

**Department of Psychology  
Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual**

Approved by Psychology Faculty 2/25/26

Approved by Provost's Office 4/13/26

## **I. Introduction**

The Department of Psychology's *Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual* supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*. Because the basic review of faculty members takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the Department's standards and policies for faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, West Virginia University, and the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty members to study carefully the standards, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, Department.

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

## **II. The Faculty Evaluation File**

Each faculty member must annually update their Faculty Evaluation File with documentation of activities completed during the reporting period under review. On the department-specified deadline date, the file shall be closed for the evaluation of activities during the reporting period.

The Faculty Evaluation File has several parts: one or more productivity reports as described in the next section; supporting materials to document accomplishments over the reporting period(s) in teaching, research, and service, or to establish the quality of these accomplishments; narratives that summarize key achievements in areas of significant contribution; and a current vita.

### **II.A Faculty Productivity Reports**

Central to the Faculty Evaluation File is the productivity report. There are three types: the Annual Report, Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report, and Promotion/Tenure Report.

#### *II.A.1. Annual Report*

Each year, by the department-specified deadline, the faculty member must ensure that the Faculty Evaluation File in the digital evaluation file is fully updated with an Annual Report and supporting materials including a current vita. Annual Reports also must include a 1-2 page narrative for each area of significant contribution. Narratives summarize the activities and accomplishments in the area and provide context for the activities in that reporting period.

The Eberly College Dean's Office will ensure that the materials available for the annual review include a copy of the faculty member's letter of hire and other official agreements indicating the nature of the faculty member's institutional role, including the Workload Plan that summarizes

the annual assignment; evaluations written by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and the Department Chair for the last three years; and a copy of any letters awarding promotion or tenure; student evaluations of teaching; and evaluation letters from the Dean or the College FEC.

Normally, all grant and contract activity recorded by the Office of Sponsored Programs is automatically imported into the digital evaluation file. Faculty are responsible for ensuring that all information is accurate, whether the file is set to automatically import such information or not.

Each faculty member in the Department of Psychology must use the Faculty Productivity Report template in the digital evaluation file to produce an Annual Report that covers the evaluation period (usually one year, but less for faculty members in the initial year of their appointment) and should reference the department's annual Guidelines for Using the Digital Evaluation File for Completing Faculty Productivity Reports document.

The Department of Psychology uses a July 1 to June 30 reporting period for annual evaluations, with the subsequent September 15 as the deadline for updating Faculty Evaluation Files. Exceptions are made for first-year faculty members, whose reporting period is from the beginning of the faculty member's contractual obligation to the date that final grades are due in the appointment year. First-year faculty must update personnel files within two days after final grades are due. This deadline accommodates the review of and response to evaluations of teaching.

#### *II.A.2. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report*

In a year when a faculty member undergoes a mid-career evaluation, the faculty member uses the Faculty Productivity Report template in the digital evaluation file to produce a Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report that links to supporting materials submitted to the Faculty Evaluation File during the time in rank related to teaching, research, and service, as well as annual ratings of these activities by the FEC and the Department Chair. This is a more extensive version of the Annual Productivity Report, and it also must link to a Career Supplement Report. The template for the Career Supplement Report is provided in the department's annual Guidelines for Using the Digital Evaluation File for Completing Faculty Productivity Reports document. The deadline for submitting the report and materials is September 15.

Note that "time in rank" is the time since the start date of the faculty member's initial appointment or since January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later.

#### *II.A.3. Promotion/Tenure Report*

In a year when a faculty member is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member uses the Faculty Productivity Report template in the digital evaluation file to produce a Promotion/Tenure Report that links to supporting materials submitted to the Faculty Evaluation File during the time in rank related to teaching, research, and service. . This is a more extensive version of the Annual Report, and it also must include a Career Supplement Report. The template for the Career Supplement Report is provided in the department's annual Guidelines for

Using the Digital Evaluation File for Completing Faculty Productivity Reports document. The Promotion/Tenure Report and supporting materials are due on December 31.

Note that “time in rank” is the time since the start date of the faculty member’s initial appointment or since January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later.

## **II.B. Supporting Materials**

Productivity reports and supporting materials are submitted through the digital evaluation file. The next sections describe the supporting materials appropriate for documenting achievements in research, teaching, and service.

### *II.B.1. Research*

“Research” includes any professionally relevant scholarly activity, including authored or edited books or book chapters, journal articles, funded grants and research-generating contracts, submitted grants and research-generating contracts, technical reports, published abstracts, and scholarly presentations.

Scholarly presentations are academic papers or posters presented at a regional, national, or international conference, or an invited academic presentation at a college or university outside of WVU.

Some scholarly activities, such as responsibilities on an editorial board or as a consultant on research projects, provide evidence of external recognition of a research program. These activities are described in the research narrative so that the recognition is considered by the FEC and Department Chair when evaluating research. The activities themselves, however, are considered professional service and are reported as described in Section II.B.3 below.

Publications must be documented by a preprint or reprint of the item. Drafts of items designated as “submitted” or “accepted” must be included in the file. Items designated as “accepted” must include the letter from the action editor or other responsible party indicating that the item is unequivocally accepted.

Credit is given for a publication just once: either when it is listed as accepted or when it is listed as published. If a faculty member wants to defer credit until the reporting period in which a paper is published, they should leave it listed as submitted until it is published. Special attention is paid to whether the faculty member is a senior author on published works and to whether those works report peer-reviewed empirical findings.

The faculty member should indicate which of their co-authors on published works and scholarly presentations are graduate or undergraduate students.

For grant proposals submitted, received, or renewed during the reporting period, the final submitted proposal, which should include research strategy, budget details, and confirmation of submission, must be attached to the digital evaluation file entry for the award. For funded grants, attach a copy of the Award Notice to the digital evaluation file entry for the award.

The faculty member is required to provide evidence of the potential for (Assistant Professors) or establishment of (Associate Professors and full Professors) national or international recognition of their scholarship. Such evidence may include appointments or elections to positions of authority within relevant professional organizations (e.g., scientific societies, journal editorships).

There is no required format for the Research Narrative in the Annual Report. The department provides a template for the narrative, which outlines context for how their research activity has met the goals for the reporting period, notable accomplishments included among the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File, any challenges they faced and how they plan to overcome them, and how their activity demonstrates the development or continuation of a coherent research program. Additional items that are relevant to the research assignment include any college, university, or national recognition or awards for research. Faculty members are encouraged to outline how the evidence provided fulfills evaluation criteria in the applicable evaluation table for a given reporting period (see Section XI).

### *II.B.2. Teaching*

“Teaching” includes courses and seminars, directed studies, supervision of practica, supervision of the teaching of others, supervision of research for undergraduate and graduate students, development of instructional materials (e.g., course guides, study materials, activities, practicum objectives), chairing or serving on thesis, dissertation, and preliminary examination committees, procuring teaching-related grants, academic advising, consulting with students and faculty, and delivering guest lectures.

Evaluations of classroom teaching are based on three components: (a) information on the course structure and content, (b) information about the performance of the students in the course, and (c) student perceptions of the course and the faculty member’s performance.

The student perceptions of teaching normally are collected using the university-approved forms and metrics.

The faculty member is responsible for preparing and submitting a formal Executive Summary for each classroom or practicum course taught or supervised. The Department provides a template for the summary, which outlines the course objectives and methods, information about teaching assistants or other instructors who participated in the course, information about student performance, and an assessment of the degree to which course objectives were met. In addition to the Executive Summary, the faculty member is required to submit a course syllabus and a sample assessment to the Faculty Evaluation File. The faculty member has the option of submitting up to 10 pages of additional materials (e.g., slides, other course materials). The report for each course must be prepared according to information contained in the Department of Psychology Guidelines for Using the Digital Evaluation File for Completing Faculty Productivity Reports.

The faculty member is required to report the supervision of undergraduate students in experiential learning, service as chair of thesis/dissertation committees, service on preliminary examination committees, the number of supervised undergraduate students, the nature of

supervision, the experiences of the students (e.g., research assistance, capstones, honors theses), and the number of thesis and dissertations committees chaired during the reporting period and the most recent 3-year moving window. This last requirement allows the Department Chair and FEC to evaluate whether the faculty member is on track to meet the requirements for promotion (or for full Professors, a salary enhancement).

Innovation in teaching may be demonstrated by major course revisions, the development of a new course, professional development activities in teaching, or development of a new program or revision of an existing program at the graduate or undergraduate levels.

There is no required format for the Teaching Narrative in the Annual Report. The department provides a template for the narrative, which outlines how their teaching activity has met the goals for the reporting period, notable accomplishments included among the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File, and any challenges they faced and how they plan to overcome them. Additional items that are relevant to the teaching assignment include service on curriculum-focused committees (e.g., the Undergraduate Training Committee), when supervision of an undergraduate student's research results in a presentation at a meeting or conference, and any college, university, or national recognition/awards for teaching or mentoring. Faculty are encouraged to outline how the evidence provided fulfills evaluation criteria in the applicable evaluation table for a given reporting period (see Section XI).

If undergraduate advising is part of the teaching assignment, faculty members must submit an Advising Portfolio. The department provides a template for the portfolio, which outlines advising activities, competencies related to advising, and, as appropriate, responsiveness to feedback from students, the FEC, or the Department Chair and steps to improve advising.

### *II.B.3. Service*

"Service" includes professionally relevant activities other than research and teaching. To be counted as service, an activity must be performed in one's capacity as a psychologist or a member of the University. The following lists are not exhaustive.

*Service to the Department:* Examples include active involvement in a Department committee (including graduate training committees), organizing a colloquium or organizing or assisting in a Departmental conference (even though a book resulting from such activities would count as research), and service components of activities whose primary contributions are in teaching, research, or another area of service. For example, although obtaining a grant is credited as an accomplishment in research, the grant may provide additional funds to the Department as well as support for graduate students. Grants also may permit consultantships that are counted as community service. Grants may also benefit the Department if they result in support for students or opportunities for student research or practica.

*Service to the College and University:* Examples include involvement in College or University committees, consulting with students or faculty in another Department, formation of University interest groups or service groups, and representing the University or the Department at an appropriate function.

*Service to the Profession:* Examples include editorial work for professional publications, involvement in a professional association as an officer or a member of a committee, and presentations at a colloquium or workshop to a professional (psychology or closely related) audience.

*Service to the Community:* Examples include presenting a speech or workshop to a "nonprofessional" audience (e.g., teachers, parents, general public), serving as a temporary or continuous consultant to an agency, serving on the board of directors of an agency, and providing professional service to clients (e.g., therapy, evaluation, organizational consultation). Private consulting apart from the University normally is not considered as part of the faculty member's service.

Professional or community service that receives monetary compensation may require disclosure to, and approval from, the university as described in [Board of Governors Rule 1.4 \(Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, and Outside Consulting Arrangements\)](#).

Faculty members with service as a significant area of contribution are responsible for preparing and submitting a Service Narrative. The department provides a template for the narrative, which outlines service activities, competencies related to each service assignment, additional support provided to those being served, and service-related professional development activities. The narrative demonstrates whether there is evidence of ongoing activities that address the needs, priorities, and initiatives of the department as well as the needs of the institution and, if appropriate, community service. Faculty are encouraged to outline how the evidence provided fulfills evaluation criteria in the applicable evaluation table for a given reporting period (see Section XI).

If undergraduate advising is part of the service assignment, faculty members must submit an Advising Portfolio. The department provides a template for the portfolio, which outlines advising activities, competencies related to advising, and, as appropriate, responsiveness to feedback from students, the FEC, or the Department Chair and steps to improve advising.

### **III. Standards of Evaluation**

#### **III.A. General Standards**

The annual review of performance in each assigned area will be assessed as Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or Unsatisfactory. As described in Section V.A, these categorical evaluations are based on numerical ratings provided by the Department Chair or the mean numerical ratings from the members of the FEC. Ratings affect performance-based salary increases and, for full Professors, the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement.

Standards of performance for each rating category in Research, Teaching, and Service are outlined in the tables found in Section XI of this document. The Department's standards are informed and guided by the WVU [Procedures document](#), with particular attention to Section III

(“Professional Expectations of Faculty Members”), Section IX.C (“Descriptors for Annual Review”), and Section X (“Criteria for Promotion or Tenure”).

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

Both “Excellent” and “Good” are meritorious ratings. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to “Satisfactory” or lower is appropriate. Meritorious work must be fully documented; for example, if information is provided for one course when one’s teaching assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating for the entire assignment must be questioned. It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide for the Faculty Evaluation File supporting material that (a) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (b) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on supporting material in the Faculty Evaluation File. If such supporting material has NOT been provided, the evaluator’s response should be, “in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I must conclude that the faculty member’s work is unsatisfactory.”

In weighing the faculty member’s contributions, the FEC and the Department Chair take account of the faculty member’s institutional role as defined in the letter of hire, subsequent annual evaluations, leave applications, memoranda of understanding, and annual assignments as summarized in the Workload Plan. For example, a faculty member’s administrative or other nonacademic responsibilities might change expectations of performance in any of the three areas of evaluation.

### *III.A.1. Research*

Evaluations of the scholarly value or importance of publications, presentations, manuscripts, and grant applications also consider indices of quality such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, prestige of the journal, funding status of a grant application, rating or score assigned to an unfunded grant, and impact of the work (e.g., citations). Theoretical viewpoints, however, are not considered in judging scholarly value. If a Tenure-Track faculty member is being considered for promotion or tenure, or a tenured faculty member is being considered for promotion, written evaluations by outside experts are considered.

Judgments are made about the relative importance of finished products versus work-in-progress. For early-career faculty (i.e., those in their first few years), credit is given for evidence of promise in research (e.g., laboratory set-up, grant applications and manuscripts submitted, data gathered) as well as for products such as publications or funded grants. For established faculty, however, greater emphasis is placed on products.

Judgments about grant applications consider the scope of the faculty member’s contribution to the research project, whether the grant program is internal or external, whether the application is funded, and any score or rating assigned to an unfunded application. Judgments about grant applications also consider the role that grant-related activity plays in the faculty member’s institutional role as defined in the letter of hire or subsequent letters of understanding from the Department Chair, Dean, or Provost. The quantity and quality of grant activity – writing and submitting grant applications as well as obtaining grant funds – are valued as part of each faculty

member's research. The absence of grant activity will be weighed in consideration of the faculty member's institutional role inasmuch as some faculty members are required to seek and obtain grants, others are strongly encouraged to seek grants, and others are not expected to seek grants. The Department Chair will clarify each faculty member's role regarding grant activity by preparing, in consultation with the faculty member, an annual Workload Plan that is uploaded to the digital evaluation file.

Judgments about whether the rates of publications and scholarly presentations are on track to meet applicable standards for promotion or tenure (see tables in Section XI) are based on supporting material provided by the faculty member, including (for example) documentation of work that has been published or presented, work accepted for publication or presentation, work under review, and research in progress.

Certain invitations to perform professional service can be taken as evidence of a faculty member's visibility as a scholar, and therefore as evidence of quality. These are considered in evaluating research, in particular, invitations to edit for journals, to consult on research projects, and to present colloquia. However, the *performance* of editorial work, consultation, and presentation at colloquia constitutes professional service, and is considered primarily in that area of the evaluation.

### *III.A.2. Teaching*

Evaluation of teaching is based on materials submitted by the faculty member regarding the structure of classroom courses and the performance of the students in the courses as well as student perceptions of teaching. Consideration of students' written comments are made with particular attention to consistent patterns of positive or negative reactions to the instruction, whether the course was a new preparation, and whether the feedback reflects serious deficiencies in the design and/or delivery of course material.

The faculty member who creates a new course or substantially revises an established course receives credit for course development. In evaluating out-of-class teaching activities, additional considerations include the number of students contacted, particularly at the graduate level (e.g., involvement in student research projects, number of advisees, number of theses and dissertations chaired).

Tenure-Track faculty members are evaluated on whether they are chairing thesis and dissertation committees at a level appropriate for their rank and research workload percentage. The faculty member must report the number of thesis and dissertation committees they chaired during the reporting period and during the most recent 3-year moving window. This will allow the Department Chair and FEC to judge whether the faculty member is on track to meet the requirements for promotion or, for full Professors, a salary enhancement.

### *III.A.3. Service*

Quantity of service is evaluated by considering the number of service activities, the breadth of these activities, and the amount of time devoted to service. Quality of service is assessed by considering visibility, impact, continuation of a consultantship, demonstration of consultation efficacy, and generation of support for students or summer salary for faculty.

Seniority is considered when evaluating service. Expectations are lower for early-career faculty, in part because of competing responsibilities (e.g., new course preparations) and in part because of limited opportunity, especially for professional and University service. Theoretical approach or program area affiliation are not considered as part of the evaluation of service.

Service activities that are acceptable when a faculty member is expected to make contributions characterized as “reasonable” – as is the case for most members of the Department’s faculty – would not be acceptable when a faculty member’s service is an area of “significant” contribution (e.g., for Service faculty). The Workload Plan delineates the service expectations of both types of faculty member, as do the faculty evaluation tables in Section XI.

### **III.B. Standards for Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

The specific standards for promotion are outlined in Table P1 in Section XI. Note that they require a preponderance of meritorious annual ratings in research and teaching for the period under review as well as for the last three years of that period. This is to guard against a deteriorating trend in the annual ratings.

Evaluation of the quality and impact of research will be assisted by external evaluations from reviewers at peer institutions. The external evaluations also will assist judgments about the faculty member’s emerging (for promotion to Associate Professor) or established (for promotion to full Professor) national visibility in research.

The standards for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are more stringent than those from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. A faculty member seeking promotion to Professor must produce a greater quantity and higher quality of results than a faculty member seeking a promotion to Associate Professor.

### **III.C. Standards for Promotion of Teaching Faculty Members**

The specific standards for promotion are outlined in Table P2 in Section XI. Note that they require a preponderance of meritorious annual ratings in teaching for the period under review as well as for the last three years of that period. This is to guard against a deteriorating trend in the annual ratings.

All faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For teaching-track faculty members without a specific research assignment in the Workload Plan, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. Teaching-track faculty with research assignments should provide evidence that their research activity meets the criteria outlined in Table P2 in Section XI.

To be promoted, the Faculty Evaluation File must include evidence of a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence and of significant programmatic contribution to the University’s teaching mission.

### **III.D. Standards for Promotion of Service Faculty Members**

The specific standards for promotion are outlined in Table P3 in Section XI. Note that they require a preponderance of meritorious annual ratings in service for the period under review as well as for the last three years of that period. This is to guard against a deteriorating trend in the annual ratings.

Service faculty assignments may include a 5-10% research component. A Service faculty appointment requires a reasonable contribution in research, and the expectations in terms of presentations or publications depends on the percentage of the assignment allocated to research.

#### **IV. Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee**

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

The FEC has five general responsibilities, which are summarized below and elaborated in later sections of the report.

1. The FEC evaluates the annual activities of faculty members. Faculty members who are fully promoted (i.e., full Professors) automatically forego evaluation by the FEC and are evaluated only by the Department Chair according to rules established by the Provost's Office. However, Professors may elect to also receive evaluation by the FEC by providing notice to the Department Chair at least 90 days before the deadline for submission of the Annual Report and supporting materials.
2. The FEC evaluates the non-administrative activities of the Department Chair, regardless of the Chair's rank. The Chair's administrative activities are evaluated by the Dean.
3. The FEC evaluates the career activities of faculty members who are (a) undergoing a cumulative pre-promotion review, (b) candidates for promotion or tenure, or (c) eligible for emeritus status. (See Section VII(E) of the Eberly College Guidelines for information about emeritus evaluations.)
4. The FEC Chair submits to the Department Chair each faculty member's letter of evaluation, prepared as described in Sections V.B (annual evaluation), VI.B. (pre-promotion), and VII.B (promotion/tenure).
5. The FEC reports annually to the Department on its activities. The report includes the composition of the committee; a summary of the business conducted, statistical summaries of the annual evaluations, and recommendations to improve the evaluation process.

In addition to these general responsibilities, the FEC may receive other charges from the Department Chair or the Dean.

##### **IV.A. General Composition and Eligibility**

The FEC consists of four tenured faculty members who serve staggered two-year terms, one untenured faculty member who serves a one-year term, and one advanced graduate student who serves a one-year term. The faculty members eligible for FEC membership are those faculty members in the Department of Psychology who qualify for performance-based salary increases (e.g., faculty members in the Service, Teaching, and Tenure-Track categories).

Regardless of tenure status, faculty members are not eligible for membership on the FEC for two consecutive years after completing a term of service, or if any of the following conditions will be met during their potential term of service: (a) they will be considered for promotion or tenure, (b) they will be in the critical year of employment at WVU, (c) they will serve on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or (d) they will be on a professional leave. For purposes of identifying “consecutive” years, time spent on unpaid leave is disregarded. The names of faculty members who meet any of these conditions will be excluded from the faculty ballot (see Section VI.B.1 below). The Department Chair is not eligible for membership on the FEC.

## **IV.B. Formation**

### *IV.B.1. Election of Faculty Members*

During the spring semester the members of the faculty elect the faculty members of the FEC. The ballots are prepared, distributed, and collected by the Department Chair. The marked ballots are kept for two years so that members who are unable to complete their terms can be replaced. If a replacement must be found, the Department Chair will order the remaining candidates in the same tenured or untenured category of the person who must be replaced according to the number of votes received, breaking any ties on a random basis, and work through the resulting list in order until a replacement is identified. If this procedure does not yield a replacement, the Department Chair will hold a special election to fill the vacated position for the unexpired portion of the term.

### *IV.B.2. Election of the Graduate Student Representative*

In the spring semester, the graduate students, acting at large, elect one representative from a list of nominees (one student per program area) prepared by the Graduate Training Committee with the assistance of the program area training committees. Nominated graduate students must have considerable availability from October through February. Those without such availability must decline the nomination. The ballots are prepared, distributed, and collected by the Graduate Training Committee. The marked ballots are kept for one year so that a representative who is unable to complete their term can be replaced. If a replacement must be found, the Graduate Training Committee will rank the remaining candidates according to the number of votes received, breaking any ties on a random basis, and work through the resulting list in rank order until a person who is available to serve as a replacement is identified. If this procedure does not yield a replacement, the Graduate Training Committee will hold a special election to fill the vacated position for the unexpired portion of the term.

## **IV.C. Committee Procedures**

The FEC’s work each year is initiated by the Department Chair, who schedules a meeting of the members early in the fall semester. The Department Chair provides the FEC with its charge;

distributes University, College, and these Departmental guidelines; and discusses any new procedures. The Chair identifies faculty members requiring an annual review, cumulative pre-promotion review, promotion/tenure review, or consideration for emeritus status. After the Department Chair departs, the members elect the FEC Chair and Recording Secretary. The FEC Chair will be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on the FEC. The Chair, with the assistance of the Recording Secretary, is responsible for scheduling the FEC's meetings, distributing assignments to the members, and ensuring that the FEC fulfills its charge in a timely manner in conformity with this and other applicable documents. The Recording Secretary also is responsible for preparing the FEC's report to the Department and taking such notes as may be needed to support the preparation.

All FEC members have full voting rights except when (a) their own case is under consideration, (b) there is a conflict of interest or appearance of bias (e.g., the case under consideration involves close personal relationship, financial interest, history of conflict, or personal grievance), or (c) for the student representative, the student's advisor is under consideration. In these cases, the member must recuse themselves: They must not be present (physically or virtually) during the FEC's deliberations nor participate in the evaluation in any way. When this proviso affects the FEC Chair, another member serves as acting chair for that single deliberation.

Members must abstain from voting when they have insufficient knowledge to evaluate (e.g., because of an absence during key discussions or incomplete review of the faculty member's report and supporting materials). Abstentions are documented in the tally of votes for a proposed recommendation. The tally includes the number of members voting in favor of the recommendation, voting against the recommendation, and abstaining. Frequent abstentions or patterns of abstentions should be avoided.

It is understood that members of the FEC keep deliberations and all information contained in faculty files strictly confidential.

## **V. Annual Evaluation**

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. All faculty members receive annual evaluations. All Service, Teaching, and Tenure-track faculty members participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process. All Assistant and Associate Professors who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both the departmental FEC and by the Department Chair based on material in the Faculty Evaluation File. Fully promoted faculty members are evaluated by the Department Chair only, unless they have requested evaluation by both the Chair and the FEC.

*The West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure, 2025-2026* (p. 15), states that "The annual evaluation shall be related to one's assignment and performance and must be both formative and summative. All levels of review shall 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 is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, 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."

## V.A. General Procedures

All members of the FEC independently review the Annual Report and supporting materials of every faculty member whose annual evaluation has been assigned to the FEC. In addition, the FEC Chair assigns two faculty members the responsibility for presenting a written summary of the pertinent facts for inclusion in the FEC's letter for each faculty member. These members are designated as the "First Reader" and "Second Reader." The First Reader drafts a summary of the facts, with separate sections related to background and – as applicable to the faculty member's assignment – teaching, research, and service. Based on an independent examination of the file, the Second Reader verifies the accuracy of the summary to be presented by the First Reader.

At the FEC meeting, the First Reader presents the draft report orally, beginning with the background material, and then separately presents the sections on teaching, research, and service. After the oral report in each area of activity, the members discuss the information. To promote a fair and honest evaluation, the discussions are candid, forthright, and held in strictest confidence. Confidentiality is essential. Anything less will hamper the full and frank exchange of ideas necessary for the FEC to fulfill its duties.

To ensure that an FEC member's judgments are not influenced by knowing the results of their own evaluations, members are not permitted to view their ratings or letters until all committee work has been completed.

Following discussion, each member independently assigns a rating on a four-point rating scale with a 0.25 gradation between whole numbers, where 4 is Excellent and 1 is Unsatisfactory:

Ratings are assigned in accordance with the appropriate table (section XI) based on the faculty member's primary designation (Tenure-Track, Teaching, Service), their rank, and their percent effort in each area of contribution. Each table outlines the specific criteria that evaluators are to use to assign ratings.

The FEC uses a modified "Olympics" style procedure in which all members simultaneously display a card with their rating. If the range of ratings is broad (range > 1.0), members making lower or higher ratings are asked to discuss the reasons for their ratings, and this information is added to the FEC's letter. Occasionally, such discussions may lead members to change their ratings, but members are not directed to do so. The First and Second Readers are responsible for tabulating the ratings and adding the mean and range to the report. In the written summaries, the mean ratings are assigned the following categorical descriptors:

| <i>Numerical Ratings</i> | <i>Descriptor</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 3.50-4.00                | Excellent         |
| 3.00-3.49                | Good              |
| 2.00-2.99                | Satisfactory      |

1.00-1.99

## Unsatisfactory

Comments and appropriate qualitative descriptors of performance are obtained from the members to be included in the letter with the numerical ratings.

After the main part of the evaluation is completed, a motion is made regarding the final recommendation. The motion is discussed and a vote is taken and noted for inclusion in the letter. For annual review of faculty members, the possible motion is “continuation in rank.” If the number of members voting in favor of the motion equals or exceeds the number voting against the motion, the motion is approved and the recommendation is “continuation in rank.” If the number of unfavorable votes exceeds the number of favorable votes, the motion is disapproved and the recommendation is “non-continuation.” The recommendation is included in the final section of the letter, along with the categorical ratings for teaching, research, service, and any general observations or comments regarding the faculty member’s activities.

Normally, every FEC member signs every evaluation letter to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting. However, when a member recuses themselves, they do not sign because they ceased to function as a member of the FEC during the recusal. In place of a signature, the term “Recused” should be written.

The FEC submits its letters for the evaluation of Assistant Professors to the Department Chair by October 31. Letters for the evaluation of Associate and Full Professors are due to the Department Chair by December 31.

The Department Chair independently evaluates each faculty member's work except their own. The Chair’s quantitative ratings are expressed on the same scale as the FEC’s, with 0.25-point gradations. The Chair will not receive their letter from the FEC until their letters for all other faculty members have been written, signed, and delivered.

### **V.B. Contents of the Annual Evaluation Letter**

The FEC and Department Chair each write an evaluation letter to the faculty member. The Department Chair distributes their letter and the FEC’s letter to the faculty member and the Dean by the deadline for submitting departmental reviews to the Dean. If either letter recommends non-continuation, the Chair alerts the Dean about the recommendation.

The specific content of the letters includes:

#### *V.B.1. Basic Information*

The FEC’s letter must report the faculty member’s rank and title, years in rank, assignment, and any other details that would tend to affect the way the faculty member’s record is evaluated (e.g., a sabbatical leave, a modification of duties during the reporting period).

#### *V.B.2. Area Evaluations*

A categorical rating (“excellent,” “good,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory”) and a numerical rating using the four-point scale described in Section V.A must be provided for all assigned areas of teaching, research, and service. Evidence justifying these ratings must be provided.

### *V.B.3. Contextual Evaluation*

The annual evaluation must be conducted in the context of recent annual evaluations. In this regard, the evaluation must consider whether suggestions for improvement from recent prior evaluations have been addressed and whether progress is being made towards the next promotion (or for fully promoted faculty members, the next salary enhancement).

### *V.B.4. Recommendation*

Annual evaluation letters by the FEC require a recommendation and the results of the vote on that recommendation. Normally, the recommendation for an annual evaluation is “continuation in rank” (non-continuation is recommended by voting against “continuation in rank”). The Department Chair’s letter also must include a recommendation regarding continuation.

## **VI. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Review**

Two years before the critical year, probationary Tenure-Track faculty members are subject to a more rigorous review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure (sometimes called a “mid-career review” or “fourth-year review”). By this time, teaching should be at a level such that, if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected of Tenure-Track faculty members, there will be particular focus on the expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. Table P1 (Section XI) describes the standards for significant contributions in teaching and research.

As noted in the Eberly College Guidelines, even though the cumulative pre-promotion review is required to support evaluation of a probationary Tenure-Track faculty member’s progress towards tenure, it may be used to gauge any faculty member’s progress towards promotion. Therefore, Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured Associate Professors, may request cumulative pre-promotion reviews to solicit the department’s detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

### **VI.A. General Procedures**

The cumulative pre-promotion reviews by the FEC and Department Chair are conducted after the faculty member’s annual review. The review is based on information about performance during time in the faculty member’s current rank. (As a reminder: “Time in rank” is the time since the start date of the faculty member’s initial appointment or since January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later.) This information is contained in the Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report submitted by the faculty member, which includes links to supporting information about the faculty member’s institutional role from the letter of hire and subsequent letters of agreement; previous annual evaluations of teaching, research, and service by the FEC and

Department Chair; the faculty member's vita; and in some cases, evaluations and supporting materials obtained during previous employment at other institutions.

Attention is paid to trends in the annual ratings in each area of evaluation, consistent with the faculty member's institutional role. Upward trends and uniformly high ratings are viewed more positively than erratic ratings over the years in rank. Another important factor is evidence of research activity of a systematic nature. This is assessed by considering, for example, the impact of the candidate's research on the field, logical development of a problem area or areas, and history of grant funding in an area.

The faculty member's career activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately by the FEC and the Department Chair. The goal is to judge whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward meeting the standards for next career step (promotion, tenure, salary enhancement) according to the standards in Table P1 (for Tenure-Track and tenured faculty), Table P2 (Teaching faculty), or Table P3 (Service faculty) in Section XI.

## **VI.B. Contents of the Cumulative Pre-Promotion Review Letter**

After the FEC has discussed the faculty member's career and made judgments about progress in teaching, research, and service, the First Reader writes the evaluation letter. The letter is checked by the Second Reader, read and signed by all FEC members except any who recused themselves from the faculty member's case, and submitted to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair independently prepares an evaluation of the faculty member's career and provides the evaluation in the form of a letter to the faculty member. The letter includes judgments about progress in teaching, research, and service, using the same criteria and descriptors as the FEC. In the case of substantive disagreements between the FEC and Department Chair, the Chair notes the disagreement and its possible source and provides justification for their ratings.

### *VI.B.1. Area Evaluations*

Categorical ratings are assigned for career activity in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Evidence justifying these ratings must be provided.

- A rating of "satisfactory progress" is warranted when the faculty member's activity in the area under consideration, if sustained, would meet the standards for promotion or tenure.
- A rating of "improvement needed" is warranted when modest adjustments in the faculty member's activity supports an expectation that the standards will be met.
- A rating of "unsatisfactory progress" is warranted when there are significant concerns about the likelihood that the faculty member's activity will meet the standards.

### *VI.B.2. Summary Evaluation*

A summary evaluation must be provided stating whether the faculty member's overall progress is on track for the next career step (promotion, tenure, salary enhancement) and what adjustments, if any, are needed for improvement. The evaluation must provide a judgment of the likelihood of success by the timeline expressed in the appropriate promotion table and if the

probability is low, a justification for non-continuation before the critical year should be provided. No additional recommendation or vote is needed for purposes of completion of the cumulative pre-promotion review.

If the department reviews express concern about a probationary Tenure-Track faculty member's progress toward tenure, the Department Chair must alert the Dean who then may require the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to conduct an additional cumulative pre-promotion review.

## **VII. Promotion/Tenure Evaluation**

### **VII.A. Faculty Categories**

#### *VII.A.1. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty*

In a Tenure-track appointment, unless extended by Board of Governors Rule 4.2, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual's sixth year on the faculty, the "critical year," as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year of employment.

Tenure-track faculty members with qualifying experience may in the appointment letter be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

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

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

#### *VII.A.2. Teaching and Service Faculty*

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

#### *VII.A.3. All Faculty Types*

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement during the time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank. (As a reminder: “Time in rank” is the time since the start date of the faculty member’s initial appointment or since January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later.) Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses.

For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time.

## **VII.B. General Procedures**

The Promotion/Tenure review is based on information about performance during time in the faculty member’s current rank. (As a reminder: “Time in rank” is the time since the start date of the faculty member’s initial appointment or since January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later.) This information is contained in the Promotion/Tenure Report submitted by the faculty member, which includes links to supporting information about the faculty member’s institutional role from the letter of hire and subsequent letters of agreement, previous annual evaluations of teaching, research, and service by the FEC and Department Chair, the faculty member’s vita, and in some cases teaching evaluations from other institutions and letters from prior employers.

In some cases, the FEC and Department Chair also will consider external evaluations of research, teaching, or service that have been collected by the Dean’s Office.

Attention is paid to trends in the annual ratings in each area of evaluation, consistent with the faculty member’s institutional role. Upward trends and uniformly high ratings are viewed more positively than erratic ratings over the years in rank. Another important factor is evidence of research activity of a systematic nature. This is assessed by considering, for example, the impact of the candidate’s research on the field, logical development of a problem area or areas, and history of grant funding in the area of research specified in the letter of hire and any subsequent memoranda of understanding.

The faculty member’s career activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately by the FEC and the Department Chair. The goal is to judge whether the faculty member has met the standards for next career step (promotion, tenure, salary enhancement) according to the standards in Table P1 (for Tenure-Track and tenured faculty), Table P2 (Teaching faculty), or Table P3 (Service faculty) in Section XI. These judgments form the basis of motions regarding the final recommendation. Each motion is discussed and a vote is taken and recorded for inclusion in the evaluation letter.

In the FEC’s discussion of a probationary Tenure-Track Assistant Professor in the critical year, the possible motions are “promotion” and “tenure,” and the possible actions in each case are “approve” and “disapprove.” The recommendations regarding promotion and tenure are based on separate motions and votes.

All other promotion cases are discretionary. The possible motions are “continuation in rank” and “promotion,” and the possible actions are “approve” and “disapprove.”

If the number of FEC members voting in favor of the motion equals or exceeds the number voting against the motion, the motion is approved. If the number of unfavorable votes exceeds the number of favorable votes, the motion is disapproved.

If a motion is approved, the FEC’s recommendation coincides with the motion (e.g., if the approved motion is “continuation in rank,” then the recommendation is “continuation in rank”). If a motion for “continuation in rank” is disapproved, the recommendation is “non-continuation.” In the case of an Assistant Professor in the critical year, if a motion for “tenure” is disapproved, the recommendation is “non-continuation.” In the case of an Associate Professor, if a motion for “promotion” is disapproved, the recommendation is “continuation in rank” (unless a separate motion for “continuation in rank” is disapproved).

The Department Chair’s evaluation of the candidate also includes a recommendation expressed in the same terms as the FEC’s recommendation.

### **VII.C. Contents of the Promotion/Tenure Evaluation Letter**

After the FEC has discussed the faculty member’s career and made judgments about whether the applicable standards have been met, the First Reader writes the evaluation letter. The letter is checked by the Second Reader, read and signed by all FEC members except any who recused themselves from the faculty member’s case, and submitted to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair independently prepares an evaluation of the faculty member's career and provides the evaluation in the form of a letter to the faculty member. The letter includes judgments about teaching, research, and service, using the same criteria and descriptors as the FEC. In the case of substantive disagreements between the FEC and Department Chair, the Chair notes the disagreement and its possible source and provides justification for their ratings.

#### *VII.C.1. Basic Information*

The FEC’s letter must report the faculty member’s rank and title, years in rank, assignment, and any other details that would tend to affect the way the faculty member’s record is evaluated (e.g., a BOG Faculty Rule 4.5 extension of the tenure clock).

#### *VII.C.2. Area Evaluations*

A categorical rating (“demonstrated significant contributions” vs “has not demonstrated significant contributions”; “satisfactory” vs “not satisfactory”) must be provided for the career activity in the areas of teaching, research, and service based on the promotion tables in Section XI. Evidence justifying these ratings must be provided.

#### *VII.C.3. Recommendation*

Letters by the FEC written for purposes of promotion and/or tenure require one or more recommendations and the results of the vote on each recommendation as described in Section

VII.B. The recommendations must be justified with reference to the standards of evaluation in Section XI as well as college and university guidelines. The Department Chair's letter also must include appropriate recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure.

### VIII. Performance-Based Raises in Salary

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations. Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college. "Excellent" and "Good" characterize performance of merit. "Satisfactory" characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

In the Department of Psychology, the Department Chair is charged with providing the Dean with pay-raise ratings for each faculty member to be used in the determination of raises in salary during years when raises are available. Each faculty member's *pay-raise rating* is calculated as follows:

1. The FEC's and Department Chair's annual ratings of the faculty member's performance are averaged, with the FEC's rating weighted 80% and the Chair's rating 20%. This is done separately for teaching, research, and service, resulting in a set of *performance ratings*. For faculty who are fully promoted and have elected to be evaluated by the Chair only, the Chair's rating comprises 100% of the annual performance rating for purposes of calculating performance-based raises.

2. To calculate the pay-raise rating, each performance rating (in the areas of research, teaching, and service) is multiplied by a *merit factor* that reflects the relative value assigned to performance ratings judged as excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory:

| <i>Rating</i> | <i>Descriptor</i> | <i>Merit Factor</i> |
|---------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 3.50-4.00     | Excellent         | 4                   |
| 3.00-3.49     | Good              | 2.5                 |
| 2.00-2.99     | Satisfactory      | 1                   |
| 1.00-1.99     | Unsatisfactory    | 0                   |

3. The Department Chair calculates the pay-raise ratings and reports them to the Dean along with a set of *assignment factors* for each faculty member. Each assignment factor reflects the relative importance of the area of performance in the faculty member's work assignment according to their approved annual workload plan (e.g., 0.4 for research, 0.4 for teaching, and 0.2 for service for a faculty member whose assignment is 40%, 40%, and 20%, respectively).

4. The Dean uses the pay-raise ratings and assignment factors to calculate each faculty member's raise in accordance with University and College guidelines.

5. If funds for performance-based raises are allocated during a faculty member's first year, the Dean may be authorized by University or College guidelines to disregard the department's pay-raise ratings and assignment factors in determining the faculty member's raise.

6. If more than one year has elapsed since the last distribution of funds for performance-based raises, then pay-raise ratings and assignment factors will be averaged over some greater period in accordance with University or College guidelines. In the absence of such guidelines, the pay-raise ratings and assignment factors will be averaged over all the years since the last performance-based pay raise, or over the last three years, whichever is less. If such a case arises when a faculty member has been on the faculty for less than the period used for deciding raises, the missing pay-raise ratings will be replaced by the average pay-raise rating in the Department – unless the faculty member’s overall performance has been judged either unsatisfactory or so meritorious that an average pay-raise rating would be unjust, or unless University or College guidelines require a different procedure. If the Department Chair believes an average rating to be unjust, the Department Chair will consult with the FEC Chair to decide what rating, if any, will be used to replace the missing rating and explain the basis for the decision to the faculty member and the Dean in writing.

It is important to remember that the receipt of performance-based raises in salary does not guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted or granted tenure. For example, raises could be allocated for satisfactory performance whereas promotion and tenure require good or excellent performance. Another possibility is that raises could be received for occasional performances that are good or excellent, whereas promotion and tenure require a preponderance of ratings of good or excellent in the areas of significant contribution for the faculty member’s career for the period under review.

### **IX. Modification of This Document**

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the FEC and to the Department Chair. The FEC and the Chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the faculty. If the faculty approve the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.

### **X. Timeline**

Here is a list of the key dates normally employed in the faculty evaluation process that are controlled by the Department of Psychology. Other key dates in the process (e.g., deadlines for submitting evaluations to the Dean) are contained in the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

#### ***Reporting Period***

The Department of Psychology’s annual evaluations are based on a reporting period from July 1 to June 30. Exceptions are made for first-year faculty members, whose reporting period is from the beginning of their contractual obligation to December 15 of the appointment year.

#### ***February 15***

This is the deadline for the FEC to submit the annual report of its activities to the Department Chair.

***April 15***

This is the deadline for the Director of Graduate Training to conduct elections to select the student members of the next year's FEC. See Section IV.B.2.

***May 15***

This is the deadline for the Department Chair to conduct elections to select the faculty members of the next year's FEC. See Section IV.B.1.

***September 15***

This is the deadline for continuing faculty members to update their Faculty Evaluation Files with materials for the annual evaluation. This deadline applies to all faculty members beyond the first year, including faculty members who are subject to a cumulative pre-promotion review and faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure. By this deadline:

- All faculty members (*except first-year faculty members*) must submit their Annual Report and supporting materials for the July 1 – June 30 reporting period. This includes faculty members who are also planning to submit a Promotion/Tenure Report in December. See Sections II.A.1 and V. (First-year faculty members must submit their Annual Report and supporting materials by the deadline in December indicated below.)
- Faculty members who are subject to a cumulative pre-promotion review must also submit their Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report covering activities through June 30 of their third year. See Sections II.A.2 and VI.
- Faculty members who are under consideration for promotion or tenure must submit their Annual Report and supporting materials for the July 1 – June 30 reporting period by September 15 (see Sections II.A.1 and V), but they should defer submission of their Promotion/Tenure Report and additional supporting materials until December 31 (see Sections II.A.3 and VII).

***September 15***

This is the deadline for the Department Chair to charge the FEC. See Section IV.C.

***October 31***

This is the deadline for the FEC to submit its letters for annual evaluation of Assistant Professors to the Department Chair. See Section V.A.

***December –2 days after final grades are due***

This deadline applies to first-year faculty members. This deadline accommodates the receipt of and response to teaching evaluations, which are released on the day final grades are due. By this deadline, they should submit their Annual Report and supporting materials for the period from

the date of their appointment through the date that final grades are due in the appointment year. See Sections II.A.1 and V.

***December 31***

This deadline applies to faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure. By this deadline, faculty must submit their Promotion/Tenure Report covering activities during the time in rank through December 31. “Time in rank” is the time since the start date of the faculty member’s initial appointment or since January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. Because the December 31 deadline extends six months beyond the June 30 end of the reporting period for the annual review, faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure must submit supporting materials covering activities from July 1 through December 31. See Sections II.A.3 and VII.

This is the deadline for the FEC to submit its letters for annual evaluation of Associate Professors to the Department Chair. See Section V.A.

**XI. Faculty Evaluation Tables**

| <b>Type of Standards</b> | <b>Type of Faculty Member</b>     |                    |                |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
|                          | <b>Tenure-Track &amp; Tenured</b> | <b>Teaching</b>    | <b>Service</b> |
| <b>Promotion</b>         | P1- p. 25-26                      | P2 - pp. 27-28     | P3 - pp. 28-30 |
| <b>Annual Teaching</b>   | T1 - p.31                         | T2 - p. 32         | T2 - p. 32     |
| <b>Annual Research</b>   | R1 - p. 33                        | R2 - p. 34         | R2 - p. 34     |
| <b>Annual Service</b>    | S1, S2 - pp. 35,36                | S1, S2 - pp. 35,36 | S3 - p. 37     |

## P1: Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track & Tenured Faculty Members

*Differences between the standards for promotion to full professor vs. promotion to associate professor are shown in bold type.*

### Tenure-Track Assistant Professor to Tenured Associate Professor

*Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.*

| Teaching/Mentoring   | Research   | Service  |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.</li> <li>At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating.</li> <li>Chair of at least 3 thesis or dissertation committees during time in rank. (Notes 1 &amp; 2)</li> <li>Evidence of regular participation as a member of preliminary exam committees and thesis/dissertation committees.</li> <li>Evidence of regular supervision of undergraduate PSYC and/or NRSC students in experiential learning.</li> <li>If undergraduate advising is assigned, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 10 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly papers have been published or have received final acceptance for publication during time in rank. Must be the senior author of at least 3 papers. Majority of the papers must be peer-reviewed reports of empirical research. (Notes 1 &amp; 3)</li> <li>At least 5 scholarly presentations at regional, national, or international conferences, or as an invited speaker at a college or university, during time in rank. (Notes 1 &amp; 3)</li> <li>At least one significant grant has been awarded during time in rank, or a track record of grant applications shows promise of future awards, or research accomplishments that offset grant expectations.</li> <li>Evidence of potential for national recognition of their scholarship, e.g., as evidenced by invitations to speak, participate in editorial reviews, or consult on research projects.</li> <li>Research is judged to be of high quality and impact by external reviewers at peer institutions.</li> <li>Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank and the last 3 years in rank (Note 1).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department.</li> <li>Consistent attendance at department faculty meetings.</li> <li>Evidence of professional service that promotes visibility as a scholar (e.g., on editorial review boards, as an officer of a professional association).</li> <li>Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank and the last 3 years in rank (Note 1).</li> </ul> |

Notes:

- Decisions about promotion and tenure are based on evaluations of the quantity and quality of accomplishments during the “time in rank” which is understood as the time since the start date of the faculty appointment or January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. An exception is made if the letter of appointment allows credit toward tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, in which case the credited work also is evaluated.
- In teaching, the table shows the student thesis/dissertation committee chair requirement for an assistant professor with a *research* assignment that averages 26-45% during time in rank. Here are the requirements for a broader range of average (mean) assignments: **20-25%** = 1 committee, **26-45%** = 3 committees, **> 46%** = 5 committees.
- In research, the table shows the publication and presentation requirements for an assistant professor with a *research* assignment that averages 36-45% during time in rank. Here are the requirements for a broader range of average (mean) assignments: **25-35%** = 8 publications (2 as senior author) and 4 presentations, **36-45%** = 10 publications (3 senior) and 5 presentations, **46-55%** = 12 publications (4 senior) and 6 presentations, **>55%** = 14 publications (5 senior) and 7 presentations.

## Tenured Associate Professor to Tenured Professor.

*Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.*

| Teaching/Mentoring   | Research   | Service   |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.</li> <li>• At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating.</li> <li>• <b>Evidence of significant curricular contributions through development of a new course or major revision of an existing course, or development of a new program or revision of an existing program at the graduate or undergraduate levels, or through service on the Undergraduate or Graduation Training Committees, or through service as an area coordinator, Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Training, Dept Associate Chair, or Dept Chair.</b></li> <li>• <b>Chair of at least 6 thesis or dissertation committees</b> during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank (Notes 1 &amp; 2).</li> <li>• Evidence of regular participation as a member of preliminary exam committees and thesis/dissertation committees.</li> <li>• Evidence of regular supervision of undergraduate PSYC and/or NRSC students in experiential learning.</li> <li>• If undergraduate advising is assigned, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>• Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1.)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>At least 12 substantive scholarly peer-reviewed papers published during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank (Notes 1 &amp; 3). Must be the senior author of at least 5 papers.</b> Majority of the papers must be peer-reviewed reports of empirical research.</li> <li>• At least 5 scholarly presentations at regional, national, or international conferences, or as an invited speaker at a college or university, during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank (Notes 1 &amp; 3).</li> <li>• <b>Evidence of national or international recognition of their scholarship, e.g., as evidenced by invitations to speak, service as an editor of a journal, election or appointment to positions of authority in scholarly organizations.</b></li> <li>• At least one significant grant has been awarded during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, or a track record of grant applications shows promise of future awards, or research accomplishments that offset grant expectations.</li> <li>• Research is judged to be of high quality and impact by external reviewers at peer institutions.</li> <li>• Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank (Note 1).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department.</li> <li>• Consistent attendance at department faculty meetings.</li> <li>• <b>Evidence of substantial contributions in service (e.g., as a committee chair) at the department, college, or university levels.</b></li> <li>• Evidence of professional service that promotes visibility as a scholar (e.g., on editorial review boards, as an officer of a professional association).</li> <li>• Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1).</li> </ul> |

Notes:

1. Decisions about promotion and tenure are based on evaluations of the quantity and quality of accomplishments during the “time in rank” which is understood as the time since the start date of the faculty appointment or January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. An exception is made if the letter of appointment allows credit toward tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, in which case the credited work also is evaluated.
2. In teaching, the table shows the student thesis/dissertation committee chair requirement for an associate professor with a research assignment that averages 36-45% during time in rank. Here are the requirements for a broader range of average (mean) assignments: 20-25% = 3 committees, 26-35% = 4 committees, 36-45% = 6 committees, > 45% = 7 committees.
3. In research, the table shows the publication and presentation requirements for an associate professor with a research assignment that averages 36-45% during time in rank. Here are the requirements for a broader range of average (mean) assignments: **25-35%** = 10 publications (4 as senior author) and 4 presentations, **36-45%** = 12 publications (5 senior) and 5 presentations, **46-55%** = 14 publications (6 senior) and 6 presentations, **>55%** = 16 publications (7 senior) and 7 presentations.

## P2: Promotion Standards for Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty Members

*Differences between the standards for promotion to full professor vs. promotion to associate professor are shown in bold type.*

### Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor

*Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.*

| Teaching/Mentoring   | Research  | Service   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.</li> <li>At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating.</li> <li>Evidence of regular supervision of undergraduate PSYC and/or NRSC students in experiential learning.</li> <li>If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during the last 5-6 years in rank during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 5% to 7% during time in rank (SEE NOTE 1), at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given at a regional, national, or international conference, or at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given as an invited speaker at a college or university outside WVU.</li> <li>If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 8% to 12% during time in rank (SEE NOTE 1), at least 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance for publication.</li> <li>If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 13% to 15% during time in rank (SEE NOTE 1), at least (a) 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance, and (b) 1 scholarly presentation has been given at regional, national, or international conferences, or at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given as an invited speaker at a college or university outside WVU.</li> <li>Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department.</li> <li>Consistent attendance at department faculty meetings.</li> <li>If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes. Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> |

Notes:

- Decisions about promotion and tenure are based on evaluations of the quantity and quality of accomplishments during the “time in rank” which is understood as the time since the start date of the faculty appointment or January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. An exception is made if the letter of appointment allows credit toward tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, in which case the credited work also is evaluated.

## Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor

*Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.*

| Teaching/Mentoring  | Research   | Service  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.</li> <li>• At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a good or excellent rating.</li> <li>• <b>Evidence of significant curricular contributions through systematic curricular development, development of a new course or major revision of an existing course, through development of a new program or revision of an existing program at the graduate or undergraduate levels.</b></li> <li>• Evidence of regular supervision of undergraduate PSYC and/or NRSC students in experiential learning.</li> <li>• If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>• <b>Quality and impact of the programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline is acknowledged by professional colleagues within the university and nationally or internationally.</b></li> <li>• Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 5% to 7% during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given at a regional, national, or international conference, or at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given as an invited speaker at a college or university outside WVU. (Note 1)</li> <li>• If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 8% to 12 % during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance for publication. (Note 1)</li> <li>• If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 13% to 15% during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least (a) 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance, and (b) 1 scholarly presentation has been given at regional, national, or international conferences, or at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given as an invited speaker at a college or university outside WVU.</li> <li>• Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of satisfactory or better service to the department.</li> <li>• Consistent attendance at department faculty meetings.</li> <li>• If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>• <b>Evidence of substantial contributions in service (e.g., as a committee chair) at the department, college, university, or professional levels.</b></li> <li>• Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> |

Notes:

1. Decisions about promotion and tenure are based on evaluations of the quantity and quality of accomplishments during the “time in rank” which is understood as the time since the start date of the faculty appointment or January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. An exception is made if the letter of appointment allows credit toward tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, in which case the credited work also is evaluated.

### P3: Promotion Standards for Non-Tenure Track Service Faculty Members

*Differences between the standards for promotion to full professor vs. promotion to associate professor are shown in bold type.*

#### Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor

*Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.*

| Teaching/Mentoring   | Research  | Service   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.</li> <li>At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a satisfactory rating.</li> <li>If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 5% to 7% during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given at a regional, national, or international conference, or at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given as an invited speaker at a college or university outside WVU. (Note 1)</li> <li>If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 8% to 10% during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance for publication. (Note 1)</li> <li>Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service portfolios provide evidence of ongoing activities that address needs, priorities, and initiatives of the department, as well as needs of the institution and, if assigned, community service.</li> <li>If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>Consistent attendance at department faculty meetings.</li> <li>Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” annual ratings during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> |

Notes:

- Decisions about promotion and tenure are based on evaluations of the quantity and quality of accomplishments during the “time in rank” which is understood as the time since the start date of the faculty appointment or January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. An exception is made if the letter of appointment allows credit toward tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, in which case the credited work also is evaluated.

## Service Associate Professor to Service Professor

Unless otherwise noted, all standards must be met.

| Teaching/Mentoring   | Research  | Service  |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching portfolios provide evidence of (a) responsiveness to student feedback; (b) course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria appropriate to the level of the course; (c) steps to improve student outcomes; and (d) if applicable, evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.</li> <li>• At least 1 summative peer review of classroom teaching consistent with a satisfactory rating.</li> <li>• If undergraduate advising is assigned as teaching, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>• Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 5% to 7% during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given at a regional, national, or international conference, or at least 1 scholarly presentation has been given as an invited speaker at a college or university outside WVU. (Note 1)</li> <li>• If the percentage of the workload allocated to Research averages 8% to 10% during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, at least 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance for publication. (Note 1)</li> <li>• Preponderance of “Satisfactory” or better annual ratings from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service portfolios provide evidence of ongoing activities that address needs, priorities, and initiatives of the department, as well as needs of the institution and, if assigned, community service.</li> <li>• If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, annual advising portfolios (a) document the number of advisees, the nature of the advice, the number of 90-credit degree audits performed, and other significant advising activities; and (b) describe challenges to the advising process and steps planned or executed to improve advising outcomes.</li> <li>• Consistent attendance at department faculty meetings.</li> <li>• <b>Evidence of substantial contributions in service (e.g., as a committee chair) at the department, college, university, or professional levels.</b></li> <li>• <b>Quality and impact of service in psychology is acknowledged by professional colleagues within the university and nationally or internationally.</b></li> <li>• Preponderance of “Good” or “Excellent” from the FEC and Department Chair during time in rank if less than 6 years, or during the last 6 years in rank, and the last 3 years in rank. (Note 1)</li> </ul> |

Notes:

1. Decisions about promotion and tenure are based on evaluations of the quantity and quality of accomplishments during the “time in rank” which is understood as the time since the start date of the faculty appointment or January 1 in the year of the last promotion, whichever is later. An exception is made if the letter of appointment allows credit toward tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, in which case the credited work also is evaluated.

## T1: Annual Evaluation of Teaching by Tenure-Track & Tenured Faculty

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any 2 of these standards.*

- Failure to submit a satisfactory portfolio for each course.
- If undergraduate advising is assigned, failure to submit a satisfactory advising portfolio.
- Failure to complete assigned teaching or advising.
- U** • Predominantly negative student perceptions of teaching across courses. (Note 1)
- If undergraduate advising is assigned, predominantly negative student perceptions of advising. (Note 1)
- Supervision of 0 undergraduate students in experiential learning (e.g., Psych 480, 481, etc.). (Note 2)
- Serves as chair on 0 thesis/dissertation committees. (Note 3)
- Serves as a member on 0 preliminary exams or thesis/dissertation committees. (Note 2)
- Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair. (Note 2)

---

*Meet the first 2 standards and at least 2 of the other standards.*

- Each teaching portfolio demonstrates that the course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria are appropriate to the level of the course, and if applicable, the portfolio provides evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.
- S** • If undergraduate advising is assigned, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate.
- Supervises 1 undergraduate student in experiential learning. (Notes 2 & 4)
- Serves as chair of 1 thesis/dissertation committee. (Note 2)
- Serves as a member on 2 preliminary exam or thesis/dissertation committee. (Note 2)

---

*Meet the standards for "Satisfactory" and all of these standards.*

- When appropriate, teaching portfolios demonstrate responsiveness to feedback from students, the FEC, or the Department Chair and steps to improve instruction.
- Student perceptions of teaching across courses are generally positive.
- If undergraduate advising is assigned: When appropriate, the advising portfolio demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from students, the FEC, or the Department Chair and steps to improve advising.
- G** • If undergraduate advising is assigned, student perceptions of advising are generally positive.
- Supervises undergraduate students in experiential learning at a level appropriate for the faculty member's rank and *teaching* workload percentage. (Notes 2 & 4)
- Serves as chair of thesis/dissertation committees at a level appropriate for the faculty member's rank and *research* workload percentage. (Notes 2 & 5)
- Serves as a member of 3 preliminary exams or thesis/dissertation committees. (Note 2)

---

*Meet the standards for "Good" and at least 2 of these standards.*

- Demonstrates innovation in teaching (e.g., major course revisions, professional development in teaching).
- Student perception of teaching across courses are almost all positive.
- Serves as a member of 4 or more preliminary exams or thesis/dissertation committees (Note 2).
- E** • Supports the curriculum through service on the Undergraduate Training Committee, Graduate Training Committee, Program Area Committee, or other committee that supports the curriculum.
- Supervision of an undergraduate student's research resulting in a presentation at a meeting/ conference (e.g., WVU undergraduate research symposium, regional/national conference).
- College, university or national recognition/award for teaching or mentoring.

---

Notes:

1. Negative feedback applies to courses that are not new preparations and reflect serious deficiencies in the design and/or delivery of course material.
2. Standard does not apply to first-year faculty members.
3. Standard does not apply to first- and second-year faculty members.
4. The faculty member must report the number of supervised students, the nature of the supervision, and the experiences of the students (e.g., research assistance, capstones, honors theses).
5. The faculty member must report the number of thesis and dissertation committees they chaired during the reporting period and during the most recent 3-year moving window, so that the Department Chair and FEC can judge whether the faculty member is on track to meet the requirements for promotion (or, for full professors, a salary enhancement).

**Assistant professors:** 20-25% = 1 committee, 26-45% = 3 committees, > 45% = 5 committees.

**Associate & full professors:** 20-25% = 3 committees, 26-35% = 4 committees, 36-45% = 6 committees, > 45% = 7 committees.

## T2: Annual Evaluation of Teaching by Teaching & Service Faculty

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any 2 of these standards.*

- Failure to submit a satisfactory portfolio for each course.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned, failure to submit a satisfactory advising portfolio.
  - Failure to complete assigned teaching or advising assigned as teaching.
- U**
- Predominantly negative student perceptions of teaching across courses. (Note 1)
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned, predominantly negative student perceptions of advising. (Note 1)
  - If a Teaching professor, supervision of 0 undergraduate students in experiential learning (e.g., Psych 480, 481, etc.). (Note 2)
  - Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair. (Note 2)
- 

*Meet all of these standards*

- S**
- Each teaching portfolio demonstrates that the course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria are appropriate to the level of the course, and if applicable, the portfolio provides evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate.
  - If a Teaching professor, supervises 1 undergraduate student in experiential learning. (Notes 2 & 4)
- 

*Meet all of these standards.*

- G**
- Each teaching portfolio demonstrates that the course content, evaluation methods, and grading criteria are appropriate to the level of the course, and if applicable, the portfolio provides evidence of appropriate supervision of teaching assistants. When appropriate, teaching portfolios demonstrate responsiveness to feedback from students, the FEC, or the Department Chair, and steps to improve instruction.
  - Student perceptions of teaching across courses are generally positive.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate. When appropriate, the advising portfolio demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from students, the FEC, or the Department Chair and steps to improve advising.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned, student perceptions of advising are generally positive.
  - If a Teaching professor, supervises undergraduate students in experiential learning at a level appropriate for the faculty member's rank, teaching assignment, and workload percentage. (Notes 2 & 4)
- 

*Meet the standards for "Good" and at least 1 (for Service faculty) or 2 (Teaching faculty) of these standards.*

- E**
- Demonstrates innovation in teaching (e.g., major course revisions, professional development in teaching).
  - Supports the curriculum through service on the Undergraduate Training Committee, Graduate Training Committee, Program Area Committee, or other committee that supports the curriculum.
  - Supervision of an undergraduate student's research resulting in a presentation at a meeting/ conference (e.g., WVU undergraduate research symposium, regional/national conference).
  - College, university or national recognition/award for teaching or mentoring.
- 

Notes:

1. Negative feedback applies to courses that are not new preparations and reflect serious deficiencies in the design and/or delivery of course material.
2. Standard does not apply to first-year faculty members.
3. Standard does not apply to first- and second-year faculty members.
4. The faculty member must report the number of supervised students, the nature of the supervision, and the experiences of the students (e.g., research assistance, capstones, honors theses).

## R1: Annual Evaluation of Research by Tenure-Track & Tenured Faculty

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any of these standards.*

- U**
- Publishes fewer than **A** papers in a 3-year rolling window (papers may be a mix of empirical work, commentaries, chapters, white-papers). (Notes 3 & 4)
  - Little evidence of ongoing research activity (e.g., 0 conference presentations).
  - No documented engagement in activities related to external research funding. (Notes 1 & 2)
  - Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair.

---

*Meet all of these standards*

- S**
- Publishes **A** papers in a 3-year rolling window (papers may be a mix of empirical work, commentaries, chapters, white papers). (Notes 3 & 4)
  - Documented engagement in activities related to external research funding. (Notes 1 & 2)
  - Some evidence of ongoing research activity (e.g., 1 research presentation at a local meeting/conference) or, for first-year assistant professors, evidence of progress in establishing a research program.

---

*Meet all of these standards.*

- G**
- Publishes **A** papers in a 3-year rolling window, with at least **B** papers involving peer-reviewed empirical work. (Notes 3 & 4)
  - On track to publish at least **C** papers as senior author by December 31 of a tenure-track faculty member's critical year or during a moving window of 6 years since a tenured faculty member's most recent promotion. (Notes 4 & 6)
  - On track to publish at least **D** papers by December 31 of a tenure-track faculty member's critical year or during a moving window of 6 years since a tenured faculty member's most recent promotion, with the majority of the papers being peer-reviewed reports of empirical research. (Notes 4 & 6)
  - On track to give at least **E** scholarly presentations by December 31 of a tenure-track faculty member's critical year or during window of 6 years since a tenured faculty member's most recent promotion. (Notes 4, 5, & 6)
  - Submits **F** or more significant external grant applications as PI or Co-I, or obtains significant research funding through 1 or more contracts, in a 3-year rolling window. (Notes 1, 3, & 4)
  - Evidence of ongoing research activity (e.g., 1 scholarly presentation at a regional/national meeting/conference) or, for first-year assistant professors, evidence of progress in establishing a research program. (Note 5)
  - If a tenured associate or full professor, evidence of national or international recognition of their scholarship.

---

*Meet the standards for "Good" and at least 2 of these standards.*

- E**
- More than **B** published papers in a 3-year rolling window are based on peer-reviewed empirical work. (Notes 3 & 4)
  - Clear evidence that progress is being made in obtaining external research funding (e.g., high-quality and competitive grant submissions, grants being scored/positive feedback). (Notes 1 & 3)
  - Publications demonstrate substantive progress in developing a research program (e.g., papers are published in leading journals or provide critical foundation for grant proposals).
  - 1 publication includes student author.
  - PI of an active grant or manager of a contract that will generate empirical findings.
  - Substantive collaborative grant activity (e.g., serving as Co-I or other key personnel on collaborative grants).
  - A new grant is funded.
  - College, university or national recognition/award for research.

---

Notes:

1. Standard applies if expectations for research funding are identified in the appointment letter or subsequent documents.
2. Standard does not apply to first-year faculty members.
3. Standard does not apply to first- and second-year faculty members.
4. Variations based on research workload percentages:

**Assistant professors:**

25-35%: A = 5, B = 3, C = 2, D = 8, E = 4, F = 1  
 36-45%: A = 6, B = 4, C = 3, D = 10, E = 5, F = 2  
 46-55%: A = 7, B = 4, C = 4, D = 12, E = 6, F = 2  
 >55%: A = 8, B = 5, C = 5, D = 14, E = 7, F = 3

**Associate & full professors:**

25-35%: A = 6, B = 4, C = 4, D = 10, E = 4, F = 1  
 36-45%: A = 7, B = 4, C = 5, D = 12, E = 5, F = 2  
 46-55%: A = 8, B = 5, C = 6, D = 14, E = 6, F = 2  
 >55%: A = 9, B = 5, C = 7, D = 16, E = 7, F = 3

5. A "scholarly presentation" is an academic paper or poster presented at a regional, national, or international conference, or an invited academic presentation at a college or university outside of WVU.
6. Judgments about whether the rates of publications and scholarly presentations are "on track" are based on evidence provided by the faculty member, including (for example) documentation of work that has been published or presented, work accepted for publication or presentation, work under review, and research in progress.

## **R2: Annual Evaluation of Research by Teaching & Service Faculty (in Years with a Research Assignment)**

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any of these standards.*

- U**
- Little evidence of ongoing research activity.
  - Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair.

---

*Meet this standard.*

- S**
- Evidence of ongoing research activity that made progress toward a product such as a scholarly presentation (Note 2) or a publication.

---

*Meet the standard for “Satisfactory” and this standard.*

- G**
- On track to produce finished research products at a level appropriate to the faculty member’s research workload. (Notes 1 and 3)

---

*Meet the standards for “Good” and at least 1 of these standards.*

- E**
- At least 1 scholarly presentation. (Note 2).
  - Peer-reviewed publication or a paper that has received final acceptance for publication.
  - At least 1 research grant application as PI or co-I to a funding source outside the Department of Psychology.
  - A new grant or research contract is funded from a source outside the Department of Psychology.
  - PI or co-I of an active grant or manager of a research contract.
  - Substantive collaborative grant activity (e.g., serving key personnel on a collaborative grant).
  - College, university, or national recognition/award for research.

---

Notes:

1. Variations based on mean research workload percentages over a 5-year period:  
**< 5%:** No expectations for formal research products. In this case the “Satisfactory” and “Good” standards are identical and the work should be judged as “Good.”  
**5-7%:** 1 scholarly presentation as defined in Note 2.  
**8-12%:** 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance for publication.  
**13-15%:** 1 substantive peer-reviewed scholarly paper has been published or has received final acceptance for publication, and 1 scholarly presentation has been given. (Note 2)
2. A “scholarly presentation” is an academic paper or poster presented at a regional, national, or international conference, or an invited academic presentation at a college or university outside of WVU.
3. Judgments about whether the rates of publications and scholarly presentations are “on track” are based on evidence provided by the faculty member, including (for example) documentation of work that has been published or presented, work accepted for publication or presentation, work under review, and research in progress.

## **S1: Annual Evaluation of 10% Service by Tenure-Track, Tenured, & Teaching Faculty**

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any of these standards.*

- U**
- Failure to regularly attend meetings of the full faculty.
  - Serves on 0 department/university or other committees.
  - Unprofessional conduct that has resulted in disciplinary action.
  - Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair.
  - If assigned to a program area, failure to regularly attend program area meetings and fulfill program area assignments.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, failure to submit a satisfactory advising portfolio.

---

*Meet all of these standards.*

- S**
- Regularly attends meetings of the full faculty.
  - If assigned to a program area, regularly attends program area meetings and fulfills program area assignments.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate.

---

*Meet the standards for “Satisfactory” and both of these standards.*

- G**
- If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, student evaluations are generally positive.
  - Serves on at least 1 additional committee at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)

---

*Meet the standards for “Good” and at least 1 of these standards.*

- E**
- Serves as chair of a committee at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)
  - Serves on at least 2 additional committees (rather than 1 as in the “Good” standards) at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)
  - Engages in professional service that promotes national visibility as a scholar (e.g., editorial board, grant review panel, conference program committee member, association board member).
  - Holds a professional key leadership role (e.g., editor, association board member or officer).
  - College, university or national recognition/award for service.

---

Note:

1. Service on an “additional committee” excludes service on the full faculty committee. It also excludes service on program area committees by core members of the area committee. Service on a program area committee by an associate member, however, does count as service on an “additional committee.”

## S2: Annual Evaluation of 20% or More Service by Tenure-Track, Tenured, & Teaching Faculty

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any of these standards.*

- Failure to regularly attend meetings of the full faculty.
- Serves on 0 department/university or other committees.
- Unprofessional conduct that has resulted in disciplinary action.
- U** • Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair.
- If assigned to a program area, failure to regularly attend program area meetings and fulfill program area assignments.
- If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, failure to submit a satisfactory advising portfolio.
- Failure to fulfill an administrative service assignment, if applicable.
- Failure to fulfill a professional function, if credited as 10% or more of the workload.

---

*Meet all of these standards.*

- Regularly attends meetings of the full faculty.
- If assigned to a program area, regularly attends program area meetings and fulfills program area assignments.
- S** • If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate.
- Satisfactory performance in an administrative service assignment, if applicable.
- Satisfactory performance of a professional function, if credited as 10% or more of the workload.

---

*Meet the standards for “Satisfactory” and all of these standards.*

- If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, student evaluations are generally positive.
- G** • Makes substantial contributions in an administrative service assignment, if applicable.
- Makes substantial contributions in a professional role, if credited as 10% or more of the workload.
- Serves on at least 1 additional committee at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)

---

*Meet the standards for “Good” and at least 1 of these standards.*

- Serves as chair of a committee at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)
- Serves on at least 2 additional committees (rather than 1 as in the “Good” standards) at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)
- E** • Engages in professional service that promotes national visibility as a scholar (e.g., editorial board, grant review panel, conference program committee member, association board member).
- Holds a professional key leadership role (e.g., editor, association board member or officer).
- College, university or national recognition/award for service.

---

Note:

1. Service on an “additional committee” excludes service on the full faculty committee. It also excludes service on program area committees by core members of the area committee. Service on a program area committee by an associate member, however, does count as service on an “additional committee.”

### S3: Annual Evaluation of Service by Non-Tenure Track Service Faculty

*U = Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, G = Good, E = Excellent*

---

*Meet any of these standards.*

- Failure to submit a satisfactory service portfolio.
  - Failure to regularly attend meetings of the full faculty.
  - Serves on 0 department/university or other committees.
  - Unprofessional conduct that has resulted in disciplinary action.
- U**
- Failure to implement changes based on repeated feedback from FEC or Chair.
  - If assigned to a program area, failure to regularly attend program area meetings and fulfill program area assignments.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, failure to submit a satisfactory advising portfolio.
  - Failure to fulfill an administrative service assignment, if applicable.
  - Failure to fulfill a professional function credited as 10% or more of the workload.
- 

*Meet all of these standards.*

- Service portfolio provides evidence of satisfactory performance in an administrative service assignment.
  - Regularly attends meetings of the full faculty.
  - If assigned to a program area, regularly attends program area meetings and fulfills program area assignments.
- S**
- If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate.
  - Serves on at least 1 additional committee at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)
  - Satisfactory performance of a professional function, if credited as 10% or more of the workload.
- 

*Meet all of these standards.*

- Service portfolio provides evidence of ongoing activities that address needs, priorities, and initiatives of the department as well as needs of the institution and, if appropriate, community service.
  - Regularly attends meetings of the full faculty.
  - If assigned to a program area, regularly attends program area meetings and fulfills program area assignments.
- G**
- If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, the advising portfolio demonstrates that the amount and quality of advising are appropriate.
  - If undergraduate advising is assigned as service, student evaluations are generally positive.
  - Makes substantial contributions in an administrative service assignment, if applicable.
  - Makes substantial contributions in a professional role, if credited as 10% or more of the workload.
- 

*Meet the standards for “good” and at least 1 of these standards.*

- Serves as chair of a committee at the department, college, university, or professional level or serves on at least 2 additional committees at the department, college, university, or professional level. (Note 1)
- E**
- Engages in professional service that promotes national visibility as a scholar (e.g., editorial board, grant review panel, conference program committee member, association board member).
  - Holds a professional key leadership role (e.g., editor, association board member or officer).
  - College, university or national recognition/award for service.
- 

Note:

1. Service on an “additional committee” excludes service on the full faculty committee. It also excludes service on program area committees by core members of the area committee. Service on a program area committee by an associate member, however, does count as service on an “additional committee.”