

Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual Department of Curriculum & Instruction/Literacy Studies

I. Introduction

The Department of Curriculum & Instruction/Literacy Studies Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual outlines the criteria and policies for faculty files, faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure at the departmental level. This document supplements the West Virginia University *Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* ([WVU Procedures](#)) and the *College of Education and Human Services Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-based Raises* ([CEHS Guidelines](#)). Department policies outlined in this document are intended to align with those of the West Virginia University [Board of Governors](#), those of West Virginia University, and those of the College of Education and Human Services. Therefore, it is essential that faculty carefully read the criteria, policies, and procedures outlined in this document as well as those in the Board of Governors, University, and College documents-

All faculty members must be reviewed annually. The purpose of the evaluation process in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction/Literacy Studies (CI/LS) is to guide and support faculty to be successful in both short- and long-term efforts by describing clear criteria for annual review as well as promotion and tenure recommendations, when applicable. Faculty in CI/LS hold a range of positions. For descriptions of broad expectations of Tenure-Track, Teaching, Research, Service, and other faculty positions, please refer to the *CEHS Guidelines* (Section II, "Appointment Letters and Assignments"). Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes pre-tenure and tenured faculty, unless otherwise indicated.

II. Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty workload assignments are designed to be flexible to recognize the varied contributions made by all faculty members. Annual assignments are the result of conversations between the faculty member and Department Chair focused on assessing progress toward set goals, establishing future goals, and creating pathways for success. All faculty must participate in annual assignment conversations with the Chair. (A full description of the Annual Workload Plan can be found in the *CEHS Guidelines*, Section III.)

The percentages of a faculty member's time allocated to teaching, research, and service as outlined in the faculty member's appointment letter or memorandum of understanding may be adjusted in annual assignment planning based on the faculty member's current and future progress and/or department and program needs. For example, a pre-tenured faculty member may reallocate efforts in either teaching or service to research. Likewise, a faculty member who is serving as program coordinator may receive a reallocation of 10% effort to administrative

service for each semester in which they serve in this role. All adjustments of this nature must be the result of discussion between the faculty member and the Chair.

While the standard workload effort in teaching is based on courses taught (normally one course is equivalent to 10% effort in teaching), some circumstances may result in a variation in this standard and 10% of effort may be allocated for other teaching activities. One such circumstance may be to acknowledge a faculty member's work with doctoral students. The department is committed to growing its doctoral programs as is appropriate for an R1 Research Institution and it compensates faculty for supporting this mission. Faculty who regularly work with doctoral students may receive credit for that work through a workload adjustment in two ways: (a) a credit of 10% effort, normally in teaching, in a semester with 6 or more active doctoral students as chair/co-chair (to be negotiated with the departmental chair as commensurate with effort), and (b) a credit of 10% effort, normally in teaching, per every five doctoral students graduated (chair/co-chair). This credit would be documented on the workload in a semester following the graduation of the fifth doctoral student. The specific semester in which this credit will be awarded will be negotiated between the faculty member and the Chair. Another common reason for negotiating an adjustment of teaching effort to activities other than teaching a course may be to acknowledge faculty who assume responsibility for supervising student teachers. For example, a faculty member who is supervising several student teachers in a semester (typically six) may have 10% of their effort in teaching credited toward this work. All adjustments of teaching activities must be discussed with the chair and reflected in the workload. Annual workload assignments require approval of the Dean or Dean's designee.

III. Department Annual Review and Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department of CI/LS Annual Review and Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation (AR/PTE) Committee evaluates and makes recommendations annually on the performance of all faculty members in alignment with the criteria, policies, and procedures outlined in this document. This committee is also responsible for making recommendations of applications for promotion and/or tenure. The committee is responsible for ensuring a fair review process and making recommendations on documentation and evidence from the faculty file.

The AR/PTE committee consists of five (5) faculty members. The composition of the AR/PTE Committee should reflect the composition of the faculty. Therefore, one member shall hold the title of Service or Teaching faculty. At least three members will be tenured. Normally these members will represent both associate and full ranks. In a year in which a faculty member is being reviewed for promotion from the rank of associate to full, at least one member of the committee must be at the rank of full.

The Department Chair, any representative to the College or University Promotion and Tenure Committee, any faculty member who does not have service as an area of responsibility (generally only in situations in which a faculty member's time is bought out to serve another unit in the university), or any faculty member who is being reviewed for a critical decision are not

eligible to serve on the department AR/PTE committee. If necessary, faculty members in other departments may be asked to serve on the committee by the Department Chair if circumstances prevent enough eligible faculty members from the department to serve.

Membership of the AR/PTE Committee will be decided by a vote of all full-time faculty members in the department. All faculty who are eligible to serve will be on the ballot. The Chair will appoint external faculty members, if needed.

The chair of the AR/PTE Committee is elected by the members of the committee. The chair will, in most cases, be a tenured faculty member who has had at least one year of experience serving on the AR/PTE Committee. Any membership changes of the AR/PTE Committee that requires a new election will also require a new election of the committee chair.

Elections will take place by the end of the preceding Spring term following the election of the college committee. Members of the committee are elected to serve a two-year term. The terms of service shall alternate with two to three new members elected each year. No member may serve more than two (2) consecutive terms (this includes terms on the department and/or college).

The AR/PTE Committee will meet regularly as needed to fulfill its responsibilities. All members of the committee must attend all meetings. Members may recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating someone that may present a conflict of interest, e.g., themselves, a partner, spouse, or immediate family member--or former partners/spouses. When the committee chair must recuse themselves, the remaining committee members will elect by majority vote another member of the committee will serve as acting chair during that case. All members of the AR/PTE Committee are required to keep committee deliberations and all information contained in the evaluation files confidential. An exception to this rule is allowed if the Committee or a member of the Committee needs to report an apparent violation of WVU, College, or departmental procedures. In such a case, the Committee or member may disclose to institutional officials (e.g., the Department Chair, Dean, Provost, as appropriate) with a need to know the information necessary to describe the violation.

IV. The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty members are responsible for reporting and documenting their achievements in teaching, research, and service electronically in the Digital Measures platform. It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide evidence in Digital Measures that (a) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (b) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The information included in Digital Measures comprises the evidence for all faculty evaluation files. The *CEHS Guidelines* (Section IV, "Faculty Evaluation Documents and Digital Measures") outlines details and structure of the information to be included in the faculty evaluation file in Digital Measures.

V. Annual Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion Review Process

A. Annual review

The annual review evaluates performance in each area of assignment for the year under review. Each faculty member is to provide evidence that will be used in the review. This evidence should demonstrate the faculty member's activity in each area of their work assignment as well as the quality of that work. The evaluation will focus on the evidence provided in the file.

The eligible voting members of the department AR/PTE committee will review each faculty member's case and discuss their contributions in each area of responsibility on the workload. Following this, the committee will assign one of four ratings to each area of responsibility on the faculty member's workload (teaching, research, and service): excellent (characterizing contributions of high merit); good (characterizing contributions of merit), satisfactory (characterizing performance that meets the minimal expectations but is not sufficient for promotion and/or tenure); or unsatisfactory (characterizing contributions that fall below expectations).

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward continued productivity or, if applicable, promotion and/or tenure. The committee will forward a summary of its deliberations along with its evaluations, signed by the members of the committee, to the Department Chair.

B. Annual Review File

In addition to all documents uploaded to Digital Measures providing evidence of activities in teaching, research and/or service as described above, the Annual Review File must include:

- Curriculum Vitae – updated and submitted annually
- Annual Review Narrative: The faculty member must submit a report every year to facilitate annual performance evaluations (about 4-5 pages). This report covers the most recently completed year of work. The narrative should describe and support the faculty member's contributions during the reporting period in each applicable area of responsibility (Teaching, Research, Service, and Administrative). The narrative provides faculty with an opportunity to provide context for the supporting documentation that accompanies the evaluation file. For example, faculty members are encouraged to describe such things as their contributions to multi-author publications, describe the significance of publications, detail efforts to develop and/or revise courses and/or programs, and the ways in which they have responded to recommendations from prior reviews.
- Faculty Productivity Report - to be run by the faculty member, reviewed and submitted annually. The Faculty Productivity Report is generated automatically by Digital Measures and includes active links to the information elsewhere submitted in Digital Measures, including in the Teaching, Scholarship/Research, and Teaching sections.

- Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure Documents – Department Chair reviews, department committee reviews, College committee reviews (if applicable), and any written responses from the faculty member.

Other Documentation as applicable:

- A Cumulative Pre-Promotion Narrative that summarizes work since the initial appointment at WVU is required of probationary tenure-track faculty members normally three years before the Critical Year. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for work done before starting at WVU, the credited work also should be included in the narrative.
- A Pre-Promotion Narrative is permitted to be submitted by non-tenure-track Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured associate professors, to solicit the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion. In these cases, the report should be based on either work since the initial appointment at WVU or work since the last promotion at WVU, whichever is appropriate. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure and promotion for work done before starting at WVU, and the work was done during the period covered by the Narrative, then the credited work should also be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.
- Other Supporting Documentation - items of an administrative nature that the Department Chair or Dean may wish to include.

C. Review for Tenure and Promotion

Review for tenure and promotion results in recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion. Each member of the AR/PTE committee participates in the review process and decides their vote of Yes/No/Abstain. A majority vote, excluding abstention votes, is required for a recommendation for tenure or a recommendation for tenure and for promotion. The committee will forward a summary statement of their deliberations along with its recommendations, signed by all members of the committee, to the Department Chair. The Department Chair, following his or her evaluation will forward his or her written recommendations along with those of the AR/PTE committee to the Dean.

D. Promotion and Tenure File

In addition to all documents uploaded to Digital Measures providing evidence of activities in teaching, research and/or service as described above, the Promotion and Tenure File should Include:

- Curriculum Vitae – updated and submitted annually
- Promotion/Tenure Narratives (Teaching, Research, and Service Narratives) which summarize accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion or tenure. The narratives' end date is on the last working day in December. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, the credited work is also included in the narratives.

- Faculty Productivity Report - cumulative report including all years in the review period. The Faculty Productivity Report is generated automatically by Digital Measures and includes active links to the information elsewhere submitted in Digital Measures, including in the Teaching, Scholarship/Research, and Teaching sections.
- Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure Documents – Department Chair reviews, department committee reviews, College committee reviews (if applicable), and any written responses or rebuttals from the faculty member.

VI. Professional Expectations and Evaluation

The Department of CI/LS adheres to the guidelines outlined in WVU's [Code of Conduct](#) which states, in part:

The professional conduct of West Virginia University employees is critical to the fulfillment of WVU's mission, vision and values. The success of our University is built upon the concept of our employees and officials conducting themselves in a manner that demonstrates WVU's values: Service, Curiosity, Respect, Accountability and Appreciation....The Code of Conduct outlines how WVU expects our employees to perform our work and interact with all members of the University community, including students, other WVU employees and visitors....WVU promotes freedom of expression and open communications. The University supports and encourages everyone to express their thoughts and concerns in a respectful manner. Leaders should provide fair and equitable treatment of others and create a positive, diverse, inclusive work environment. WVU expects employees to abide by these standards, to protect the University by complying with state and federal laws and regulations, and to follow professional standards of conduct and/or ethical requirements specific to their assignment or discipline.

A. Annual evaluation

The quality of a faculty member's performance in teaching, research and service is the basis for annual evaluation. Expectations for productivity in each of these areas is outlined below.

1. Evaluation of Teaching

In the Department of CI/LS, teaching is at the heart of a faculty member's responsibility. Teaching involves the dissemination of knowledge and the stimulation of critical thinking. Teaching includes not only traditional modes of instruction such as classroom lecture, but also laboratory or practicum instruction, thesis and dissertation directions, various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction, advising, and evaluation and ongoing feedback in support of student learning.

While teaching can be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department, it is expected that a course portfolio (including syllabus, brief narrative, SEIs, sample exams/assignments, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness) be submitted for each course taught during the review period. An exception to SEI inclusion may be in the case of courses that are independent studies, directed research, dissertation (usually having course numbers such as 790, 797, 795, and/or 798) or courses in which only one student is enrolled. In these cases, the faculty member may opt out of administering the SEI for that course. In order to avoid excessive reliance on student evaluations, which can be biased and provide only a partial picture of instructional quality, faculty are encouraged to include other forms of evidence of the quality of their teaching in their file (e.g., peer observations/reviews of teaching, recognition of teaching excellence in the form of awards.)

The Department will evaluate the quality of each faculty member's teaching based upon their assigned teaching duties. In addition to evidence related to assigned coursework, teaching activities submitted for review might include (but are not limited to): the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students' theses and dissertations, supervision of pre-service teachers' field or clinical placements, clinical or practicum work, mentored teaching/lead instructor role, accreditation activities (CAEP or SPA), professional development activities (development or implementation of PD), edTPA support, outreach work in public schools, program development and/or revision, course and/or curriculum development and/or revision, and development of curricular materials (e.g., textbooks, units). In the event that any of the above teaching activities are part of the faculty member's workload agreement, evidence is expected to be provided to substantiate the nature of those responsibilities. Otherwise, faculty are strongly encouraged to provide evidence on activities such as the ones listed above to be considered as part of their overall teaching effort. This is to provide documentation for the committee to consider that clearly and comprehensively demonstrates the *range of ways* the faculty has engaged in teaching and the quality of those efforts.

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity.

The quality of teaching is expected to tend toward meritorious ratings. Faculty members who have received credit for other teaching activities beyond a course (e.g., advising, program development, accreditation work, student supervision) should note that in their narratives. Further, they should use the narrative and their reporting in Digital Measures to describe the work completed and the hours and activities typically involved. The narrative, in combination with documentation in Digital measures, should help other colleagues in the department understand the significance and impact of these activities.

Evidence of teaching and teaching related work may fall into several categories. All files must include: a) a teaching statement/summary in the annual narrative; b) all course syllabi; and c)

student evaluations (SEI and others). In addition, faculty are encouraged to provide additional documentation. These may include:

Teaching Materials & Assignments

- Lecture notes or lesson plans
- Descriptions of uses of computer or other technologies in teaching
- Course/class activities that reflect course goals
- Descriptions of special projects, such as independent study projects

Representative Student Learning Materials

- Students' papers, lesson plans, portfolios, reflections, or other assignments.
- Instructor's written feedback on student assignments.

Representative Evaluations of Teaching (beyond SEI)

- Mid-term or end-of-course evaluations (faculty-developed)
- Letters from students (preferable unsolicited)
- Comments from peer or colleague observation

Representative Undergraduate or Graduate Advising

- Lists or descriptions of undergraduate advising work.
- List or description of graduate advising work.
- List or description of directed research, independent study, and/or mentored teaching.
- List or description of dissertation or proposal development support.
- Membership on doctoral committees.

Representative Professional Development Materials

- Participation in seminars or meetings related to teaching.
- Design of new courses or redesign of existing courses.
- Use of new teaching approaches, including new technologies and course materials, and new assessment strategies.

Representative Materials Demonstrating Teaching Leadership or Innovation

- Description of activities related to serving as a course lead and/or mentoring other faculty including adjuncts.
- Supervision of students in practicum or internship placements.
- Description of work on curriculum revision or development
- Teacher development workshops

Representative Teaching Honors and Recognitions

- Nominations for college teaching award.
- Teaching awards from department, college, university or profession.
- Invitations based on teaching expertise to consult, guest lecture, or provide professional development.

Descriptions of the ratings possible in teaching, **Excellent**, **Good**, **Satisfactory**, and **Unsatisfactory**, are below.

Excellent. A rating of Excellent indicates that there is evidence that efforts in teaching consistently and significantly exceed departmental expectations for satisfactory teaching. The quality of teaching and related work are consistently exceptional. Teaching performance evaluated as excellent usually includes a combination of evidence from a range of activities as noted above (usually at least three categories) which could include, *but is not limited to*, teaching courses, advising undergraduate or graduate students, the mentoring of graduate students' theses and dissertations, supervision of pre-service teachers' field or clinical placements, clinical or practicum work, mentored teaching/lead instructor role, accreditation activities (CAEP or SPA), professional development activities (development or implementation of PD), edTPA support, outreach work in public schools, program development and/or revision, course or curriculum development and/or revision, and development of curricular materials (e.g., textbooks, units). It is the range and/or quality of the activities and the commitment required rather than the number of activities that will determine an evaluation of excellent.

Good. A rating of Good indicates that there is evidence that efforts in teaching consistently exceed departmental expectations for satisfactory teaching. Teaching performance evaluated as good usually includes a combination of evidence from at least two types of activities (as described above). It is the range and/or quality of the activities and the commitment required rather than the number of activities that will determine an evaluation of good.

Satisfactory. A rating of Satisfactory indicates that there is evidence that teaching meets department expectations and materials support evidence of effort. However, evidence is limited and typically includes only the required elements (syllabi and SEIs from assigned courses). The evidence provided demonstrates the quality of activities or the commitment needed to meet but not consistently exceed departmental expectations.

Unsatisfactory. A rating of Unsatisfactory indicates that there is little to no evidence of teaching effectiveness. The required elements may be missing or underdeveloped. Little to no supporting material is provided that demonstrates quality or commitment in other teaching activities described above.

2. Evaluation of Research and Scholarship

Tenure-track faculty in the Department of CI/LS are expected to establish and maintain an active research agenda in their field of expertise and consistent with the expectations outlined in their letter of appointment and any subsequent memoranda of understanding.

Refereed publications in high-quality journal outlets, books and successfully funded grant proposals are common, but not the sole, evidence of scholarly productivity. Other examples of research or scholarly activities are listed below.

Research Activities (some illustrative examples; these are not exhaustive):

- Publications
 - Peer-reviewed journal articles
 - Peer-reviewed book chapters
 - Books
 - Peer-reviewed practitioner articles
 - Book reviews
 - Invited chapters

- Public scholarship
 - International/national media
 - Op-eds, online media publications, print media
 - Podcasts/Radio/Television

- Dissemination of research
 - National and international conference presentation
 - Peer-reviewed conference proceedings¹

- Grant activity (NOTE: The AR/PTE committee does not evaluate administrative tasks related to grants; this is part of the administrative workload).
 - Grant proposal submissions
 - Grants awarded
 - Grant implementation (carrying out the research/work of the grant)

- Creative works
- Ongoing research activity
 - Data collection and analysis
 - Manuscript submissions
 - Revise and resubmit book proposals
 - Special journal issue proposals
 - Editing a book

The criteria for Excellent, Good, and Satisfactory ratings outlined below are illustrative examples. These are not exhaustive examples.

Please note: only publications that are either unequivocally accepted (needing no further revisions), in press, or published may be counted as a publication. The faculty member should be clear in the narrative statement at which state they wish to “count” a particular piece. For the purposes of assessing the number of publications, a publication will only be counted at accepted, in-press, or published once. For example, if the faculty member chooses to submit an accepted manuscript as a counted publication, they may not also count the manuscript when it enters either the in-press or final publication stage. For promotion to professor, only publications that are in print may be counted.

¹ Some sub-fields may view peer-review, published conference proceedings as leading outlet publications. A case for counting proceedings as publications should be made in the research narrative.

For a critical year decision, faculty members should display a record displaying a range of authorship (some first or sole if required by Letter of Appointment or Memorandum of Understanding) on publications is important.

Expectations for research products align with the proportion of workload assigned to Research effort as outlined below.

40% Research

Annual productivity rated as excellent typically includes two publications (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published during the annual review period or one publication and other research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products (e.g., grant, book).

Annual productivity rated as good typically includes one significant publication (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published during the annual review period or a significant number of peer-reviewed manuscript submissions and/or revise and resubmit decisions as well as other research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as satisfactory typically includes clear evidence of research activity that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as unsatisfactory provides little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of scholarly or creative work. The required documentation of satisfactory research may be missing, incomplete, or unacceptable in terms of quality and the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload agreement.

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity. Further, the committee will examine prior evaluations and narratives to verify the status of publications that may have been counted in past reviews to ensure consistency.

Book publications may be considered significant publications over three annual review cycles (i.e. counted during the acceptance/contracted year and completed publication year)

*Target for faculty being reviewed for tenure is an average of two publications (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) per year (9 to 12 total). Scholars who publish books may have fewer journal publications along with published, peer-reviewed scholarly books.

30% Research

Annual productivity rated as excellent typically includes one publication (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published during the annual review period and clear evidence of ongoing research activity that would reasonably be expected to lead to publication (e.g., funded grants, manuscripts under review, etc.).

Annual productivity rated as good includes a number of manuscript submissions and/or revise and resubmit decisions as well as other research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as satisfactory typically includes clear evidence of research activity that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as unsatisfactory provides little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of scholarly or creative work. The required documentation of satisfactory research may be missing, incomplete, or unacceptable in terms of quality and the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload agreement.

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity. Further, the committee will examine prior evaluations and narratives to verify the status of publications that may have been counted in past reviews to ensure consistency.

Book publications may be considered significant publications over three annual review cycles (i.e. counted during the acceptance/contracted year and completed publication year)

*Target goal for faculty being reviewed for tenure is an average of 1.5 per publications per year (7-9 total) (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed). Scholars who publish books may have fewer journal publications along with published, peer-reviewed scholarly books.

20% Research

Annual productivity rated as excellent may include one significant publication (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published during the annual review period or several manuscript submissions and/or revise and resubmit decisions.

Annual productivity rated as good may be a manuscript submission and/or revise and resubmit decision as well as other research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as satisfactory may be clear evidence of significant research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as unsatisfactory provides little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of scholarly or creative work. The required documentation of satisfactory research may be missing, incomplete, or unacceptable in terms of quality and the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload agreement.

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity. Further, the committee will examine prior evaluations and narratives to

verify the status of publications that may have been counted in past reviews to ensure consistency.

For those in fields where books are normative, book publications may be considered significant publications over two annual review cycles (i.e. counted during the acceptance/contracted year and completed publication year).

10% Research

Annual productivity rated as excellent may be one significant publication (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published or two manuscripts submissions and/or revise and resubmit decisions over a two-year cycle.

Annual productivity rated as good may a manuscript submission and/or revise and resubmit decision as well as other research activity (as listed above) over a two-year cycle that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as satisfactory may be clear evidence of significant research activity (as listed above) over a two-year cycle that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as unsatisfactory provides little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of scholarly or creative work. The required documentation of satisfactory research may be missing, incomplete, or unacceptable in terms of quality and the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload agreement.

For those in fields where books are normative, book publications may be considered significant publications over two annual review cycles (i.e. counted during the acceptance/contracted year and completed publication year)

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity. Further, the committee will examine prior evaluations and narratives to verify the status of publications that may have been counted in past reviews to ensure consistency.

50% Research

Annual productivity rated as excellent may be three significant publications (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published during the annual review period or two peer-reviewed publications and other research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products (e.g., grant, book); A 50% Research assignment normally is reserved for individuals who hold an active significant federal research grant.

Annual productivity rated as good may be two significant publications (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) accepted or published during the annual review period or one significant publication published with a significant number of manuscript submissions and/or revise and resubmit decisions as well as other research activity (as listed above) that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as satisfactory may be one significant publication (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) and clear evidence of research activity that would ultimately lead to scholarly products.

Annual productivity rated as unsatisfactory provides little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of scholarly or creative work. The required documentation of satisfactory research may be missing, incomplete, or unacceptable in terms of quality and the faculty member's letter of appointment and workload agreement.

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity. Further, the committee will examine prior evaluations and narratives to verify the status of publications that may have been counted in past reviews to ensure consistency.

For those in fields where books are normative, book publications may be considered significant publications over two annual review cycles (i.e. counted during the acceptance/contracted year and completed publication year)

*Target for faculty being reviewed for tenure is an average of 2-3 publications per year (12 to 18 total). Scholars who publish books may have fewer journal publications along with published, peer-reviewed scholarly books.

3. Evaluation of Service

The Department of CI/LS values service to the department, the College, and the University, service to the profession, and service to the local and state community.

Faculty should document their efforts and successes in service on the annual productivity report. The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with the faculty member's university affiliation identified. There are a range of workload assignments in the department. Therefore, there will be a range of service profiles. To help clarify a faculty's service profile in a given year, each faculty member must always include:

- 1) A reflective statement describing service efforts in the annual narrative, and
- 2) Documentation in Digital Measures that provides representative evidence of service activities and their significance (time commitment and/or outcomes).

Examples of service activities are listed below.

Service Activities (some illustrative examples; these are not exhaustive):

- Service to the Department:

- Departmental Committees and Working Groups or Ad Hoc Committees
 - Recruitment events
 - Development of marketing and promotional materials such as brochures, targeted emails, social media advertisements, radio ads, etc.
 - Advising (unless included in a faculty's administrative appointment)
- Service to the College:
 - College Committees
 - Advising Student Organizations specific to students from CEHS
 - Organizing events for CEHS students/faculty/staff such as guest speakers, graduation banquet, etc.
- Service to the University:
 - University Committees
 - Advising Student Organizations open to anyone within the university
 - Presenting at university functions
 - Collaborating with other departments/colleges on programs or tasks that can be mutually beneficial
 - Service to the university includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college.
- Service to the Profession:
 - Editorial board memberships and ad hoc journal reviews
 - Serving agencies specific to your field in the form of a board member, committee member, volunteer, etc.
 - Providing community outreach specific to your field (can be in conjunction with a public school or an outside agency)
 - Organizing conferences or other events
 - Collaborating with agencies to bring about policy changes (example: WVDE, CAEP, SPAs, etc.)
 - Consultant or expert advisor related to your field

While faculty are encouraged to share multiple sources of documentation of their service activities, they do not have to include everything in their file. Rather, they should select a representative collection that provides representation of the range of their efforts and the significance of those efforts.

Excellent. Annual productivity in service is rated as excellent when there is evidence that service has been performed that is well above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Excellent service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: extensive and continuing time and/or effort; extensive knowledge of (or willingness to learn about) the department, college, institution, or profession; or extensive and continuing responsibilities in terms of organization, leadership, etc.

Good. Annual productivity in service is rated as good when there is evidence that service has been performed that is above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Good service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: significant time and/or effort; knowledge of (or willingness to learn about) the department, college, institution, or profession; or significant responsibilities in terms of organization, leadership, etc.

Satisfactory. Annual productivity in service is rated as satisfactory when there is evidence that service has been performed at the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Satisfactory service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits: moderate time and/or effort; or responsibilities that require attendance at meetings.

Unsatisfactory. Annual productivity in service is rated as unsatisfactory when there is little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed time in terms of service to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community.

In addition, the committee will consult evaluative statements from prior annual evaluations to determine if the individual has addressed feedback for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, if applicable, or continued productivity.

4. Evaluation of Administrative Service

Administrative service may be designated for faculty who are program coordinators or who hold other administrative responsibilities at the department or college level (e.g., associate chair, directors, etc.). Administrative service is evaluated by the Chair at the department level or at the appropriate unit head at the college or university level (i.e., Dean). Administrative service is not evaluated by the department committee.

All candidates that have an administrative service assignment must have a letter of appointment for this activity from the appropriate supervisor in digital measures.

VII. Performance-Based Salary Policy

The *WVU Procedures* document (Section IX.C, “Descriptors for Annual Review”) and the *CEHS Guidelines* (Section X, “Performance-Based Salary Increases) outline procedures for performance-based salary increases. Please refer to these documents for a full description.

VIII. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Review

The cumulative pre-promotion review, formerly known as the mid-tenure evaluation, is a departmental expectation for probationary faculty (i.e., pre-tenure faculty). The review is

intended to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. The review will consider progress toward tenure in relation to workload assignments, field of specialization, and responsiveness to previous feedback provided in past letters from the departmental evaluation committee and the department chair.

The review normally will be conducted three years (non-inclusive of leave) prior to the Critical Year by both the AR/PTE Committee and the Department Chair. According to the *CEHS Guidelines*, "Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the areas of significant contribution or in fulfilling specific expectations in the letter of appointment may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the Critical Year."

Individuals will submit productivity materials and a pre-promotion narrative. External reviews are not included in this process. According to the *CEHS Guidelines*, the cumulative pre-promotion narrative should summarize "work since the initial appointment at WVU." In addition, "If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for work done before starting at WVU, the credited work also should be included in the narrative."

Pre-promotion narratives can also be submitted by non-tenure-track Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured associate professors. As outlined in the *CEHS Guidelines*, the purpose of these narratives is to solicit feedback on progress towards promotion. In these cases, the report should be based on either work since the initial appointment at WVU or work since the last promotion at WVU, as appropriate. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure and promotion for work done before starting at WVU, and the work was done during the period covered by the Narrative, then the credited work should also be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.

The cumulative pre-promotion review is evaluated as follows:

- Contributions in teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching.
- Because significant contributions in research are expected of Tenure-Track faculty members, there will be a particular focus on the expectation to have developed an active and sustainable research program as defined in the letter of appointment. The evaluation is based on the cumulative pre-promotion report described in Section IV.C.1.b of the *CEHS Guidelines* as well as the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File.
- Besides ratings of teaching, research, and service (as appropriate to the faculty member's assignment), the evaluation includes a judgment about whether the faculty member is making progress toward promotion and tenure and what steps, if any, are needed for improvement.

The cumulative pre-promotion evaluation also includes a recommendation to continue the faculty member at their current rank (termination is recommended by voting against continuation). In a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation, a recommendation in favor of continuation suggests that the faculty member is likely to attain tenure in the Critical Year. A

recommendation against continuation suggests that the faculty member is unlikely to attain tenure in the Critical Year.

IX. Promotion and Tenure Review Process

A. External review

In most cases, faculty members going up for promotion must include external evaluations in the Faculty Evaluation File. The exception to this would be a faculty member seeking promotion from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor or Teaching Assistant to Teaching Associate Professor do not need external letters). For a full description of the external review process, please see Section XII (“External Evaluations”) of the *WVU Procedures* document and Section IX of the *CEHS Guidelines*.

The general procedures for identifying and selecting suitable external evaluators are described in Section XII (“External Evaluations”) of the *WVU Procedures* document and Section IX (“External Evaluations”) of the *CEHS Guidelines*. In C&I/LS, the identification of external evaluators is shared by the AR/PTE Committee and the Department Chair utilizing the process that follows. Additional details, such as the timeline for completing the steps, are subject to change and distributed annually by the Office of the Provost.

B. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure-Tenure Track Faculty

The department adheres to the policies and procedures outlined in the *CEHS Guidelines* relating to promotion and tenure and evaluation of Emeritus Status (Section VII.C and Section VII.E).

The department of CI/LS recognizes the diversity of our faculty and their contributions to our department, the college, the university, the state, and their respective fields. Therefore, we take the position that the determination of *significant contributions* is “dynamic and multifaceted” and cannot be strictly quantified “in artificially precise terms” (George Mason University, College of Education and Human Development, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines: Criteria for Tenure, p. 8). Rather:

Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mountaineer). (George Mason, College of Education and Human Development, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines: Criteria for Tenure, p. 8)

In addition to the information outlined in the *CEHS Guidelines* (Section VII.D), CI/LS also includes the following criteria for tenure and/or promotion.

1. Promotion to Associate

Promotion to Associate Professor normally requires significant contributions in both teaching and research and reasonable contributions in service (unless prior approval has been received to change the areas requiring significant contributions, as outlined in University guidelines). The term “significant contributions” in teaching suggests performance in classroom teaching, academic and research advising or in other settings which meets or exceeds that of colleagues recently promoted in C&I/LS.

The term “significant contributions” in research suggests performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently promoted in C&I/LS and in similar departments at peer or aspirational peer universities. Beyond the mere quantity, the quality of the research, as measured by its impact on the field is also strongly considered. Research accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by the scholars at peer or aspirational institutions. For promotion to Associate Professor, works either in press, published or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate to account for the tenure decision but the majority of the work presented for tenured decision should be in print.

Faculty members submitting for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should clearly and explicitly address the following as a part of their narrative statement:

- Expectations Stated in the Memorandum of Understanding
- Overview of Student Evaluations
- Overview of Annual Review Ratings
- Feedback/Suggestions in Annual Review Letters
- Comparisons of Recently Promoted (2 previous years) Peers within the Department
(NOTE: If no one in the department was recently promoted, then peers recently promoted within CEHS could serve as a comparison.)

2. Promotion to Professor

Ordinarily, the Interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement and a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. For promotion to Professor, the focus of the evaluation is on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term associate professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity assuming that more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time.

To be recommended for promotion to Professor, an Associate Professor is normally expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research, significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or in other settings, and reasonable contributions in service. An exception occurs when prior approval has been received to change the areas requiring significant contributions as

prescribed in the University guidelines. For promotion to Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print. Annual evaluations should guide faculty towards this achievement.

Faculty members submitting for promotion to Professor should clearly and explicitly address the following as a part of their narrative statement:

- Expectations Stated in the Memorandum of Understanding
- Expectations Stated in Tenure Letter from the Provost Office
- Overview of Student Evaluations
- Overview of Annual Review Ratings
- Feedback/Suggestions in Annual Review Letters
- Comparisons of Recently Promoted (2 previous years) Peers within the Department
- Leadership Roles
- National Recognition Associated with Significant Areas

C. Criteria for Promotion of Teaching and Service Faculty

1. Promotion of a Teaching or Service Instructor to Assistant Professor

- a) Teaching assistant professor: Promotion to a professorial rank – that is, from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor – normally requires a terminal degree. As described in Section II.B of *CEHS Guidelines*, the Dean may grant an exception in an emerging field with a scarcity of specialists with doctoral degrees, in which case significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree.
- b) Service assistant professor: Promotion to a professorial rank - that is, from Service Instructor to Service Assistant Professor - normally requires a relevant terminal degree at the time of promotion (and meets the other criteria for promotion).

2. Promotion to Teaching or Service Associate Professor

- a) Teaching associate professor: For promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to the rank of Teaching Associate Professor, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain a narrative and evidence of the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective judgment of students, student advisees and/or mentees, and of peer and Chair evaluations of instructional performance. The File may 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 college. Note that external evaluations are *not* needed as part of the Faculty Evaluation File for faculty members seeking promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor.
- b) Service associate professor: Promotion to Service Associate Professor requires significant contributions in teaching and in service (and reasonable contributions in research), as specified in the letter of appointment. There is special emphasis

on service. Because promotion of Service faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory. As noted in Section IV.E of the *CEHS Guidelines*, however, departments provide such reviews upon request, so that Service faculty members can obtain the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

- c) In a year when a faculty member who has service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's service from persons external to the University, as described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the *WVU Procedures* document and Section IX of the *CEHS Guidelines*.

Promotion to a Teaching or Service Professor

- d) For promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evidence showing that professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally or internationally, acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline. Departmental evaluations can document the judgment of colleagues within the university. To document the judgments of colleagues nationally or internationally, the candidate for Teaching Professor has two options: (a) The file must include evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's programmatic contributions in teaching from persons external to WVU, as described in Section IX of the *CEHS Guidelines*, and/or (b) the file must include a record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature, and/or a record of pedagogically related presentations at professional conferences of national or international stature.
- e) In a year when a faculty member who has service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's service from persons external to the University, as described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the *WVU Procedures* document and Section IX of the *CEHS Guidelines*.

D. Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Review and Tenure, Promotion, or Termination Recommendations

1. Annual Review

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 or otherwise takes issue with the evaluations or the assignment of descriptors the faculty member may work informally with the Chairperson or ask the Dean to review the evaluations or descriptors. After considering the faculty member's request, the Dean may direct the Chairperson or AR/PTE 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.

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

2. Tenure, Promotion, or Termination

Faculty members may submit formal responses to their evaluations from the AR/PTE committee or the Department Chair. For a full description of this process, please refer to the *CEHS Guidelines* (Section VII, "Rebuttals and Responses to Faculty Evaluations") and the *WVU Procedures* (Sections XIII.A.4, XIII.A.5, XIII.A.6 and XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6).

X. Changes to This Document

Eligible faculty members (i.e., full time [1.0 FTE] permanent employees of CI/LS in the Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Service categories) can propose a change or an addition to this *Manual* by making a recommendation to the Department Chair. After consulting with appropriate parties – for example, the Dean, the Department AR/PTE Committee – the Department Chair will make a recommendation to the faculty. If a ballot of eligible faculty members yields a simple majority in favor of the proposal, the change or addition will be incorporated into a revised draft of this *Manual* and submitted for the Dean's approval. Upon such approval, the revised *Manual* will be adopted for the subsequent review year.