

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY
APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE 2024-25 last modified 11/19/2024
approved by the Provost 12/2/2024**

adapted from

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL
EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE last modified 5/22/2020**

I. INTRODUCTION

The ability of a university to function, progress, develop excellence, and serve society depends on both the individual performance of each faculty member and the collective performance of the faculty as a whole. Thus, the success and reputation of a university are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among its faculty and how effectively those talents are marshaled to accomplish the institutional mission. To achieve and maintain high quality, a comprehensive faculty evaluation system is essential. This system encourages professional growth of individual faculty members, assures retention of those faculty members who demonstrate high-level scholarship and academic performance, and permits appropriate recognition of achievement.

The work of faculty members as independent professionals is not easily categorized or measured. Faculty evaluation must be guided by principles and procedures designed to protect academic freedom and to ensure accuracy, fairness, and equity. This document outlines these broad principles and establishes the rigorous and common procedures necessary to maintain these qualities in the faculty evaluation process.

West Virginia University Institute of Technology (WVU Tech), a regional campus of West Virginia University (WVU), is a unique instructional unit within the WVU System, with specific faculty evaluation guidelines, as appropriate to its teaching focus. However, as part of the WVU System, WVU Tech also participates in the tripartite mission of teaching, scholarship and service. Accomplishing this mission in an environment of respect for diversity requires a creative, collective intermingling of individual faculty talents. Annual evaluation, promotion in rank, and the granting of tenure are acts of critical importance both to members of the academic community and for the welfare of the university. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and the university and is both evaluative and developmental. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions reward individual achievement; they also shape the university for decades.

Consistent with this document, schools shall supplement these guidelines with more detailed descriptions and interpretations of the criteria and standards that, when approved by the Provost, will apply to faculty members in the particular unit. A subsequent step in this process, if appropriate, subject to Provost approval, could occur at the department level. The unit guidelines may be more specific to expectations of individual disciplines, and they may be more rigorous than the WVU Tech guidelines but not less so.

II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCESS, CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

A. The Faculty Evaluation Process

The faculty evaluation process at WVU Tech is designed to assist the institution in attracting promising faculty members, helping them reach their potential, rewarding their proficiency, continuing their productivity and professional development throughout their careers, and retaining only those who are outstanding. The process is both evaluative and developmental and has three distinct components:

1. Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives. It forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that will encourage professional growth and provide support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. An important aspect of the annual evaluation is an assessment of one's progress toward tenure and/or the next promotion, as appropriate. Once tenure is awarded, post-tenure review occurs as part of the annual review process. These reviews can support subsequent promotion in rank and the salary enhancement for continued academic achievement. They might also lead to a more rigorous review process which could result in a remediation plan, as determined by the unit.

2. Evaluation for Promotion in Rank

Promotion in rank recognizes meritorious performance of a faculty member. The evaluation for promotion in rank provides the opportunity to assess a faculty member's growth and performance since the initial appointment or since the last promotion.

3. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure

For an award of tenure, tenure-track faculty undergo a rigorous evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments and the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained. A more comprehensive assessment of one's progress toward tenure must occur no later than mid-way through the tenure-track period.

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the university community. Primary responsibility for evidence of the quality and presentation of an individual's work in the evaluation file rests with the particular faculty member as outlined in Section VII Faculty Evaluation File. Faculty colleagues participate in annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure through membership on faculty evaluation committees and on the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Independent reviews at the school and institutional levels assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments and schools. The legal authority and responsibility of Chairpersons, Vice President Academic Affairs, the Campus President or appointed designee, and the WVU Provost also enter into the determination of academic personnel decisions, as do the needs and circumstances of the department, school, and university.¹

B. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of specific departments, schools or other academic units and their work is to be evaluated in that context. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution. Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles, which may change over time; such changes normally are identified in an annual workload document or memorandum of understanding.

Collectively, members of the faculty teach, advise, mentor, engage in scholarly and creative activity, publish and disseminate their findings and new knowledge, and provide public, professional, and institutional service and outreach. The extent to which a faculty member's responsibilities emphasize the areas of the university's mission will vary. All faculty members have an obligation to foster the quality, viability, and necessity of their programs. The financial stability of a program and recruitment of an adequate number of students depend in part on the faculty.²

In the faculty member's approved letter of appointment, the university official (usually the Vice President Academic Affairs) responsible for hiring shall define the general terms of the faculty member's major responsibilities and identify the year by which tenure must be awarded, if applicable. The terms of this appointment may be reviewed periodically (normally in consultation with the Vice President Academic Affairs) and may be changed by mutual consent, consistent with this document. Any changes must be reflected in writing by amendment to the letter of appointment. Within the terms of this general apportionment of responsibilities, the details of a faculty member's specific assignments should be subject to joint consultation but are to be determined by the appropriate administrator.

Each department and school shall refine these broad criteria in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in ways that reflect the unit's discipline and mission. The criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways that equitably reflect the particular responsibilities and assignments of each. How the unit criteria apply to a faculty member's own set of duties should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed in the annual evaluation.

Adjustments in the expectations for faculty members may occur in keeping with changing institutional and unit priorities

¹ The term "department" refers throughout this document to departments, divisions, or other discrete units in colleges. The term "college" refers to colleges or schools reporting to the WVU Provost. The term "Chairperson" refers to department, division, or school Chairpersons, or other unit heads who report to Deans or the Vice President Academic Affairs. The term "unit guidelines" applies to guidelines at either the department or college/school level.

² WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.1, Section 3.2. See link in section XIV.

and personal interests. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members must do scholarly, creative, or professional work that informs their teaching and service, as defined by the approved unit guidelines.

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Teaching (learning), scholarship³ (discovery), and service (engagement) constitute the heart of the mission of WVU Tech. Faculty responsibilities are defined in terms of activities undertaken in each of the three areas. Faculty evaluation is based primarily upon a review of performance in these areas. Depending upon one's discipline and the unit's guidelines, publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields.

Faculty are evaluated in each category, Teaching, Scholarship, and Service on a 0-3 scale with 0 being Unsatisfactory, 1 being Satisfactory, 2 being Good, and 3 being Excellent. Typically, to achieve a rating of Satisfactory, faculty must provide evidence of dependable performance of the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the appointment letter (or equivalent memorandum of understanding) and workload document. To achieve a rating of Good, faculty must provide evidence of consistent and dependable performance of the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the appointment letter and workload document. To achieve a rating of Excellent, faculty must provide evidence of consistent and dependable performance of the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the appointment letter and workload document.

A. Teaching (Learning)

Teaching involves the stimulation of critical thinking, the dissemination of knowledge, and the development of artistic expression. Teaching includes but is not limited to traditional modes of instruction such as the in-person classroom lecture, other classroom activities, and modes such as clinical, laboratory, online, and practicum instruction; distance learning; thesis and dissertation direction; evaluation and critique of student performance; various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction; and advising (mentoring) of undergraduate and graduate students, which is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process. The goals of the teaching-learning endeavor are to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits that should culminate in degree completion. The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer knowledge, a commitment to deepen student learning, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. Supporting documentation for the evaluation of effective performance in teaching might include evidence drawn from such sources as the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective judgment of students, student advisees and/or mentees, and of peer and Chairperson evaluations of instructional performance.⁴ It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, the development or use of instructional technology and computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and school. Regardless of the activities defined as "teaching" assigned to a faculty member, faculty who teach are expected to be effective in their explicit teaching assignments. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in teaching, faculty must provide evidence that they taught their assigned classes and were available to students through office hours. Such evidence may include lesson plans, assessments, online content provided, schedule of office hours, sample emails/forum posts with students, log of students advised, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in teaching, faculty must provide evidence of effective teaching. Such evidence may include teaching materials they designed or curated, departmental assessment data, student testimonials (e.g., positive feedback in student evaluations), success rates of students in subsequent courses, etc. Faculty should also include

³ The term "scholarship" is used in this document to include appropriate professional activities such as research publications, professional consulting, scholarly writing, artistic performance, and creative activities. These activities result in products that may be evaluated and compared with those of peers at other institutions of higher learning.

⁴ WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2, Section 7, requires student evaluations as part of the faculty evaluation process. See link in section XIV.

context for how this evidence demonstrates effective teaching.

3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in teaching, faculty must provide evidence that their teaching is of the highest quality. This could be done by continually improving and refining their own teaching, developing new courses, or presenting assessment data justifying the current pedagogy. Evidence may include teaching innovations/methods used in class, efforts to align methodology with established best practices in teaching, and/or assessment data showing the merits of the current method of instruction. Faculty should also include the context for work completed and the evidence provided, along with the value of both.

Faculty are not expected to have a piece of evidence of each type listed above (e.g., teaching innovations/methods used in class), nor is their evidence required to be one of the types listed. However, faculty are expected to have some evidence in each category above (i.e., Satisfactory, Good, and Excellent) in order to achieve successive ratings. Faculty are not expected to have evidence in each category for every class taught, but they should include evidence in each category every year (or preferably semester). Evidence of Satisfactory teaching should be included for every class taught. To clarify, faculty may choose to focus on redesigning or innovating in one class per year (or semester) but should still include evidence that they taught their other assigned courses.

Due to WVU Tech's mission as an undergraduate institution with a focus on high quality teaching, faculty with a reduced teaching load may have less evidence in each category. However, all faculty regardless of teaching load should be endeavoring to excel in the classroom and including evidence of their efforts.

B. Scholarship (Discovery)

Scholarship can occur in four general kinds of activity: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. The scholarship of discovery can involve the creation of new knowledge, the creation of new insights, the critical appraisal of the past, or artistic creation and performance. These forms of scholarship are considered to be the traditional activity of “research.” The scholarship of integration can involve the synthesis of knowledge and the development of new approaches to understanding phenomena. This type of scholarship includes more traditional forms of research and scholarly activity along with scholarship associated with institutional goals and priorities. The scholarship of application can involve the application of knowledge and expertise to address new and/or different problems. One venue for this form of scholarship can be the application of a faculty member’s expertise in solving relevant problems for the institution as it relates to institutional goals and priorities or for industry, business or government. This type of scholarship is also reflected in the work of a scholar-practitioner, whose work focuses on practical application of knowledge gained through research or training, particularly within a specific field or practice area. The scholarship of teaching can involve the creation of new approaches of explaining knowledge and the development of sound pedagogical methods. Often, these activities will result in products that may be evaluated and compared with those of peers at other institutions of higher learning. Professional development activities can sometimes enhance the scholarship in one or more of these four areas.

Scholarship is an important component of the mission of the institution, infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. It validates the concept of the teacher-scholar. Although often discipline-focused, an individual’s scholarship also may be interdisciplinary and collaborative or more directly related to the goals and priorities of the institution. An original contribution of a creative nature relevant to one or more disciplines may be weighted as heavily as the publication of a scholarly book or article. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. Evidence of scholarly merit may be either a work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a program of worthwhile scholarly activity. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Criteria for the evaluation of scholarship should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in scholarship, faculty must provide evidence that they keep current in their field. Such evidence may include evidence of membership in professional groups, a log of articles read, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in scholarship, faculty must provide evidence that they participate in their field. Such evidence may include evidence of conference attendance, list of articles refereed, etc.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in scholarship, faculty must provide evidence of actively contributing to their field. This could be done through new research, consultancy, or a variety of other activities appropriate to the field. Such

evidence may include copies of published articles, manuscripts for working papers, copies of presentations given, evidence of grants applied for or received, documentation of consultancy work, etc.

Faculty are not expected to complete each activity listed above, nor is their evidence required to be one of the types listed. However, faculty should typically include evidence for each activity completed. Quality of the evidence presented, as well as quantity of work done, will be considered during the review. Note that expectations may differ for faculty with 10% versus 20% of their annual workload allotted to scholarship (and corresponding areas of important and reasonable contribution). Each unit (school and/or department) are encouraged to develop more specific criteria or guidelines for what level of activity is expected for 10% or 20% of a faculty member's workload. Such guidelines should be flexible enough to allow faculty to achieve these goals in different ways. School guidelines should be developed by the faculty of that school in consultation with their Chairperson. Departmental guidelines should be developed by the faculty of that department in consultation with their program director and Chairperson. School and departmental guidelines should typically be submitted to the Vice President Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost for approval no later than work plans are due for the year in which the guidelines are expected to take effect. The Vice President Academic Affairs will inform other evaluators of any approved guidelines.

C. Service (Engagement)

Service activities promote WVU Tech, the profession, and the local, state, national and/or global community and involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and scholarship to address the needs of society. Service to the institution can include participation in governance structures, participation in national and international organizations, activity in service organizations, as well as contributions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and school. Service can also be in the form of activity that supports institutional goals and priorities, including those duties and responsibilities associated with leadership positions.

In keeping with its tradition, WVU Tech is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities on the part of its faculty as essential components of its mission. Enlightened perspectives, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable resources in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Service by faculty members to West Virginia is of special importance to the institutional mission.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the institution, society, or the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of the institution and clients, induces positive change, improves performance, accomplishes institutional goals, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. One important benefit of service to the institution is faculty participation in the governance system including administrative roles. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with one's institutional affiliation identified. The definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of promotion and tenure should be identified in the unit's evaluation guidelines. Criteria for the evaluation of service should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in service, faculty must provide evidence that they meet the essential needs of the unit to function. Such evidence may include membership on committees or initiatives, documentation of volunteer work, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in service, faculty must provide evidence that they work to improve their unit, university, community, or profession. Such evidence may include active participation on institutional committees, administrative role in a professional organization, advising student organizations, organizing campus events, etc.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in service, faculty must provide evidence of more impactful work to improve their unit, university, community, or profession. This level of work may be due to the faculty member serving in additional way (more committee work, volunteering, etc.) or by assuming a leadership role in their department, committee, or other scholarly organization or activity.

Faculty are not expected to complete each activity listed above, nor is their evidence required to be one of the types listed. However, faculty should typically include evidence for each activity completed. Quality of the evidence presented, as well as quantity of work done, will be considered during the review. Note that expectations may differ for faculty with

10% versus 20% of their annual workload allotted to service (and corresponding areas of important and reasonable contribution). Each unit (school and/or department) should develop clear criteria or guidelines for what level of activity is expected of 10% or 20% of a faculty members' workload. Such guidelines should be flexible enough to allow faculty to achieve these goals in different ways. These guidelines should typically be submitted to the Vice President Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost for approval no later than work plans are due for the year in which the guidelines are expected to take effect.

Faculty in an administrative role (i.e., Chairperson or Program Director) with a higher percentage of their workload allotted to service are expected to provide evidence of their increased levels of activity. Such evidence may include a list of the types of activities they perform outside their normal faculty responsibilities, documentation for committees they serve on, or a log of time spent on administrative tasks.

IV. CONTEXTS OF APPOINTMENT FOR TENURED OR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A faculty member is usually appointed without tenure.⁵ Appointments can be made without or with credit toward tenure for previous experience.

A. Without Credit

A faculty member's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful candidacy for promotion and tenure, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the "critical year," that is, the year in which a tenure decision must be made. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the Vice President Academic Affairs to bring the critical year forward by one year to year five.

B. With Credit

It is not uncommon for a new appointee to have had full-time experience at another institution of higher learning where they were engaged in teaching, scholarship, and service. Depending upon the amount of successful experience in these mission areas at the intended rank or the equivalent, up to three years credit toward tenure may be allowed, unless the candidate does not wish such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative critical year, shall be identified in the letter of appointment. In such a circumstance, by the end of the second academic year the faculty member could accept the identified critical year, or all or part of the possible allowable credit to be applied in their instance, at which point the critical year would be confirmed by the Vice President Academic Affairs. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit should be added to the evaluation file. If no credit is accepted, during the fourth year the faculty member may petition the Vice President Academic Affairs to bring the critical year forward by one year to year five.

If, by the end of the second year, the faculty member does not request modification of the tentative critical year identified in the letter of appointment, that year will become the recognized critical year. (There is no obligation on the part of WVU Tech to credit time served in a prior non-tenure-track appointment toward tenure in a subsequent tenure-track appointment.) Action on tenure earlier than the thus-defined critical year will not be considered except as defined in the previous paragraph, or in unique situations that are truly exceptional.

C. Appointment at Various Ranks

At WVU Tech, requirements for appointment at the various ranks are as follows:

1. An appropriate master's degree is required for the following appointment types: Instructor, Visiting Professor (of any rank), and Lecturer. Such appointment will not count towards tenure-track credit.
2. For appointment at the rank of Teaching Instructor or Senior Lecturer professional experience or professional qualifications related to the discipline in which hired to teach are required. For appointment at the rank of Teaching Assistant Professor, a terminal degree, or master's degree and professional experience, in the discipline in which hired

⁵ Occasionally, appointment with tenure is possible. To be appointed with tenure, or to the ranks of associate professor or professor, the individual must have been interviewed by an official in the Office of the Provost or Campus President during the interview process; the individual's curriculum vitae must be reviewed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Chairperson of their school; and a recommendation for tenure must be submitted by the department and school to the Office of the Provost.

- to teach or a related discipline is required.
3. For appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, a faculty member ordinarily must have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the faculty member's field or have an appropriate Master's Degree plus both of the following: (1) thirty (30) hours of appropriate graduate study or the equivalent and (2) a minimum of three years of successful full-time teaching at an institution of higher education or the equivalent.
 4. For appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must ordinarily have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the faculty member's field and must have at least six years of successful professional experience, including full-time teaching at an institution of higher education or the equivalent. Prior to an initial appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, the school Chairperson may ask the appropriate Faculty Evaluation Committee to review the credentials of the candidate (see footnote on page 5). The Vice President Academic Affairs or designee will make the final decision as to whether or not a recommendation for an initial appointment at the rank of Associate Professor will be forwarded to the Provost.
 5. For appointment at the rank of Professor, a faculty member must ordinarily hold an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the faculty member's field and have had at least 10 years of successful professional experience including full-time teaching at an institution of higher education or the equivalent. Prior to an initial appointment at the rank of Professor, the school Chairperson may ask the appropriate Faculty Evaluation Committee to review the credentials of the candidate (see footnote on page 5). The Vice President Academic Affairs or designee will make the final decision as to whether or not a recommendation for an initial appointment at the rank of Professor will be forwarded to the Provost.

Neither graduate assistantships nor research -trackpositions shall be construed as meeting either teaching or professional experience requirements for credit toward tenure, for tenure or promotion, or for appointment with tenure or initial appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

V. REQUIRED PERSONNEL ACTIONS/TIMELY NOTICE FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A personnel action is required each year for each faculty member. Such personnel actions include but may not be limited to reappointment, promotion, tenure, or non-renewal.

In the WVU System, the award of tenure is campus-specific. For this purpose, there are four campuses: WVU-Morgantown (General University, including Extension); WVU-Morgantown (Health Sciences Center, including faculty in the Charleston and Eastern Divisions); WVU Potomac State College; and WVU Institute of Technology.

A tenure-track faculty member in the sixth year, or in the year determined to be the “critical” year, must be reviewed for tenure and must either be awarded tenure or given notice of termination of appointment and a one-year terminal contract. 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. Such notice of non-retention shall be emailed and mailed “Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested” and by first class mail. Under certain circumstances the critical year may be extended.⁶

In the case of a first-year, tenure-track, full-time faculty member holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the Provost shall give written notice concerning retention or non-retention for the ensuing year by letter post-marked and mailed no later than March 1.

Time spent on a leave of absence or in an assignment less than 1.00 FTE normally shall not count when calculating years of service toward tenure for a tenure-track faculty member. The faculty member may request that such time spent on scholarly activities apply toward years of service. The faculty member's Chairperson shall determine in advance of the leave whether such time will apply and will make a recommendation to the Provost. Written notification of the decision to modify the critical year will be forwarded to the faculty member and be added to the faculty member's evaluation file.

VI. DISCRETIONARY PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Discretionary personnel actions are those which are not required to be taken at specific times, and may include the following (See also Section IV, above):

⁶ WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.5. See link in section XIV.

1. Promotion in rank when the critical year does not apply
2. Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member
3. Non-renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member
4. Termination of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year
5. Termination of the appointment of a tenured faculty member for cause, reduction or discontinuance of an existing program, or financial exigency⁷

A tenure-track faculty member will be reviewed automatically in the critical year, unless the faculty member requests no review, in which case a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Otherwise, the faculty member must initiate consideration for a discretionary promotion by sending a written letter to the Chairperson by December 31. The Chairperson is responsible for ensuring that the other evaluators are aware of the application for promotion. A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

Evaluations and recommendations for one's first promotion and/or tenure will be based primarily on one's contributions since appointment at WVU Tech but may be based in part on work elsewhere for which years of potential credit have been identified in the letter of appointment. In the latter case, evidence of one's performance during the established years of credit should be included in the evaluation file.

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at WVU Tech will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion. However, for discretionary promotion to professor, special weight will normally be placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term associate professor will not be penalized for an extended period of limited productivity, as long as more recent quantitative and qualitative productivity has been regularly achieved and maintained in an appropriate disciplinary area. Holding the rank of professor designates that the faculty member's academic achievement merits recognition as a distinguished authority in his/her field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for his/her contributions to the discipline. A professor sustains high levels of performance in his/her assignments and responsibilities in all mission areas. The record of a successful candidate for professor must have shown evidence of high-quality productivity over an extended period of time.

While tenure and promotion are separate actions, only in the most extraordinary circumstances may a person be granted tenure without already being at or above the rank of associate professor or being concurrently promoted to the rank of associate professor. It also is university policy that the granting of promotion does not guarantee the award of tenure in a subsequent year. Neither promotion nor tenure shall be granted automatically or merely for years of service.

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Evaluations and recommendations are to be based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The primary evidence to be weighed must be contained in the faculty member's evaluation file contained in the faculty member's electronic evaluation file. Also included are the professional judgments at each level of review as to the quality and impact of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, as applicable.

An official faculty evaluation file shall be established and maintained by each faculty member in Digital Measures. In principle, the record in the evaluation file should be sufficient to document and to support all personnel decisions. Each unit must utilize an annual reporting form ("Productivity Report") appropriate to the work assignments in that unit for use by all members of the unit, including the Chairperson. The Productivity Report without supporting documentation is not in itself sufficient for evaluation purposes. Evaluation file materials will be in electronic form, provided that the integrity of the information and the date of entry in the file are maintained.

The faculty member's evaluation file should contain, at the minimum, the following items:

1. The letter of appointment and other documents which describe, elaborate upon or modify one's assignment, including position description, work plans, memoranda of understanding, annual reviews, and subsequent letters of agreement.
2. An up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography containing: a) critical dates relative to education, employment,

⁷ As defined in WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.7. See link in Section XIV.

- change in status, promotion, leave of absence, etc.; b) a list of publications (or the equivalent) with complete citations, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of scholarship and/or creative work; c) a list of service activities.
3. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught and enrollments in each, graduate students supervised, clinical assignments, committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work.
 4. For faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of the individual's performance to the home department. In such cases the home department's evaluation should reflect the relative proportion of each dimension of the total assignment, however the home department faculty evaluation committee and/or Chairperson shall provide ratings.
 5. A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses.
 6. Other information and records that the Chairperson and/or Vice President Academic Affairs may wish to add. Faculty members should be notified of such additions and may respond to the additions within ten working days, which may be after the closing date.
 7. All other information that bears upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in all pertinent areas. This information may include, but need not be limited to, teaching evaluations, professional presentations, published materials, grant applications and awards, research in progress and the preparation of unpublished materials, other creative scholarship, and service to the university, the citizens of West Virginia, and the profession. A reflective summary by the faculty member that supports the evidence in the file is strongly recommended.

The faculty member is responsible for assuring completion of Items 2, 3, and 7 and correctness of remaining items. The Office of the Provost may periodically issue more detailed instructions for the development and maintenance of faculty evaluation files. Those requirements may be supplemented or elaborated by school or department procedures.

VIII. COMPLETION OF AND ACCESS TO THE FILE

The faculty evaluation file shall be annually updated by the end of December 31. On that date, the file shall be closed for the review period. Only such materials generated by the annual faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Faculty members have the right of access to their evaluation files at any time. Others shall have access to the file only on the basis of a need to know. Members of a faculty evaluation committee or administrative officers responsible for personnel recommendations are assumed to have a need to know. When otherwise necessary, the appropriate administrative officer or the Vice President Academic Affairs shall determine whether an individual has a need to know and what material is necessary to fulfill the need to know. All persons will treat the material from the file as confidential. The security of all evaluation files is to be assured. The confidentiality of each file is to be respected. Disclosure of file materials to those outside the evaluation process shall occur only under valid legal process or order of a competent court of jurisdiction.

IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

A. General Description

The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at WVU. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members,⁸ provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and documents that support recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. The primary purpose of these annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the role and mission of the university. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary; however, in accord with the type of appointment, rank, and tenure status.

The evaluation procedures may be found below in Section XIII. Annual evaluation for all faculty, whether tenure-track, tenured, term, or not eligible for tenure (including faculty with prefixes of "teaching" and lecturers), will be conducted at

⁸ Occasional part-time faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment.

the departmental level by the faculty evaluation committee and Chairperson. Faculty being evaluated for mid-tenure review, tenure, or discretionary personnel action will also be evaluated at the college level by the faculty evaluation committee. All evaluations will be based on documentation in the evaluation file (see Section VIII). Written evaluations will be placed in the evaluation file and forwarded to the Office of the Vice President Academic Affairs and to the faculty member being evaluated.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance and should be both formative and summative. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and are goal-oriented. The review is not limited to events of the immediately previous one-year period; it may also be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed.

The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, paying particular attention to one's cumulative progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion and, if positive, as a basis for merit salary adjustments and salary enhancements for continued academic achievement. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity to develop changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the university.

B. Faculty Categories

Faculty members in all categories have full citizenship in the institution and have the rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility. This responsibility includes attendance at and participation in faculty meetings and in other dimensions of the concept of shared governance. They are eligible for appointment to any administrative office if they meet the requirements for the position as stated in the position announcement.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members are those who are in a tenure-track appointment but are not yet tenured. For these persons, the annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance should be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion and tenure.

In one's first review, limited evidence of the faculty member's progress will be available. For that review, material in the file such as reports by colleagues on one's teaching and information on one's activities in scholarship and service are useful in order to assess progress.

As one moves through the tenure-track period, annual evaluations will focus increasingly on the successful outcomes of one's activities rather than simply on the activities themselves.

While the absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure, these evaluations should apprise tenure-track faculty members of performance deficiencies and should call attention to expectations for subsequent consideration for promotion and/or tenure and the extent to which they must enhance their productivity. Occasionally, the evaluations will result in termination of the faculty member's appointment, sometimes prior to the critical year, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts. In these cases, notice shall be given in accord with WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2.⁹

2. Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted

The annual evaluation of faculty members who are tenured but not fully promoted will generally emphasize both quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the rank of Professor. While not all faculty members may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide them toward that achievement.

3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted

Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating faculty members at these ranks is to describe their

⁹ See link to WVU Board of Governors Rules in Section XIV.

performance in the context of appropriate expectations, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments and reappointment. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels.

4. Teaching-track Faculty

Teaching-track faculty, in which the principal assignment is teaching, are designated with the prefix “teaching,” accompanying a traditional rank. Teaching-track faculty members are hired to respond to program needs. These positions focus on education in all of its manifestations, including but not limited to teaching, advising, or educational program development.

Normally, a teaching-track faculty assignment will be at least 80% teaching. The balance might address needs of the unit and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission. Contributions in the area of service are expected to be more impactful than general service provided to the university. Additionally, the nature of the work of term faculty allows for flexibility in course load as well as areas of contribution, with changes determined by the Chairperson in consultation with the faculty member. Any changes are documented annually in the term faculty member’s work plan. As noted elsewhere in this document, “Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works.” For term faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

Teaching-track Faculty may be eligible for reappointment. Reappointment will be determined primarily on the faculty member’s performance of their assigned duties. However, other factors that may lead to cessation of the appointment include: resource availability, program viability, and the need to staff specific classes. Upon promotion to or appointment at the rank of Teaching Instructor or Teaching Assistant Professor, a faculty member may be eligible to receive an appointment or reappointment not to exceed three years. Upon promotion to or appointment at the rank of Teaching Associate Professor, a faculty member may be eligible to receive an appointment or reappointment not to exceed six years. Upon promotion to or appointment at the rank of Teaching Professor, a faculty member may be eligible to receive an appointment or reappointment not to exceed nine years. No number of term appointments shall create any presumption of a right to appointment as a tenure-track or a tenured faculty member.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a term faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a term faculty member and their Chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For term faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the file is expected to show evidence of significant curricular and/or programmatic development and important contributions to the University’s teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Promotion to the rank of teaching professor designates that the faculty member’s achievement merits recognition in their field. At the Vice President Academic Affairs’s discretion, a panel of term appointees in similar disciplines, who have achieved promotion, may contribute to the review at the school level.

5. Service-track Faculty

Service-track faculty are those faculty whose primary area of contribution is related to providing service in support of institutional goals and priorities. Tenured associate professors may pursue a service track with support of the Vice President Academic Affairs. Should a faculty member choose to pursue promotion and/or tenure through a service-track, significant contributions would be required in service. Teaching and scholarship may still be demonstrated during the period under consideration, though their contributions may be adjusted to reflect the focus on service. For those faculty whose area of significant contribution is service work, a memorandum of understanding identifying service role and expectations of that role will be developed with the approval of the Vice President Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost. Typically, this memorandum of understanding should be approved at least three years before the faculty member may apply for promotion.

6. Librarian-track Faculty

Library faculty hold appointments which are not subject to consideration for tenure, regardless of the number, nature, or time accumulated in such appointments. Library faculty appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment. Library faculty have all rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility. Continued appointment depends upon the faculty member's fulfillment of the responsibilities specified in the letters of appointment, assignment documents, or subsequent documents.

Library faculty are typically not evaluated under the process described in this document. All full-time and continuing part-time Librarian-Track faculty members are required to participate in annual evaluations completed by the WVU Dean or Associate Dean, with input from the WVU Tech President or Vice President Academic Affairs. Then the file will be peer reviewed by the appointed Peer Review Committee within the libraries.

7. Other Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation of faculty members who are not eligible for tenure may emphasize different criteria from those applied to other faculty. Annual evaluations will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. If the faculty member is promotable, the annual evaluation will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty members will attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal. These evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties and occasionally will lead to notices of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. Non-renewal of grants or other external funds may result in non-renewal of appointments despite positive evaluations. These faculty members hold appointments that are not subject to consideration for tenure, regardless of the number of, nature of, or time accumulated in such appointments. Such appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment.

8. Part-Time Faculty

Evaluation of continuing part-time (less than 1.00 FTE) faculty will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Occasional part-time faculty members should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignments.

C. Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of one's performance in each of the mission areas to which one is assigned must be assessed as Excellent [characterizing performance of high merit], Good [characterizing performance of merit], Satisfactory [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, when applied to an area in which significant contributions are required, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure], or Unsatisfactory. See additional information in section III above. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" ratings, particularly in an area in which a significant contribution is required, would not qualify for promotion or tenure.

The assessments provided by annual reviews are the primary basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available, and for the salary enhancement for continued academic achievement program available to faculty at the rank of professor or the equivalent. They should be a basis for those periodic recommendations which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action that are forwarded to the Provost. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be supported both (a) by a series of annual reviews above the "satisfactory" level, and (b) beyond those reviews, by performance and output which are judged to meet expectations identified in the appointment letter and subsequent documents, as well as the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" (see below).

X. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE

The University criteria for the awarding of promotion and the granting of tenure described below are general expectations that may be enhanced by school and/or departmental criteria which take account of the distinctive character of the faculty member's discipline. Any copies of school and/or departmental criteria shall be available to all participants in the review process.

The faculty of an outstanding university is a community of scholars whose productivity is manifested in a variety of ways, including teaching, scholarship and service.

Successful teaching is an expectation for faculty who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for either tenure or promotion, significant contributions will have been made in teaching. In the teaching context, “significant contributions” are normally those that meet or exceed those of peers recently (normally within the immediately previous two-year period) achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at WVU Tech. In some cases, external reviews of teaching contributions may be appropriate.

The term “important contributions” in scholarship means performance in scholarship which meets or exceeds that of peers who recently (normally within the immediately previous two-year period) achieved similar promotion and/or tenure and who are respected for their contributions in scholarship at peer or aspirational peer universities and at WVU Tech. The department, subject to approval by the Vice President Academic Affairs, determines peer or aspirational peer universities. Examples of contributions in scholarship include, but are not limited to:

1. Academic Growth
 - a. Relevant academic attainment
 - b. Participation in short courses, seminars, etc.
 - c. Original scholarly work
2. Professional Activities
 - a. Professional societies: membership, participation in activities, and offices held
 - b. Consulting work relevant to the faculty member's expertise that enhances the faculty member's professional expertise or that serves the educational mission of the university
 - c. Publications
 - d. Scholarship/creative activity
 - e. Licenses held
 - f. Short courses, seminars, etc., which the individual has helped conduct
 - g. Inventions, copyrights, artistic accomplishments, etc.

Candidates for tenure who are expected to make significant contributions in teaching and important contributions in scholarship are also expected to demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in service. Service activities that would be acceptable when one is expected to make contributions characterized as reasonable should be differentiated from those activities that are viewed as important. Examples of contributions in service include, but are not limited to:

3. Institutional Service
 - a. Committee assignments
 - b. Student recruitment
 - c. Special assignments
 - d. Sponsor of student organizations
 - e. Administrative duties
4. Service external to the Institution
 - a. Service to the people of the Community and the State of West Virginia, the United States and the world.
 - b. Service to the profession

In order to be recommended for discretionary promotion, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching. The faculty member will be expected to make important contributions in either scholarship or service and reasonable contributions in the remaining area which will be identified in the letter of appointment or modified in a subsequent document.

In order to be considered for promotion, faculty members who are not eligible for tenure but who are eligible for promotion normally will be expected to make significant contributions in the area(s) of their assignment as outlined in the letter of appointment or as modified in a subsequent document. Typically, they are expected to make significant contributions in teaching and reasonable contributions in service.

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

The decision by the Provost to accept a recommendation for or against retention or the awarding of tenure shall rest on both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the department, school, and the university, and on the strengths and limitations of the faculty member as established in the annual evaluation process.

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the one in which the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or tenure, should have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the department in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the Vice President Academic Affairs or Campus President (or designee) and by the Provost. An administrative assignment will be evaluated by the immediate supervisor rather than by the unit committee.

XI. CHANGING THE AREA OF IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION

When a faculty member achieves tenure, the criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching, important contributions in scholarship, and reasonable contributions in service may be modified on an individual basis to require important contributions in service and reasonable contributions in scholarship. Such 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. Typically, this request should be initiated at least three years before the faculty member is eligible for promotion using the new expected area of important contribution. Such a modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, Chairperson of the school, and the Vice President Academic Affairs, and must be stipulated in subsequent letters of agreement.

A document requesting a change in the area of important contribution should be developed which identifies both the types and quantity of service expected in the new context and the methods by which the quality of that service will be measured. In most cases, service will be directed toward the needs of the citizens of West Virginia and will go far beyond the kinds of service which are expected in order for one to achieve good university citizenship. "Reasonable contributions in scholarship" must also be defined, in both qualitative and quantitative terms. The document should also specify the timeframe for subsequent promotion, when applicable. Once approved by all parties, this document should be included in Digital Measures.

Changes to the area of important and reasonable contribution should also be reflected in the percentages dedicated to each area in the annual work plan. However, changing the percentages on an annual basis (e.g. to fulfill a one-time need of a department) does not automatically change the area of important contributions. Faculty members who do not have an approved letter or agreement or modification of appointment in their file must be evaluated according to the guidelines in sections III and X above, regardless of their rank, responsibilities, or years of service to the institution.

XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

External evaluations are among the many factors which may be considered when evaluating the faculty member. In years when a faculty member who has scholarship or service as an area of important contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the evaluation file may contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's scholarship or service from persons external to the University. The school or department should have a published process to determine if such external evaluations are required.

The names of persons who will be asked to provide external reviews must be selected with participation by the faculty member who is to be evaluated and from the persons in the school who conduct the evaluation. The suggested method for identifying external evaluators is for the Faculty Evaluation Committee (either with or without participation by the Chairperson) and the faculty member each to propose a list of names of appropriate evaluators selected for their

professional competence in the discipline. Each list should contain four to six names. A paragraph describing each evaluator should be submitted indicating qualifications to serve in this capacity. Any personal or professional relationship the faculty member has or has had with the evaluator should be identified. The Chairperson or Vice President Academic Affairs should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from two or more persons on each list. A minimum of four external evaluations is required.

Persons who have been closely associated with the person being evaluated, such as co-authors or doctoral research advisors or advisees, may be asked for evaluations but, as with all evaluators, should be requested to identify their professional or personal relationship to the candidate for promotion or tenure. The faculty member has the right to review the list of potential evaluators, to comment upon those who may not provide objective evaluation and to request deletions. The faculty member's written comments and requests should be forwarded to the Chairperson and Vice President Academic Affairs.

In selecting evaluators, the Chairperson and Vice President Academic Affairs may consider the faculty member's comments and requests, but the faculty member does not have the right to veto any possible evaluator, nor is the final selection of evaluators to be achieved through obtaining the consent of the faculty member.

If external reviewers from non-university settings are used, there should be an explanation of their qualifications that focuses on their professional competence in the discipline that led to their selection rather than the selection of a reviewer from a university setting. As a general principle, reviewers of scholarship from non-university settings should be used only under very special circumstances and should be a minority rather than a majority among the reviewers selected. External reviewers of scholarship from universities should be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought. For external reviews of service, individuals in non-university settings may be more appropriate as referees.

The Chairperson, using letters approved by the Vice President Academic Affairs, should request the external evaluations, stressing that the standard used as a basis for review should be the quality of the work and the impact or potential impact on the field. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations should be included in the faculty member's file with the external evaluators' identifying information removed. The external evaluator may also assess whether the quality of the work of the faculty member being reviewed is comparable to or better than that of persons recently promoted in the evaluator's university. For non-tenurable faculty, the standard should be based on one's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment. The assessment of whether the quantity of scholarly work is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a judgment best left to the local department, school, and the university. The evaluations should be forwarded to the Vice President Academic Affairs by the external evaluators.

If four evaluations are not received by the time the file is closed, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended through the written consent of the faculty member, Chairperson, and Vice President Academic Affairs.

The external reviews will be maintained in the confidential section of the faculty member's electronic evaluation file and the Office of the Vice President Academic Affairs. The various committees and individuals directly involved in the promotion and tenure review process shall be provided with this documentation when they have need. The faculty member shall have the right to view the redacted reviews after the external evaluators' identifying information has been removed. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall be sealed and shall not be used in any subsequent personnel actions.

XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS

Annual evaluations of the achievements of faculty at WVU Tech will be carried out at the school level by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chairperson (this is analogous to WVU's departmental-level evaluation). Faculty being evaluated for mid-tenure review, tenure, or discretionary personnel action will also be evaluated at the institutional level by the Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Vice President Academic Affairs (this is analogous to WVU's college-level evaluation). Decisions regarding promotion and tenure will also include evaluation at the university level by the WVU University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel and the Provost. Faculty members should neither initiate nor participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (i.e., initial appointment, retention, annual evaluation, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate family or household or other individuals with a potential conflict of interest.

Each level of review will consider the material in the candidate's electronic evaluation file, which, when combined with reviews from previous years, will form the basis for the evaluation statements and recommendations. All recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their critical year will be forwarded through the complete review process. Recommendations for non-retention or a terminal appointment of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member automatically receive review at all levels. Participants at each level of review will exercise professional judgment regarding their assessment of the record in the evaluation file in arriving at a recommendation or a decision.

Timeframes for the evaluation process are typically determined by the Provost's Office. It is the responsibility of the Office of the Vice President Academic Affairs to disseminate the evaluation schedule to all evaluator and to ensure all steps of the evaluation process are completed in a timely fashion.

A. Faculty Evaluation Committee Evaluation

1. Each school may form "clusters" of departments within the school. The Chair's Council of the school may determine which disciplines are included in each cluster, subject to the approval of the Chairperson of the school. Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) evaluations constitute the first review of the evaluation process.
2. Each FEC consist of a minimum of five members, a majority of whom must hold tenure. Exceptions must be approved by the Chairperson of the school. Preferably, membership should reflect the diversity of the unit. When possible, the FEC should include at least one representative from each department in the cluster. The method of selection of members is left to the discretion of the unit, but Chairpersons shall not be a member of the committee. Visiting faculty are not permitted to serve on the FEC, but teaching-track faculty are allowed. If needed, a unit may supplement committee membership with faculty members from a related discipline. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure is not eligible to serve on any committee reviewing their evaluation file.
3. FECs are engaged in two specific activities: annual reviews, typically with a recommendation regarding continuation, and reviews for purposes of promotion, tenure, or non-continuation. The FEC will review and evaluate material in the faculty member's electronic evaluation file. Based on this evidence, the committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the Chairperson of the respective faculty member's school. The total number of positive and negative votes or abstentions must be recorded. If desired, committee members may include minority statements, which should be included in the body of the evaluation, without separate signatures.
4. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the FEC of the evaluative comments and recommendations. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's electronic evaluation file.
5. Responses to annual reviews may be submitted at any time and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the Chairperson with an additional memo to the file. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluations or the assignment of descriptors, the faculty member may work informally with the Chairperson or Vice President Academic Affairs to review the evaluations or descriptors. Any informal efforts to resolve such an issue will not suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances. After considering the faculty member's request, the Vice President Academic Affairs may direct the committee to reconsider their action, based on a written justification that would be placed in the faculty evaluation file. Any subsequent adjustments would be documented in an additional memo to the file.
6. When the FEC makes a recommendation against promotion or tenure, or a recommendation for termination of appointment, the faculty member may include a rebuttal to the review at the college level. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the Vice President Academic Affairs within five (5) working days of receipt of the evaluations.

B. School Chairperson Evaluation

1. The School Chairperson will review evaluations and recommendations from the FEC and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The School Chairperson shall inform the faculty member, in writing, of their evaluation and recommendation. Copies of all written statements shall be forwarded to the faculty member and also placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.
2. If either the FEC or the School Chairperson supports a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the

faculty evaluation file, including the FEC and School Chairperson recommendations together with any external evaluations, is forwarded to the Vice President Academic Affairs. If a request for promotion (outside the critical year) receives negative recommendations by both the FEC and the School Chairperson, the faculty evaluation file normally would not be forwarded to the next level. All recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their critical year will be forwarded through the complete review process.

3. Recommendations by the Chairperson for tenure must be accompanied by a statement indicating how the proposed awarding of tenure of a probationary faculty member will affect the long-range staffing pattern of the department and/or school, taking into account expected attrition, accreditation, budgetary limitations, and the need for flexibility.
4. Faculty members follow the same procedures in XIII.A.5. and XIII.A.6. to make a response or rebuttal of the Chairperson evaluations.
5. The Chairperson will not receive an evaluation at this level. The evaluation of the Chairperson by the FEC will be included in the electronic evaluation file for subsequent evaluation by the Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee and Vice President Academic Affairs.
6. If a faculty member is an immediate family member (or other individual with a potential conflict of interest) of the Chairperson, then the faculty member will be evaluated by the Chairperson of another school. The faculty member should work with the Vice President Academic Affairs prior to the end of the year being evaluated to determine which Chairperson will complete the evaluation.

C. Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee Evaluation

1. The Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee should consist of one tenured faculty member from each School. Exceptions must be approved by the Vice President Academic Affairs. Whenever possible these members should be individuals who have been part of the evaluation process in the past, either as Chairperson or member of an FEC. The method of selection of members is left to the discretion of the program unit, but faculty who are already part of the evaluation process (Chairperson, members of FEC, and faculty under consideration for promotion and/or tenure) are not allowed to serve on the committee.
2. Faculty on the Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee will typically serve for 3 years. Schools will take turns selecting new members, with staggered terms, to allow some continuity in the committee from year to year. Since faculty under consideration for promotion are not eligible to serve on this committee, Schools should typically select members who do not intend to apply for promotion within 3 years. In the event of a vacancy (including a faculty member recusing themselves from evaluation), the remaining members of the Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee will work with the corresponding School to select a replacement.
3. The Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee is expected to provide or coordinate training of new Chairpersons and FEC members in the evaluation process. If FEC members are trained separately by each School, then all members of the Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee should normally attend all such trainings to help ensure consistency across the institution.
4. The Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee will review departmental evaluations. The committee will prepare a written evaluation in each case, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, tenure and/or promotion, as applicable. Normally the committee will review cases in which promotion, tenure or termination are recommended at the School level, although, at the Vice President Academic Affairs's discretion, annual reviews may also be considered. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the Vice President Academic Affairs. The total number of positive and negative votes must be recorded. Committee members may include a minority statement in the body of the evaluation without separate signatures.
5. The Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee will also review mid-tenure faculty to evaluate progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Typically, the mid-tenure review will occur during the third year of employment. The committee will assess annual evaluations for the first three years of employment. No additional steps are required by the faculty for the mid-tenure review process.

D. Vice President Academic Affairs

1. The Vice President Academic Affairs will review all applications for promotion and/or tenure, as well as recommendations for non-retention or a terminal appointment of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member.
2. The Vice President Academic Affairs will also review mid-tenure faculty to evaluate progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Typically, the mid-tenure review will occur during the third year of employment. The Vice President Academic Affairs will assess annual evaluations for the first three years of employment. No additional steps are

required by the faculty for the mid-tenure review process.

3. The Vice President Academic Affairs will make an assessment, in writing, for any review completed (including mid-tenure review) with unequivocal recommendations for these faculty members, taking into consideration prior evaluations of the FEC, Chairperson, and Campus Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Vice President Academic Affairs shall inform the faculty member, in writing, of their evaluation and recommendation. Copies of all written statements shall be forwarded to the faculty member and also placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.
4. Typically, the Vice President Academic Affairs will complete their evaluation within thirty (30) business days of the faculty member's respective Chairperson filing their evaluations.

E. WVU University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel

1. The Provost will consult with the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel, consisting of at least five faculty members selected by the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee. No person who has reviewed faculty at the department or college level during the current cycle, or who is being considered for promotion or tenure, may serve on the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel.
2. The recommendations and faculty appeals will be reviewed by the Advisory Panel. Primary attention will be given to four questions:
 - a. Has each recommendation been supported by objective evidence in the evaluation file to ensure that no faculty member is being treated capriciously or arbitrarily?
 - b. Have the review procedures at all levels been followed?
 - c. Is each recommendation consistent with university and unit policies and objectives?
 - d. Are the recommendations consistent with the department, college, division, and university criteria for promotion and tenure?
3. The Advisory Panel will advise the Provost regarding the cases considered and will prepare written statements addressing these issues. The statement must be signed by all members of the panel, dated, and added to the faculty member's file. Panel members may include minority statements with the general statement.

F. WVU Provost Level

1. For the purposes described in these guidelines, the decision-making authority of the President has been delegated to the Provost, as appropriate.
2. Decisions on promotion and tenure recommendations will be made by the Provost, as appropriate, after review of the recommendations by departments, colleges, and their administrators and the findings of the Advisory Panel.
3. The President or designee will report the decisions to the WVU Board of Governors. Such report will indicate the number of decisions as well as the individuals receiving positive action and will verify that the appropriate standards and guidelines have been met.
4. The faculty member and the Chairperson will be notified in writing of the decision rendered.

G. Negative Decisions

1. Tenure Denied; Non-retention or Termination During Tenure-Track Period
A faculty member may request from the President or designee, within ten (10) working days of receipt of the notice from the President's designee of non-retention or termination during the tenure-track period, the reasons for the decision (Section 6.6 of WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2). Within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons, the faculty member may appeal the decision by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.¹⁰
2. Promotion Denied; Other Personnel Decisions
A faculty member desiring to appeal a decision on promotion or other personnel decisions not included above may appeal by using W.Va. Code §6C-2, as described in Board of Governors Rule 4.2. The appeal should reach the office of the President's designee within fifteen (15) working days after receipt of the written decision.

XIV. LINKS TO REFERENCED DOCUMENTS

1. WVU Board of Governors Rules: <https://policies.wvu.edu/finalized-bog-rules>

¹⁰ See links to the WVU Board of Governors Rules and W.Va. Code §6C-2 in Section XIV.

2. W.Va. Code §6C-2: <http://pegb.wv.gov/>

Faculty may wish to check with the Division of Human Resources (Morgantown) to assure that they have access to the most recent copy of the procedures.