

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY - POTOMAC STATE COLLEGE
Guidelines for

**Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and
Tenure**

Approved by WVU-PSC Faculty Assembly: 04/24/26

Approved by WVU Provost's Office: 4/24/26

I. INTRODUCTION

The West Virginia University - Potomac State College (WVU-PSC) Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure complement and align with the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure. This document is designed to direct procedures, establish college-wide standards and conventions, and codify the procedures to be followed in conducting faculty evaluations. If procedures are not explicitly declared in this document, then the procedures outlined in the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure document take precedence.

College evaluations must conform to the rules and procedures promulgated by West Virginia University (WVU) and its Board of Governors. Therefore, faculty members, division chairpersons, faculty evaluation committees, and the administrative-level evaluators (the Campus President, Dean of Academic Affairs, and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs) must familiarize themselves with the contents of these Guidelines, the WVU Procedures document, relevant rules of the Board of Governors, and the evaluation schedule approved by the Dean of Academic Affairs and Campus President.

The work of faculty members as interdependent professionals can be categorized or measured in multiple ways. Faculty evaluation must be guided by principles and procedures designed to protect academic freedom and to ensure accuracy, fairness, and equity. This document outlines these broad principles and establishes the rigorous and consistent procedures necessary to maintain these qualities in the faculty evaluation process. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and the University and is both evaluative and developmental. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions reward individual achievement; they also shape the university for decades.¹

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

A. The Faculty Evaluation Process

The faculty evaluation process at WVU is designed to attract promising faculty members, foster their productivity and professional development, help them reach their potential, reward their accomplishments, and retain them at WVU. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and the university and is both evaluative and developmental. The

¹ (West Virginia University 2025 § I)

faculty evaluation process promotes high standards and provides recognition for meritorious work.² Annual evaluation, promotion in rank, and the granting of tenure are acts of critical importance both to members of the academic community and for the welfare of the university system.

1. Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives. It forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that will encourage professional growth and provide support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. An important aspect of the annual evaluation is an assessment of one's progress toward tenure and/or the next promotion, as appropriate. Once tenure is awarded, annual reviews will support subsequent promotion in rank and the salary enhancement for continued academic achievement.

2. Evaluation for Promotion in Rank

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

3. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure

For an award of tenure, tenure-track faculty undergo a rigorous evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments and the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained.

Each evaluation level should follow the written standards of evaluation that are informed and guided by this document.

B. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of WVU-PSC and the WVU system as a whole. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution. Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles, which may change over time; such changes normally are identified in an annual workload document.

Ratings of "Unsatisfactory" are reserved for cases in which the faculty member is not meeting the college's minimal standards for job performance. Ratings of "Unsatisfactory" follow (a) a period of performance decline for which the faculty member had received specific feedback in prior annual evaluations yet has not demonstrated improvement or (b) gross misconduct (e.g., job abandonment). If any faculty member receives an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s) from two levels (Division Chairperson, College-Wide Review Committee, Administrative) the Office of Academic Affairs must notify the Division Chairperson who will develop a written performance improvement plan with the faculty member. The performance improvement plan must be developed within 30 days of the notification. The Division Chairperson must work with the faculty member on their performance improvement plan and monitor their progress,

² (West Virginia University 2025 § II.A)

although the faculty member is ultimately responsible for meeting the requirements of the performance improvement plan.³

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

A. Overview

Teaching, service, and professional growth and development (PG&D) are the cornerstones of WVU-PSC. Faculty responsibilities are defined in terms of activities undertaken in each of the three areas; faculty evaluation is based upon a review of performance in these areas.

Faculty members are responsible for reporting and documenting their achievements in teaching, service, and PG&D in the faculty Digital Evaluation File. Faculty are evaluated on a 0-3 scale with 0 being Unsatisfactory, 1 being Satisfactory, 2 being Good, and 3 being Excellent. Typically, to achieve a rating of Satisfactory, faculty must provide evidence of dependable performance of the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the appointment letter (or equivalent memorandum of understanding) and workload document. To achieve a rating of Good, faculty must provide evidence of consistent and dependable performance of the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the appointment letter and workload document. To achieve a rating of Excellent, faculty must provide exemplary and comprehensive evidence of consistent and dependable performance of the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the appointment letter and workload document.⁴

It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide evidence that (a) demonstrates that they have conducted their assignment as described in their letter of appointment, and (b) informs the evaluator(s) of the quality of their work.⁵

For purposes of annual evaluation, the faculty Digital Evaluation File is closed for the review period on the college-specified deadline date. For purposes of evaluation for promotion, tenure, or non-continuation, the Digital Evaluation File closes on the last business day of the calendar year. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process may be added to the Digital Evaluation File after it is closed.⁶

If work at a previous institution is credited toward tenure or promotion at WVU (see description in Section IV), the faculty member includes it in the faculty Digital Evaluation File as evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at WVU. Such evidence might not be taken into consideration in the initial annual evaluations, but it is likely to be important to the cumulative evaluation in which tenure or promotion (or both) is at stake.

B. Professional Expectations by Category

At WVU-PSC, tenure-track faculty are usually assigned to make significant contributions to teaching in their annual workload. Faculty have the option to decide what remaining areas they want to make reasonable and important contributions to, either Professional Growth and Development or Service (see Section XI for further description).

³ (West Virginia University 2025 § II.A.4)

⁴ (West Virginia University Institute of Technology 2025 § III)

⁵ (West Virginia University 2025 § III)

⁶ (West Virginia University 2025 § VIII)

1. Teaching

Teaching includes traditional modes of instruction such as the in-person classroom lecture, class discussion, seminars, and other classroom activities. It can occur in different modes such as clinical, laboratory, online instruction, and it can be done via distance learning as well as face-to-face. Teaching also includes activities outside scheduled classes, including but not limited to evaluation and critique of student performance; various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction; and mentoring of students. The goals of the teaching-learning endeavor are to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits. The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer knowledge, a commitment to deepen student learning, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students.

Teaching is documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of WVU-PSC. Supporting documentation for the evaluation of effective performance in teaching might include evidence drawn from such sources as the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective judgment of students and student mentees, and of peer and Chairperson evaluations of instructional performance. It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, the development or use of instructional technology and computer assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught or other evidence deemed appropriate.⁷ Regardless of the activities defined as “teaching” assigned to a faculty member, faculty who teach must be effective in their explicit teaching assignments. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the Digital Evaluation File rather than over-reliance on student feedback of instruction.

A teaching narrative for all annual evaluations is required, when teaching is an area of significant contribution. Untenured faculty are required to have two evaluations of instructor performance annually, from the Division Chairperson and either a member of the College-Wide Review Committee (CWRC) or a tenured peer. Tenured faculty must have at least one evaluation of instructor performance in their annual Digital Evaluation File. The Division Chairperson must have at least one evaluation of instructor performance by their choice of a College-Wide Review Committee member from a different Division, other Division Chairperson, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, or Dean of Academic Affairs. To achieve a rating of Good, faculty must meet all the requirements for Satisfactory in addition to the requirements for Good. To achieve a rating of Excellent, faculty must meet all the requirements for Good and Satisfactory in addition to the requirements for Excellent.

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in teaching, faculty must provide a syllabus containing all required components for each course and section, data from a university-approved student feedback of instruction instrument, applicable number of classroom evaluations, a curriculum vitae, evidence that they taught their assigned classes, were available to students through office hours, and a teaching narrative that summarizes activities and accomplishments during the review period. Such evidence may include lesson plans, assessments, online content provided, a schedule of office hours, sample emails/forum posts with students, etc.

⁷ (West Virginia University 2025 § III.A)

2. To achieve a rating of Good in teaching, faculty must provide evidence of effective teaching. Such evidence may include teaching materials they designed or curated, departmental assessment data, student testimonials (e.g., positive feedback in student evaluations), success rates of students in subsequent courses, etc. Faculty should also include context for how this evidence demonstrates effective teaching.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in teaching, faculty must provide evidence that their teaching is of the highest quality. This could be done by continually improving and refining their own teaching, developing new courses, or presenting assessment data justifying the current pedagogy. Evidence may include teaching innovations/methods used in class, efforts to align methodology with established best practices in teaching, and/or assessment data showing the merits of the current method of instruction. Faculty should also include the context for work completed and the evidence provided, along with the value of both.

Faculty are not expected to have a piece of evidence of each type listed above, nor is their evidence required to be one of the types listed. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. However, faculty are expected to have some evidence in each category above (i.e., Satisfactory, Good, and Excellent) in order to achieve successive ratings. Faculty are not expected to have evidence in each category for every class taught, but they should include evidence in each category every year (or preferably semester). Evidence of satisfactory teaching should be present for every course assigned in the form of syllabi and approved university student feedback of instruction. To clarify faculty may choose to focus on redesigning or innovating in one class per year (or semester) but should still include evidence that they taught their other assigned courses.⁸

Additional examples of teaching, possible considerations, and associated evidence can be found in Appendix A in the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document.

2. Service

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

⁸ (West Virginia University Institute of Technology 2025 § III.A)

Service activities promote WVU-PSC, the profession, and the local, state, national and/or global community and involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and scholarship to address the needs of society. Service to the institution can include participation in governance structures, participation in national and international organizations, activity in service organizations, as well as contributions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and school. Service can also be in the form of activity that supports institutional goals and priorities, including those duties and responsibilities associated with leadership positions. When appropriate, faculty may include a summary of the advising activities that encompass registration activities as service to the college (examples of effective registration and graduation support could include a sampling of emails to advisees, graduation application information, notes and reports on advising appointments, and/or other applicable evidence).

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the institution, society, and/or the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of the institution and clients, induces positive change, improves performance, accomplishes institutional goals, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. One important benefit of service to the institution is faculty participation in the governance system including administrative roles. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file. To achieve a rating of Good, faculty must meet all the requirements for Satisfactory in addition to the requirements for Good. To achieve a rating of Excellent, faculty must meet all the requirements for Good and Satisfactory in addition to the requirements for Excellent.

For important contribution (20%) in Service, the criteria for ratings are as follows:

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in service, faculty must provide evidence that they work to improve their division, college, university, community, and/or profession. Such evidence may include participation on an institutional committee/council, volunteer activity in a professional organization, list of volunteer work at campus events, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in service, faculty must provide evidence of meaningful work to improve their division, college, or university, and community or profession. This level of work must include institutional services and service external to the Institution (profession or community/state/USA/world). Evidence of internal services may include meritorious institutional committee work or marginal involvement on multiple college committees, attendance lists of campus/student events, educational presentations to student/faculty groups, etc. Evidence of external service may include active participation in civic organizations or activities, facilitating a school fair, meritorious volunteering, etc.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in service, faculty must provide evidence of more impactful work to improve their division, college, or university, and community or profession. This level of work may be due to the faculty member serving in additional ways (more committee work, volunteering, etc.) or by assuming a leadership role. Evidence of internal services may include leadership in committee work, advising a student organization/club, organization of campus/student events, educational presentations to student/faculty groups, etc. Evidence of external service may include leadership in civic organizations or activities, chairing advisory panels to national organizations, scholarly presentations, etc.

For reasonable contribution (10%) in Service, the criteria for ratings are as follows:

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in service, faculty must provide evidence that they meet the essential needs of the college to function. Such evidence may include essential duties to the division, membership to a committee/council, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in service, faculty must provide evidence that they work to improve their division, college, university, community, and/or profession. Such evidence may include participation on an institutional committee/council, volunteer activity in a professional organization, list of volunteer work at campus events, etc.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in service, faculty must provide evidence of meaningful work to improve their division, college, or university, and community, or profession. This level of work must include institutional services and service external to the Institution (profession or community/state/USA/world). Evidence of internal services may include meritorious institutional committee work or marginal involvement on multiple college committees, attendance lists of campus/student events, educational presentations to student/faculty groups, etc. Evidence of external service may include active participation in civic organizations or activities, facilitating a school fair, meritorious volunteering, etc.

Faculty are not expected to complete each activity listed above, nor is their evidence required to be one of the types listed. However, faculty should typically include evidence for each activity completed. Quality of the evidence presented, as well as quantity of work done, will be considered during the review. These guidelines should be flexible enough to allow faculty to achieve these goals in different ways. When evaluating the quality of service presented, the documentation of evidence should be judged on positive results and products, as well as time and workload of the service acts. When evaluating the quantity of service presented, consideration may be given as to whether or not the service is one of the regular duties of the faculty member. Regardless of contribution percentage, supporting documentation for the evaluation of service should include a summary of how the activity has met essential needs, improved the institution, and/or improved the community.

Private consulting apart from the University normally is not submitted to the faculty Digital Evaluation File. Faculty members are encouraged to review consulting agreements with the Office of Sponsored Programs (Morgantown campus), and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate, so that consulting is no longer private and can be considered as faculty activity. Furthermore, any consulting agreements must align and follow the BOG Governance Rule 1.4 - Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, and Outside Consulting Arrangements. Any exceptions must be clearly defined in the Annual Workload Plan.

Additional examples of service contributions, possible considerations, and associated evidence can be found in Appendix C in the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document.

3. Professional Growth and Development

It is imperative for all faculty at a teaching institution to remain dedicated scholars in their profession. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Professional growth and development in the form of research, scholarship, and/or creative work are documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall ability to stay current in their discipline and/or research interests. Although often discipline-focused; an individual's scholarship also may be interdisciplinary and collaborative or more directly related to the goals and priorities of the institution, this includes activities in support of professional growth and development in the teaching profession. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. Evidence of scholarly merit may be either a work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a program of worthwhile scholarly activity.⁹ Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the Digital Evaluation File. To achieve a rating of Good, faculty must meet all the requirements for Satisfactory in addition to the requirements for Good. To achieve a rating of Excellent, faculty must meet all the requirements for Good and Satisfactory in addition to the requirements for Excellent.

For important contribution (20%) in Professional Growth and Development (PG&D), the criteria for ratings are as follows:

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in PG&D, faculty must provide evidence that they keep current in their field. Such evidence may include evidence of membership in professional groups, a log of articles read, workshop attendance, certifications, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in PG&D, faculty must provide evidence that they participate in their field. Such evidence may include evidence of conference attendance, professional/teaching presentations, contributions to professional memberships, etc. and must include a comprehensive summary of how the activities impact their teaching or scholarship.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in PG&D, faculty must provide evidence of actively contributing to their field. This could be done through new research, consultancy, or a variety of other activities appropriate to the field. Such evidence may include copies of published articles, a list of articles refereed, manuscripts for working papers, copies of presentations given, evidence of grants applied for or received, documentation of consultancy work, etc.

⁹ (West Virginia University Institute of Technology 2025 § III.B)

For reasonable contribution (10%) in Professional Growth and Development, the criteria for ratings are as follows:

1. To achieve a rating of Satisfactory in PG&D, faculty must provide evidence that they maintain relevancy in their field. Such evidence may include evidence of membership association in professional groups, attendance at WVU-PSC development days, etc.
2. To achieve a rating of Good in PG&D faculty must provide evidence that they keep current in their field. Such evidence may include a log of articles read, workshop attendance, certifications, etc.
3. To achieve a rating of Excellent in PG&D, faculty must provide evidence that they participate in their field. Such evidence may include evidence of conference attendance, professional/teaching presentations, contributions to professional memberships, etc. and must include a comprehensive summary of how the activities impact their teaching or scholarship.

Faculty are not expected to complete each activity listed above, nor is their evidence required to be one of the types listed. However, faculty should typically include evidence for each activity completed. These guidelines should be flexible enough to allow faculty to achieve these goals in different ways. Quality of the evidence presented, as well as quantity of work done, will be considered during the review. Regardless of contribution percentage, supporting documentation for the evaluation of PG&D should include a summary of how the activity impacts their scholarship or WVU-PSC as a whole, and comment on the success of transferring knowledge from coursework into courses being taught.¹⁰ When evaluating the quality of PG&D presented, the documentations of evidence should be judged on positive results and products, as well as time and workload of the scholarly acts. When evaluating the quantity of PG&D presented, consideration may be given as to whether or not the activities provided are of the regular duties of the faculty member.

IV. CONTENTS OF APPOINTMENT LETTER AND ASSIGNMENTS FOR TENURED OR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including required teaching contact hours as well as percentages of the assignment normally allocated to teaching, PG&D, and service. The expectations and percentages differ depending on the category of the faculty appointment. The appointment letter identifies the areas of significant and important contributions in which meritorious performance is required as well as the timeline for tenure.

¹⁰ (West Virginia University Institute of Technology 2025 § III.B)

In some cases, the letter may give an individual with previous relevant experience (normally in a similar position) the option to count achievements at their previous institution toward promotion and/or tenure at West Virginia University - Potomac State College, as described in the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document.

Initial Tenure-Track appointments normally are made at the rank of Assistant Professor and require at least a master's level degree in a relevant field.

Appointment with tenure is possible. This is most likely when an individual is recruited for a senior position or for a named professorship.

V. REQUIRED PERSONNEL ACTIONS

A personnel action is required each year for each faculty member. Such actions include annual review, promotion, and/or tenure review. Such personnel actions include but may not be limited to continuation at current rank, continuation with promotion in rank, continuation with tenure awarded, continuation with promotion in rank and tenure awarded, or non-continuation.¹¹

VI. DISCRETIONARY PERSONNEL ACTIONS¹²

Discretionary personnel actions are those which are not required to be taken at specific times, and may include the following:

1. Promotion in rank when the critical year does not apply;
2. Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
3. Non-renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
4. Non-renewal of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year;
5. Non-continuation of the appointment of a non-tenure track faculty member on greater than one year contract;
6. Non-continuation of the appointment of a tenured faculty member;
7. Termination of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year;
8. Termination of the appointment of a tenured faculty member for cause under WV BOG Faculty Rule 4.2, reduction or discontinuance of an existing program, or financial exigency as defined in WV BOG Faculty Rule 4.7.

¹¹ (West Virginia University 2025 § V)

¹² (West Virginia University 2025 § VI)

A Tenure-Track faculty member in the sixth year, or in the year determined to be the "critical" year, must be reviewed for tenure and must either be awarded tenure or given notice of termination of

appointment and a one-year terminal contract. If a faculty member petitions successfully to bring the critical year forward and tenure is not awarded in that year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Under certain circumstances, the critical year may be extended, although under no circumstances may the critical year be extended beyond the ninth full-time year in a Tenure-Track status, nor may the critical year be extended when the faculty member is in their critical year.¹³ A Tenure-Track faculty member will be reviewed automatically in the critical year, unless the faculty member requests no review, in which case a one-year terminal contract will be issued.¹⁴

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Faculty evaluations and recommendations are to be based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The evidence to be weighed must be contained in the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File. Also included among that evidence are the professional judgments at each level of review as to the quality and impact of the faculty member's teaching, service, and PG&D, as applicable. An official faculty Digital Evaluation File shall be established and maintained for each faculty member. In principle, the record in the Digital Evaluation File must be sufficient to document and to support all personnel decisions. Each unit must utilize an annual reporting form ("Productivity Report") appropriate to the work assignments in that unit for use by all members of the unit, including the chairperson. The Productivity Report without supporting documentation is not in itself sufficient for evaluation purposes and should receive a rating of "Unsatisfactory" for that area on an annual review. Digital Evaluation File materials will be in electronic form, provided that the integrity of the information and the date of entry in the Digital Evaluation File are maintained.

The faculty member's Digital Evaluation File must contain, at the minimum, the following items:

1. The letter of appointment and other documents which describe, elaborate upon or modify one's assignment, including position description, memoranda of understanding, annual reviews, and subsequent letters of agreement.
2. An annual workload plan that distributes the effort must be reflected in the faculty Digital Evaluation File.
3. An up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography containing a) critical dates relative to education, employment, change in status, promotion, leave of absence, etc.; b) a list of publications (or the equivalent) with complete citations, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of research, scholarship, and/or creative work; c) a list of service activities.
4. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught, syllabi, data from a university-approved student feedback of instruction instrument, enrollments in each, clinical assignments, committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work.

¹³ (West Virginia University 2025 § V)

¹⁴ (West Virginia University 2025 § VI)

5. For faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of the individual's performance to the home division. In such cases the home division's evaluation should reflect the relative proportion of each dimension of the total assignment.
6. A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses.
7. Other information and records that the chairperson and/or Dean may wish to add. Faculty members shall be notified of such additions and may respond to the additions within ten (10) working days, which may be after the Digital Evaluation File closing date.
8. All other information that bears upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in all pertinent areas. This information may include, but need not be limited to, teaching evaluations, professional presentations, published materials, grant applications and awards, research in progress and the preparation of unpublished materials, other creative scholarship, and service to the university, the citizens of West Virginia, and the profession.

A narrative is required for areas of significant contribution(s) that summarizes activities and accomplishments in each area during the review period.

The faculty member is responsible for assuring completion of Items 3, 4 and 8. The chairperson and in some cases the Dean has responsibility for Items 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7.¹⁵

VIII. COMPLETION OF AND ACCESS TO THE FILE

Faculty shall have access to their Digital Evaluation Files at any time. Security of all Digital Evaluation Files is assured as described in the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document.¹⁶

IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives. Annual evaluations are conducted at the Division, College-Wide, and Administrative levels to include a recommendation regarding continuation at the current position and academic rank consistent with BOG Faculty Rule 4.2. The annual review assessments are also the primary basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available and for the program of Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievements available to faculty at the rank of professor or the equivalent. In the event of a reduction in force of faculty identified through the academic program review process detailed in BOG Academic Rule 2.2, annual reviews will be one of the criteria used to select faculty for a reduction in force (BOG Faculty Rule 4.7).¹⁷

¹⁵ (West Virginia University 2025 § VII)

¹⁶ (West Virginia University 2025 § VIII)

¹⁷ (West Virginia University 2025 § IX.B.1)

A. Tenure-Track Faculty

For Tenure-Track faculty, the appointment letter defines the workload percentages for teaching, service, and professional growth and development. Faculty can request a change of their second category to professional growth and development and have their third area changed to service, as described in Section XI. Regardless of percentages, Tenure-Track faculty members are normally expected to make significant contributions in their first area, at least important contributions in their second area, and at least reasonable contributions in their third area. Tenure-Track faculty will be evaluated through the WVU-PSC evaluation process.

B. Service-Track Faculty

The prefix "Service" is applied to faculty members at WVU-PSC whose assignment is at least 60 percent service, 5-10 percent professional growth and development, and the remainder teaching. Teaching by Service-Track faculty members is normally limited to two (2) courses or equivalent per semester.

The College authorizes Service-Track faculty positions when an ongoing need for significant service and instruction is anticipated. Although Service-Track positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion. To be promoted, significant-level contributions are required in the areas of service, significant-level contributions in teaching, and at least reasonable-level contributions in professional growth and development. Service-Track faculty will be evaluated through the WVU-PSC evaluation process, as stated in Section XIII.

C. Librarian-Track Faculty

The prefix Librarian-Track is applied to faculty members at WVU-PSC whose assignment is primarily to the library. The Librarian-Track faculty will be evaluated through the WVU Libraries evaluation process.

D. Nursing (Clinical-Track) Faculty

The Clinical-Track is applied to faculty members in Nursing at WVU-PSC whose assignment is to teach BSN courses on the WVU-PSC campus. The Nursing faculty will be evaluated through the WVU School of Nursing evaluation process.

E. Other Faculty

WVU-PSC has two additional categories of faculty. Some are appointed to meet short term instructional needs without anticipating a long-term commitment; these include Visiting faculty and Adjuncts. These temporary, non-Tenure-Track positions are not eligible for promotion.

1. Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty appointments normally are limited to a total of three (3) years. Visiting faculty members may, at any time during or after an appointment, apply for a permanent faculty position at WVU-PSC (or elsewhere) if one is posted, but a Visiting appointment per se is not a prelude to a permanent position and entails no promise of such a position.

2. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct (part-time paid) faculty appointments are made by the Dean of Academic Affairs at the request

of the Division Chairperson. The Chairperson (a) attests that the candidate for an Adjunct appointment has the support of the division's faculty, (b) summarizes the candidate's qualifications and anticipated contributions to the division, and (c) provides a copy of the candidate's vita and completed Faculty Certification documentation.

X. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE¹⁸

To achieve promotion or tenure, a faculty member must meet the requirements for their intended position and whose cumulative body of work meets or exceeds absolutes outlined in the letter of appointment, memorandum of understanding, and/or College guidelines.

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

A. Assignment of Significant Contributions in Teaching

Successful teaching is an expectation for faculty who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for either tenure or promotion, significant contributions will have been made in teaching. For tenure or promotion to associate professor, "significant contributions" in teaching normally represents five years of full-time teaching experience (or equivalent professional experience), Good or Excellent ratings in a majority of their annual evaluations in Teaching, and evidence of steps taken to address any areas of concern raised in annual evaluations. For promotion to full professor, faculty are expected to have demonstrated a commitment to continuous improvement in their teaching. This could be persuasively documented by clear and effective evidence of designing new courses, learning and applying innovative techniques, mentoring other faculty, or other development activities.

B. Assignment with Important Contributions in Service

Faculty applying for tenure or promotion to associate professor with "important contributions" in service should present acts of improvement to the institution, society, or the profession; with evidence of examples of impactful work external to the institution; Good or Excellent ratings in a majority of their annual evaluations in Service; and evidence of steps taken to address any areas of concern raised in annual evaluations. For promotion to full professor, faculty are expected to have demonstrated that they are a recognized contributor to service in both the institution and society as a whole. This could be achieved by leadership roles within the college/university, organizing civic events, governance in community committees, or participation in regional, state, national and/or international organizations, etc.

¹⁸ (West Virginia University 2025 § X)

Candidates for tenure/promotion who are expected to make significant contributions in teaching and important contributions in service are also expected to demonstrate at least "reasonable contributions" in PG&D. For tenure or promotion to associate professor, reasonable contributions in PG&D normally represent active participation in scholarship activities. The faculty should also earn Good or Excellent

ratings in a majority of their annual evaluations in PG&D, and provide evidence of steps taken to address any areas of concern raised in annual evaluations. For promotion to full professor, faculty are expected to have demonstrated a continuous commitment to elevated examples of scholarly activity such as participation in professional organizations, certificates, continuing education credits, etc.

For faculty who have service as the area of important contribution, service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the state will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for tenure/promotion purposes. While service to the university and professions are worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must have impactful service activities external to the institution. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the unit, college, or university. Such exceptions should be identified in the letter of appointment and/or annual workload document.

C. Assignment with Important Contributions in Professional Growth and Development

Faculty applying for tenure or promotion to associate professor with "important contributions" in professional growth and development should represent active pursuits of knowledge, with evidence of one or more active contributions of work, Good or Excellent ratings in a majority of their annual evaluations in PG&D, and evidence of steps taken to address any areas of concern raised in annual evaluations. For promotion to full professor, faculty are expected to have demonstrated that they are a recognized contributor to their field. This could be achieved by publication of research, active roles in the profession, or other outward-facing recognition in your discipline.

Candidates for tenure or promotion who are expected to make significant contributions in teaching and important contributions in PG&D are also expected to demonstrate at least "reasonable contributions" in service. For tenure or promotion to associate professor, reasonable contributions in service normally represent active efforts to improve the success of the college, the university, the profession, or the community. The faculty should also earn Good or Excellent ratings in a majority of their annual evaluations in Service, and provide evidence of steps taken to address any areas of concern raised in annual evaluations. For promotion to full professor, faculty are expected to have also demonstrated a continuous commitment to elevated acts of service such as chairing committees, organizing civic events, or administrative service within professional organizations, etc.

XI. CHANGING THE AREA OF IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION

The percentage allocation of a faculty member's teaching, service, and PG&D expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter as described in Section IV above. Annual percentages may be adjusted in accord with local circumstances and documented in the Annual Workload Plan.

If a temporary, one semester or academic year, reallocation of effort from service/professional growth and development to professional growth and development/service (or vice versa) is warranted, the Division Chairperson, in consultation with the Dean of Academic Affairs, has the discretion to switch the areas of important and reasonable contributions. Upon the reallocation decision from the faculty member and the Division Chairperson, with approval from the Dean of Academic Affairs, a memorandum of understanding and workload document will be provided to the Office of Academic Affairs for inclusion in the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File. Common reasons for reallocating effort might be the granting of a sabbatical leave (requiring a higher percentage of effort in professional growth and development) or reallocating a higher percentage away from professional growth and development to service for a specific WVU-PSC service need.

If a change in percentage is to be maintained on a more-or-less permanent basis, the change should be recorded in a memorandum of understanding. Normally the memorandum is prepared in the Office of Academic Affairs based on input from the Division Chairperson and faculty member and signed by the Dean of Academic Affairs and the faculty member.

Regardless of percentages, expectations for promotions and tenure remain as described in the appointment letter unless formal approval is granted for a change in the area of important contribution. The process is described in West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure document and requires approval by the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Campus President, and the WVU Provost. In the case of Tenure-Track faculty members, a change in the area of important contribution can be considered only after tenure is awarded.¹⁹

XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

External evaluation does not apply to faculty at WVU-PSC.

¹⁹ (West Virginia University 2025 § XI)

XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS²⁰

A. Annual Review and Planning Process

Annual faculty assignments are documented in the Annual Workload Plan and recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual Workload Plans reflect collaborative discussion between the faculty member and the Division Chairperson in which they review progress and set goals and expectations for the period typically covered in the next evaluation. Faculty members in the Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Service-Track categories must participate in this formal process of review and planning, with the result being an Annual Workload Plan signed by the faculty member and the Division Chairperson and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. The purpose of the Annual Workload Plan is to guide and mentor faculty activities throughout the review period. The Annual Workload Plan may not be used in a retaliatory manner against faculty as defined in BOG Governance Rule 1.6.

B. Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives. Annual evaluations are conducted at the Division, College-Wide, and Administrative levels to include a recommendation regarding continuation at the current position and academic rank consistent with BOG Faculty Rule 4.2. The annual review assessments are also the primary basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available and for the program of Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievements available to faculty at the rank of professor or the equivalent. In the event of a reduction in force of faculty identified through the academic program review process detailed in BOG Academic Rule 2.2, annual reviews will be one of the criteria used to select faculty for a reduction in force (BOG Faculty Rule 4.7).²¹

C. Cumulative Evaluation and Standards for Promotion or Tenure

Promotion in rank recognizes exemplary performance by a faculty member and is normally conducted when a faculty member seeks promotion and/or tenure. The evaluation for promotion in rank provides the opportunity to assess a faculty member's growth and performance since the initial appointment or the last promotion. In order to be recommended for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions in the area(s) defined in their letter of appointment. The decision by the Provost to accept a recommendation for or against retention or the awarding of tenure shall rest on both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the department, college, and the University,

²⁰ (West Virginia University 2025 § II)

²¹ (West Virginia University 2025 § IX.B.1)

and on the strengths and limitations of the faculty member as established in the annual evaluation process.²²

D. Faculty Productivity Reports

Faculty members must submit a productivity report with their contributions in teaching, service, and professional growth and development as outlined in the Annual Workload Plan (Section III). The annual productivity report must include a narrative for areas of significant contributions as assigned in the Annual Workload Plan. Digital Evaluation Files of faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure, must include a cumulative productivity report and a narrative summary of all areas of one's assignment as outlined in the Annual Workload Plan. The Productivity Report without supporting documentation is not in itself sufficient for evaluation purposes in a given area and should receive a rating of "Unsatisfactory" for that area on an annual review.²³

E. Evaluation Process by Faculty Category

All Digital Evaluation Files of faculty who are not fully promoted shall undergo a three-level review process (the first level is the Division Chairperson, the second level is the College-Wide Review Committee (CWRC), and the third level is administrative). Digital Evaluation Files including a cumulative report will undergo a fourth (University) level of review. A fully promoted and tenured faculty member will be evaluated annually only by the Division Chairperson (or equivalent) unless the faculty member petitions the CWRC to also conduct an annual review. The faculty member must inform the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, in writing, of this intent 90 days in advance of the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File closing.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

For an award of tenure, Tenure-Track faculty undergo a particularly rigorous evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments and an assessment of the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance must be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion and tenure. If there is limited evidence, as defined in these guidelines, of the faculty member's results in their first review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A Productivity Report without supporting documentation should receive a rating of "Unsatisfactory" on an annual review. While the absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure, negative evaluations shall apprise Tenure-Track faculty members of performance deficiencies and shall call attention to expectations for subsequent consideration for promotion and/or tenure and the extent to which they must enhance their productivity. Occasionally, the evaluations will result in termination of the individual's appointment, sometimes prior to the critical year, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts; in these cases, notice shall be given in accord with WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.2.²⁴

²² (West Virginia University 2025 § X)

²³ (West Virginia University 2025 § VII)

²⁴ (West Virginia University 2025 § IX.B.1)

2. Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted

The annual evaluation of faculty members who are tenured but not fully promoted will generally emphasize both quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the rank of professor. Review assessment for promotion to full professor should be more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor. While not all faculty members may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations shall guide them toward that achievement. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion.²⁵

3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted

For ordinary annual reviews, fully-promoted faculty members are evaluated by their chairperson and may also choose to be evaluated by the College-Wide Review Committee. The faculty member must inform the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in writing, 90 days in advance of the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File closing if they wish to be evaluated by the College-Wide Review Committee.

Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating faculty members at these ranks is to describe their performance in the context of appropriate expectations, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments and reappointment. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's continued productivity. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving the next Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member's results in a review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of limited evidence of the faculty member's results normally would receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s).²⁶

4. Service-Track Faculty

A Service-Track faculty member and the Division Chairperson may normally choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year 7), or later. For a Service-Track faculty member, promotion depends on significant contributions in service and teaching and at least reasonable contributions are required in professional growth and development.²⁷

5. Professor Emeritus Status

A faculty member is considered for Emeritus status when their retirement is announced and, normally, after at least 10 years of full-time service to WVU-PSC. A faculty member who meets these criteria and requests Emeritus status is evaluated by the Division Chairperson and the CWRC. If the faculty member's overall contributions to WVU-PSC are judged as meritorious, the evaluators submit to the Campus President their recommendations in favor of Emeritus status along with a brief description of the contributions that warrant the recommendation. The evaluations can be based upon a review of the

²⁵ (West Virginia University 2025 § IX.B.2)

²⁶ (West Virginia University 2025 § IX.B.3)

²⁷ (West Virginia University 2025 § IX.B.4)

faculty member's vita or other suitable summary of their contributions; a cumulative report is not required.

Faculty members who are awarded Emeritus status retain their professional titles. In every case, the term "emeritus" follows the rank and title (e.g., "Associate Professor Emeritus," "Service Professor Emeritus")

F. Evaluation Levels

Each evaluation level shall employ the standards described in this, WVU-PSC Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure document.

1. Division-Level Evaluation

The Division Chairperson will review the Digital Evaluation File and will make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member. The Division Chairperson shall indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. In a recommendation for tenure, the Chairperson shall take into account the long-range staffing pattern of the department. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Chairperson of the evaluative comments and recommendations. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File and shared with the faculty member.²⁸ The Dean of Academic Affairs will review the Division Chairperson at this level of evaluation.

2. College-Level Evaluation

The WVU-PSC College-Wide Review Committee composition is described in the WVU Potomac State College Faculty Assembly Constitution.

The CWRC shall review the faculty Digital Evaluation File, all recommendations forwarded from the Division Chairperson, and any rebuttals or other responses made by the faculty member forwarded to them by the Office of Academic Affairs. The committee will prepare a written evaluation in each case with an unequivocal recommendation for or against continuation, tenure, and/or promotion, as applicable. The evaluation must indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward, and expectations for, tenure and/or the next promotion. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs. The total number of positive and negative votes must be recorded. Committee members may include a minority statement in the body of the evaluation without separate signatures.²⁹ Copies of all written statements shall be forwarded to the faculty member and also placed in the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File and shared with the faculty member, including the signatures, votes or abstentions, and minority statement from the college committee, if applicable.³⁰

3. Administrative-Level Evaluation

The Campus President with assistance from the Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs will perform the annual administrative level evaluation. If the Digital Evaluation File includes a cumulative report (promotion, tenure, Emeritus status, non-continuation), then the Campus President shall conduct the review. The evaluator will review the productivity report and evaluations and recommendations from

²⁸ (West Virginia University 2025 § XIII.A.3)

²⁹ (West Virginia University 2025 § XIII.B.2)

³⁰ (West Virginia University 2025 § XIII.B.3)

the first two levels, and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member. The faculty member shall be informed, in writing, of the evaluation and recommendations. A copy of the evaluation shall be placed in the faculty member's Digital Evaluation File and shared with the faculty member. If the Digital Evaluation File contains a cumulative review, it will move to the WVU Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel and the WVU Provost Office for review. The WVU Provost will make the final decision.

G. Responses and Rebuttals to Faculty Evaluations

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to evaluations from all levels of review. The reactions fall into two (2) general classes: “responses” in the general case and “rebuttals” in specific situations. These are described in more detail in the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure document.³¹

Each evaluation letter must advise the faculty member of the appropriate type of reaction that is available to them, as follows:

1. Rebuttals

When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or non-continuation, the evaluation should include a statement advising the faculty member of their right of rebuttal at the next level. In a Division Chairperson-level evaluation, the statement should say that “If you wish to challenge this evaluation, you may submit a rebuttal to the College-Wide Review Committee within five (5) working days of your receipt of this evaluation.” And so on for each level of the evaluation process.

A faculty member may petition the Provost for a review of recommendation rendered by the Campus President regarding tenure, promotion, or non-continuation. The petition should reach the Provost within five (5) working days of receipt of notification by the Campus President.

2. Responses

Responses to annual reviews at the Division or CWRC level must be submitted within ten (10) working days. Evaluations without a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion or non-continuation should say, “You may, within ten (10) working days, submit a response to this evaluation to your Division Chairperson or College-Wide Review Committee Chairperson or the Office of Academic Affairs, in accordance with the WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, and Promotion and Tenure document.”

³¹ (West Virginia University 2025 § XIII.A.5-6, XIII.B.5-6)

References

West Virginia University. 2025. "*WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL, EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE 2025-26.*"

<https://faculty.wvu.edu/files/d/07f9f013-b8d5-43a7-9e13-a63efc38dea1/university-procedures-final-2025-2026>. Pdf.

West Virginia University Institute of Technology. 2025. "*WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE 2024-25.*"

<https://faculty.wvu.edu/files/d/f52e3153-678d-4709-b1a8-692b0e6f85bd/wv-tech-pt-document-10-27-2025.pdf>.

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