appointee and denote trust by the School of Pharmacy in their ability to assist with the teaching, research or service mission. Unpaid or volunteer adjunct faculty can be granted a courtesy appointment for longer than one semester or one academic year. A more detailed description for adjunct faculty with courtesy appointments can be found in the Adjunct/Courtesy Appointments Guideline and Procedure.

1. Non-Preceptor Courtesy Appointments

Individuals seeking a non-preceptor adjunct appointment must submit a written application describing their intended contribution to the missions of the department and School to the department chair (or Dean if outside a specific department). Faculty members may also nominate an individual directly. If the chair (or Dean, if outside a department) deems the relationship beneficial, an application is given to the individual to submit along with a current curriculum vitae. The department chair (or Dean) forwards the individual’s application and a completed Adjunct Faculty Appointment Form to the department faculty for their review and formal vote for or against approval (or Executive Council if a Dean’s Office appointee). The department’s

recommendation for appointment at a specific rank is based on an assessment of the qualifications and experience of the applicant. Written justification must be provided for applications disapproved by the department faculty. The department chair forwards the final written recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes the final decision regarding the appointment and rank of applicants. The specific responsibilities of adjunct faculty are defined in writing by the School at the time of initial appointment, with the concurrence of the individual faculty member and his/her primary employer (as appropriate). Changes in these initial responsibilities can be made with the mutual consent of the adjunct faculty member, the chair of the department of the appointment, and the Dean. Initial appointments are for a maximum period of one year.

2. Preceptor Courtesy Appointments

Individuals wishing to become volunteer preceptors must submit a preceptor application to the Office of Experiential Learning. This includes individuals who already hold a non-preceptor courtesy appointment. Those who are deemed to meet preceptor criteria must provide an APPE rotation description (if appropriate) and sign and return an affiliation agreement. New preceptors receive an official notice of appointment after completing an online preceptor orientation program and providing precepting availability for the current academic year. Approval is by the Experiential Learning Committee. Proof of valid pharmacist license is also required. Preceptors who possess the B.S. Pharmacy degree but not the terminal PharmD degree are normally appointed at the rank of adjunct instructor. Preceptors with the PharmD degree are normally appointed at the rank of adjunct assistant professor. Appointment at a higher rank (e.g., adjunct associate professor) requires justification based on background and experience. If an individual already holds a preceptor courtesy appointment, it is not necessary to obtain a non-preceptor courtesy appointment to fulfill other responsibilities to the School, such as classroom teaching.

C. Criteria for Reappointment

1. Non-Preceptor Courtesy Appointments

The department chair reviews the appointments annually to ensure that the appointee is continuing to make the contributions for which they were appointed. The appointment may be discontinued if such contributions have ceased. Renewals begin on January 1 of each year.

2. Preceptor Courtesy Appointments

The Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) requires schools to periodically assess preceptor quality and discontinue relationships that do not meet preset quality standards. Every preceptor who has had an IPPE or APPE student is evaluated by the Office of Experiential Learning at the end of the academic year based on student evaluations and other relevant information. Preceptors with student evaluation scores below a set threshold are further evaluated by the Experiential Learning Committee. The committee may recommend that preceptors who have substantial deficiencies for two evaluation periods be removed from rotation availability. These recommendations are forwarded to the Dean for a final decision. Preceptor courtesy appointments must be renewed annually.

D. Criteria and Process for Promotion

Adjunct faculty members holding their primary faculty appointments at other schools or universities may be granted the commensurate rank by the Dean if they have been promoted at the other institution. Promotion for adjunct faculty members who do not hold appointments at other academic institutions is based primarily on an assessment of their activities and accomplishments for the School of Pharmacy since the initial appointment. Promotion is not typically awarded until the faculty member has held an adjunct appointment for at least five years.

At any time during the year, adjunct faculty who wish to be considered for promotion may submit a written application to the chair of the department in which they hold the appointment. The application must include the requested rank, a current curriculum vitae, and a detailed description of School-related activities and accomplishments related to expectations contained in the appointment letter. The chair will forward the application to the departmental evaluation committee for their review and formal vote for or against approval. The committee must also be given access to the initial or current adjunct appointment letter and the results of any previous reviews or promotion requests. The committee shall forward a written recommendation for approval or disapproval to the Dean, who makes the final decision regarding the appointment and rank. If approved, the promotion is effective immediately and the candidate is notified in writing of the promotion and the new faculty rank. Promotion to a higher rank in a courtesy (unpaid) position does not guarantee appointment at the same rank should the faculty member change to a paid faculty position in the future.