CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN STEM EDUCATION
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION,
AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES

Approved by the Faculty of the Center for Excellence in STEM Education, September 1, 2020.
Approved by the Office of the Provost, September 30, 2020.

OUTLINE

I.   INTRODUCTION

This document specifies those aspects of the Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises that are unique to the Center for Excellence in STEM Education (CE-STEM or Center) at West Virginia University. Although the CE-STEM is not a constituent unit of the College of Education and Human Services, the topics in this document are arranged in the same order as is found in the *College of Education and Human Services Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises* to promote consistency between the practices of the two related units. The College of Education and Human Services document, in turn, is substantially similar to the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences document. Those topics already described in the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* are not duplicated here.

Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the Center, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, and promotion at the Center level. Policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors and those of West Virginia University. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board and University documents. In event of conflict among documents, the precedence is Board, University, and then Center.

In the Center, the role in the evaluation process typically performed by the dean of a college is performed by the Center director. The role in the evaluation process typically performed by the chair of a department is performed by a faculty member appointed by the Center director, referred to as the Chair-designee. In the Center, the Chair-designee is the WVUteach Co-director appointed by the College of Education and Human Services.

II.   APPOINTMENT LETTER AND ASSIGNMENTS

This section specifies the types of faculty roles in the Center and how the expectations for an individual faculty member are to be documented. These procedures do not nullify or negate existing, documented agreements specifying a faculty member's expectations that were in place prior to the approval of these *Guidelines.*

Often faculty serving in the CE-STEM are assigned to home units in other colleges and departments. These faculty are evaluated under the rules of their home units and not within the center, and this document does not guide their process.

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment normally allocated to teaching, research, and service. The expectations and percentages differ depending on the category of the faculty appointment. Each percentage expresses the value placed on the activity and not necessarily the time or effort devoted to it.

Each faculty member's appointment letter defines the specific expectations for their position in research, teaching, and service, as appropriate given the faculty member's areas of contribution. These expectations can be modified by an officially approved amendment to the appointment letter or a memorandum of understanding. Such modifications should be issued in the event of a significant and relatively permanent change to a faculty member's expectations, including changes in programs or departments. In general, the appointment letter or memorandum of understanding should be periodically reviewed, including upon promotion, to determine if modifications are warranted. The most recent appointment letter and/or memorandum of understanding supersedes all prior letters and should be used for making decisions on promotion.

Teaching, Service, and Research faculty positions are promotable. In such cases, the appointment letter identifies the areas of significant contribution in which meritorious performance is required as well as the timeline for promotion. 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 at WVU.

A. Service faculty

Most faculty members in the Center for Excellence in STEM Education have appointments related to their role as master teachers. Since "master teacher" is a term that refers to their role within the externally described UTeach model, these faculty hold service-prefixed titles (Service Instructor, Service Assistant Professor, Service Associate Professor, Service Professor).

This prefix is applied to faculty who have a primary assignment in service with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. In the Center, Service normally constitutes at least 50 percent of the assignment and the remainder is in teaching and, in some cases, research. The initial term of a Service appointment is normally one year. Upon satisfactory completion of the initial term, reappointment may be for one or more years as allowed by the university for a particular rank. There is no limit on the number of terms.

A Service faculty member with a master's degree is eligible for the rank of Instructor (formally, "Service Instructor"). A terminal degree in the relevant discipline—normally a doctoral degree, but sometimes a master's degree—is required for professorial rank (e.g., Service Assistant Professor). The Center director may grant an exception to this, where significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree. An individual appointed initially as a Service Instructor may be promoted to Service Assistant Professor if the individual holds a relevant terminal degree (or approved substitute[1]) at the time of promotion (and meets the other criteria for promotion).

Although Service positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion (i.e., Service Assistant Professor, Service Associate Professor, and Service Professor). Requests for promotion review are at the discretion of the faculty member and are normally made after at least five years at the current rank. To be promoted, significant contributions are required in the areas of service and teaching. At least reasonable contributions are required in the area of research, if it is part of the faculty member's assignment.

B. Teaching Faculty

The WVU *Procedures* document describes faculty appointments with the prefix "teaching" as renewable term appointments of up to three years in which the principal assignment is instructional (normally 80%) and the balance of the assignment depends on the needs of the department and the interests of the faculty member. In the Center for Excellence in STEM Education, the assignment normally is defined as at least 80 percent teaching and at least 5 percent service. At 1.0 FTE, an 80 percent teaching load is eight courses (or equivalent in consultation with departmental policy) per nine-month academic year.

The Center authorizes Teaching faculty positions when an ongoing need for instruction is anticipated (temporary teaching appointments generally are "Visiting" faculty members, "Lecturers" or "Senior Lecturers" as described below). The initial term of a Teaching appointment is normally one year. Upon satisfactory completion of the initial term, reappointment may be for one or more years as allowed by the university for a particular rank. There is no limit on the number of terms.

---

[1] For example, a Master's degree or National Board Certification, plus the standard five or more years of experience at the current rank would make one eligible for promotion if stated in the letter of appointment or determined to be adequate by the Center director.

A Teaching faculty member with a master's degree is eligible for the rank of Instructor (formally, "Teaching Instructor"). A terminal degree in the relevant discipline—normally a doctoral degree, but sometimes a master's degree—is required for professorial rank (e.g., Teaching Assistant Professor). The Center director may grant an exception to this, where significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree. An individual appointed initially as a Teaching Instructor may be promoted to Teaching Assistant Professor if the individual holds a relevant terminal degree (or approved substitute[2]) at the time of promotion (and meets the other criteria for promotion).

Although Teaching positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion (i.e., Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor). Requests for promotion review are at the discretion of the faculty member and are normally made after at least five years at the current rank. To be promoted, significant contributions are required in the area of teaching and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other areas of assignment.

C. Research Faculty

The primary focus of a Research faculty appointment in the Center is supporting STEM Education projects at WVU. This involves helping faculty develop research plans around STEM education projects, helping STEM faculty gauge the effects of their education and outreach work, and serving as an evaluator for STEM Education projects. Such roles more often place a Research faculty member in the Center in a co-investigator or senior personnel role than as principal investigator in externally funded research but provide broader overall funding opportunities to WVU. A Research faculty assignment may be 100 percent research. Alternatively, a portion of the assignment may be allocated to teaching and/or service. If teaching is part of the assignment, it must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. Except for the salary associated with teaching, the salary of Research faculty appointments may be fully or partially supported by institutional funds at the outset and include a timeline for becoming self-supporting through external funds (normally after two or three years). Because the salaries of Research faculty members are contingent on external funding, they are not considered "permanent" faculty members for the purposes of these *Guidelines.*

Individuals with a terminal degree are eligible for a professorial rank (e.g., "Research Assistant Professor").

Although Research positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion (i.e., Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor). Requests for promotion review are at the discretion of the faculty member and are normally made after at least five years at the current rank. In addition to a terminal degree, significant contributions are required in the area of research and at least reasonable contributions in other assigned areas (if applicable).

D. A note on tenure-track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members appointed to the Center are not described in this document since no instances exist nor are anticipated. Should one occur prior to the updating of this document, they should follow the guidelines described in the *College of Education and Human Services Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises.*

III.   ANNUAL WORKLOAD PLAN

A. Annual Review and Planning Process

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty, Chair-designee and Center director. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Center-evaluated faculty members in the Teaching and Service categories must participate

---

[2] (See the service category for example equivalent experience for teaching faculty.)

in this formal process of review and planning, with the result being a Workload Plan signed by the faculty member and the Chair-designee and submitted to the Center director for final approval. Faculty in the research category will develop their annual assignment plan in collaboration with the Center director.

Since many faculty members in the Center do much teaching within their service-described positions, there is need to clarify what effort is credited toward the two areas of significant contribution. The annual workload agreements can be used to define what portion of effort is considered teaching versus service for the purpose of evaluation. For example, a one-credit course that includes substantial clinical supervision of students in off-campus public school classrooms can be described on the workload as the equivalent of a more traditional three-credit course in the category of teaching. There is no conflict if additional clinical supervision provided by the same faculty member is classified on the workload as service. No effort may be classified as both teaching and service, but if a particular effort that could fairly be classified as either is not assigned to a category on the workload, the faculty member may choose to include it with either teaching or service in their file.

The workload does not have to specify *all* of a particular faculty member's service. While many service responsibilities (for example, leading advising or leading program recruiting) may be described on the workload, some service is emergent. Up to 20% of the service on the workload may be reserved for this emergent service, which may depend on how faculty choose to serve the community and/or how committee work is assigned midyear.

For faculty members approved for a leave or a Modification of Duties, the approved leave or Modification of Duties plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the leave or modification period. Copies of the approved leave or Modification of Duties (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the annual evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

B. Departures from the Appointment Letter

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

If a temporary (i.e., per year) reallocation of effort is warranted, the Center director typically affords the Chair-designee the discretion to make a change of 10 percentage points (e.g., from 40 in teaching, 10 in research, 50 in service to 30 in teaching, 20 in research, 50 in service). Reallocation of more than 10 percentage points requires the written approval of the Center director and Office of the Provost.

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 CE-STEM office based on input from the Chair-designee and faculty member and is signed by the Center director, the faculty member and the Office of the Provost.

Regardless of percentages, expectations for promotion remain as described in the appointment letter or memorandum of understanding unless formal approval is granted for a change in areas of significant contribution. The process for changing areas of significant contribution is described in Section XI of the WVU *Procedures* document and requires approval by both the Center director and the Provost.

C. Workloads During Sabbatical Leaves

For faculty members approved for a sabbatical leave, the approved application and plan together constitute an agreement temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the period of the leave or program.

Sabbatical leave assignments are negotiated between the faculty member and the Chair-designee and approved by the Office of the Provost. A sabbatical leave may be granted so that a faculty member may engage in research, writing, or other activity calculated to contribute to their professional development and overall value to WVU.

The percentages reported in the annual Workload Plan depend on the duration of the leave. Depending upon the area of significant contribution the faculty workload will be adjusted to reflect this one-year change in effort (i.e. 100% research, or 100% teaching, or 100% service). The percentages are simple in full-year cases: for example, a 100 percent research assignment. The arithmetic is slightly more complex in one-semester cases. For example, a faculty member's percentages might be 0 in teaching, 100 in research, and 0 in service during a one-semester sabbatical leave, and 40 in teaching, 10 in research, and 50 in service in the non-leave semester. Averaging the two semesters would yield annual percentages of 20 in teaching, 55 in research, and 25 in service. Similar calculations apply in other cases. In general, the annual percentages should add up to 100 and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on a leave. In the case of a leave in which the assignment does not fall into research, teaching, or service, the percentages would be based on the portion of the review period not on the leave.

D. Modification of Duties

The University offers work-life policies and procedures that promote flexibility for faculty members who are dealing with certain personal, parental, or professional responsibilities; see Board of Governors (BOG) Faculty Rule 4.5 Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty; Extension of the Tenure Clock.

The Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty normally results in a release from, or modification of, traditional teaching duties to accommodate the birth, adoption, or guardianship of a child without salary reduction. The Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty also accommodates serious circumstances – for example, illness of the faculty member or a member of the immediate family, care of an elderly parent, or some other serious but unforeseen circumstance – without salary reduction.

The approved assignment temporarily replaces the effort normally assigned to traditional teaching duties during the semester in which the event occurs so that the percentages reported in the annual Workload Plan remain at 100 percent.

In terms of annual evaluations, the faculty member is not penalized because the quantity of teaching decreased during the year. The evaluation focuses on the quality of the assigned teaching for the year under review. A similar approach is taken with regard to research and service: The evaluations focus on the quality, not the quantity, of the faculty member's research or service for the year under review.

IV.   THE FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Faculty members are responsible for reporting and documenting their achievements in service, teaching, and research in the Faculty Evaluation File. It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide for the file evidence that: (a) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (b) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work.

At the time of this writing, all faculty are required to update their productivity information each year in the electronic Digital Measures system and the annual productivity report will be generated from the Digital Measures system. The term "annual file" includes the electronic Digital Measures system.

For Center faculty, the file shall be closed for the review period on December 31. For purposes of evaluations for promotion, additions to the electronic Digital Measures system closes on the last business day of the calendar year.

Faculty content in Digital Measures is structured in five activity groups: (1) General Information, (2) Teaching, (3) Scholarship/Research, (4) Service, and (5) Archived Reports and Documents. The teaching, research, and service activity groups include documentation for each respective area of contribution. In most cases, the faculty member is responsible for providing the documentation for each category with the exception of Student Evaluations of Instruction, which are centrally loaded into Digital Measures. Administrative Data, including documents such as initial appointment letters, critical year letters, and intent to renew appointment letters, are generally uploaded by administrative staff. Faculty are responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in the Digital Measures file.

A. General Information

Faculty document and keep current the General Information components, including (though not limited to): contact information, administrative assignments, awards and honors, education and certifications. CE-STEM annual workload information and other documents describing a faculty member's assignment (e.g., appointment letter) are also stored in this area, though are generally uploaded by administrative staff.

Private consulting apart from the University normally is not submitted in Digital Measures. Faculty members must disclose consulting agreements with the Office of Sponsored Programs through the annual usage of the Conflicts of Interest form, and develop a contract with the University when appropriate, so that consulting is no longer private and can be considered as faculty activity. Exceptions must be clearly defined in the annual Workload Plan. These consulting arrangements must generally be approved by the chair.

B. Teaching

The Center avoids sole or excessive reliance upon the student evaluation of instruction. To achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and/or evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing priorities of the Center or University.

C. Scholarship/Research

Faculty with assignments that do not include a research component are not required to do research. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Faculty may opt to do this is through research activity.

For those who do have a research component in their assignment, activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work are documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research mission of the Center. Some information, such as proposals and awards managed through WVU+kc will be automatically imported, though faculty members should confirm the accuracy of the information.

Specific to the Center, publications of research articles, books, and other manuscripts shall be counted as scholarly activity in the year they appear in print, i.e., the date that would appear in a citation of the work.. It should also be noted that large-scale, long-term projects, such as books and scholarly works of similar

scope, may be reported, and credit given, over more than one reporting period (January 1 through December 31).

Each article and book must be documented with proof of publication. For an article, the proof can be a reprint of the article or, if the department guidelines allow a publication to be claimed when it is "in press," a letter from the publishing journal that states unequivocally that the article has received final acceptance for publication. For a book, proof can consist of the title page and table of contents. The "in press" status of a book requires a letter from the publisher stating that the book has received final acceptance for publication.

External grants, and the amounts allocated to the faculty member's activities, must be documented by official communications from the granting agency and/or the relevant office within WVU. For purposes of annual and promotion reviews, descriptions of external funding must clearly delineate whether the funding was awarded to support research, teaching, or service and is credited in the appropriate category. Individuals also must clearly note their role and contribution to the funded project.

D. Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the Center, University, or profession. As per the University's land-grant mission, service to the community and state that draws on a faculty member's expertise is encouraged. The Center was created to improve STEM education in West Virginia broadly. Faculty members should submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment that is consistent with current University and Center expectations for documenting service.

E. Archived Reports and Documents

Faculty members should update and submit their curriculum vitae at least annually. Other supporting documentation, including items of an administrative nature that the Chair-designee or Center director may wish to include, will be included in this section as well.

Report Narratives are included in this section. The faculty member must submit an Annual Review Narrative as part of an annual report every year to facilitate annual performance evaluations. This report covers the most recently completed year of work. The Center follows WVU's timelines for faculty evaluation, which are based on a calendar-year reporting period.

There are other types of Report Narratives that may be applicable to a faculty member in a given year:
- Promotion Narratives (Teaching, Research, and Service Narratives, which must be loaded together in a single file) summarize accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion and/or tenure. If the appointment letter allows credit towards promotion and/or tenure for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, the credited work is also included in the narratives.
- A Cumulative Pre-Promotion Narrative is permitted, though not required, to be submitted by non-tenure-track Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members to solicit detailed feedback on their progress towards discretionary promotion. In these cases, the report should be based on either work since the initial appointment at WVU or work since the last promotion at WVU, whichever is appropriate. If the appointment letter allows credit towards promotion for work done before starting at WVU, and the work was done during the period covered by the Narrative, then the credited work should also be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.

The Faculty Productivity Report is to be generated and submitted annually by all faculty members.
Review and Promotion Documents—Chair-designee reviews, Faculty evaluation committee reviews, Center director reviews, and any written responses from the faculty member—are archived. Such documents are generally uploaded by administrative staff.

F. Administrative Procedures and Security

Administrative procedures related to the use of Digital Measures by designated committees, the Chair-designee, Center director, and Provost are guided by university policy.

Individual faculty have password access to their evaluation data and must take appropriate precautions to protect their password and not share it with others per WVU ITS Policy 2.2 Identity and Access Management. Committee members and others involved in the evaluation process will be given viewing access to specified faculty members' accounts by the Center.

V. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Faculty Evaluation Committee serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and when action is recommended for promotion, tenure, cumulative pre-promotion review, termination of appointment, or nonrenewal of appointment. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty evaluation files.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee in the Center consists of a minimum of three Center-affiliated faculty plus a chair appointed by the Center director, but excludes any faculty member being considered for promotion, anyone serving on any other faculty evaluation committee that would evaluate the same faculty within the University, the Chair-designee, or any person holding a position in University administration. Since the faculty group is small, all faculty are eligible to participate except as listed above. Since this committee composition does not include a majority of tenured faculty (because such faculty are not common in the Center), this composition requires an exception from the Provost. Faculty will not be members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee during any semester in which they are on an approved leave or Modification of Duties.

Committee members recuse themselves when their own annual evaluation case is under consideration by the Committee. Committee members must recuse themselves when the annual evaluation case of anyone who is in their immediate family or household is under consideration by the Committee. If this proviso affects the chair of the Committee, another member serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. When an individual recuses themselves from the Committee, they cease to be a member of the Committee during the recusal.

All voting members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting. If a member is recused from a case, the member does not sign; instead, the term "Recused" is written in the signature area.

When unavoidable, members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee may participate in Faculty Evaluation meetings electronically as long as such participation allows all participants to see and hear all relevant information. At least two-thirds of the Faculty Evaluation Committee must be present for every meeting of committee.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will keep committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential except in a case where an apparent violation of WVU or Center procedures needs to be reported.

VI. THE EVALUATION PROCESS

A. General Standards and Annual Evaluation

Faculty members are evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Chair-designee and the Center director each year. The evaluations by the Committee and the Chair-designee are independent in the sense that the Chair-designee's evaluation is not controlled by the Committee's evaluation. However, in reviewing

the faculty member's record, the Chair-designee should review the Committee's report and recommendations and comment on them. The Center director provides input to the Committee and the Chair-designee regarding the work of the faculty members in supporting broader WVU STEM initiatives lead by the Center.

The evaluations provide ratings of performance in the areas of assignment (service, teaching, research, as appropriate) as well as statements that are developmental and goal-oriented. The Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the Faculty Evaluation File. In annual evaluations, 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 recommendations for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment should guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, paying particular attention to cumulative progress toward, and expectations for, promotion and/or tenure.

The Chair-designee should avoid excessive duplication of the narratives in the Committee's evaluation. However, the evidentiary basis of an evaluation needs to be clearly articulated. For example, a faculty member's research for the year might be rated as "excellent," based on the Faculty Evaluation Committee's and Chair's interpretations of the departmental guidelines for that faculty member's specific workload and memorandum of understanding because the faculty member published two papers in top journals and won a federal grant. Evidence for the "excellent" rating should be clearly stated. If the Committee's statement is clear and the Chair agrees, the Chair's statement needs only to acknowledge agreement.

Evaluation of performance in each area of assignment is 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 and/or tenure), or "Unsatisfactory."

Evaluations and recommendations are based on the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File as described in Section IV of these *Guidelines*. If there is not enough information in the File to warrant a meritorious rating ("excellent" or "good"), a rating of "satisfactory" or lower is appropriate. If there is no evidence in the File to document a particular activity, a rating of "unsatisfactory" is appropriate with an explanation of why that rating is given.

The Center director reviews and evaluates each recommendation (as well as rebuttals and responses) of faculty members under consideration for promotion or termination and makes an independent recommendation that includes a rationale for each decision. The Center director reports the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Chair-designee, and to the Provost for continuation of the process at the University level.

B. Reviews for Promotion

A career evaluation normally is conducted when a faculty member seeks promotion. A career evaluation is conducted by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair-designee in addition to the annual evaluation. In addition to rating performance in the areas of assignment, the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding promotion.

1. Service Faculty
    A Service faculty member and the Chair-designee may normally choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

    For a Service faculty member, promotion depends on significant contributions in service and teaching, with specific expectations articulated in the faculty member's appointment letter or memorandum of

understanding as well as departmental evaluation guidelines. At least reasonable contributions at a "satisfactory" level are required in research, if research effort is part of the faculty's appointment and/or workload.

Promotion to a professorial rank—that is, from Service Instructor to Service Assistant Professor—normally requires a terminal degree. As described in Section II.A of these *Guidelines*, the Center director may grant an exception to this, in which case significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree.

In a year when a faculty member who has service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's service from persons external to the University, as described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the WVU *Procedures* document and Section VIII of these *Guidelines*. This external evaluation expectation includes when a faculty member seeks promotion from Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor and a promotion from Service Associate Professor to Service Professor.

2. <u>Teaching Faculty</u>
   A Teaching faculty member and the Chair-designee may normally choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

   For a Teaching faculty member, the sole area of significant contribution is teaching, with specific expectations articulated in the faculty member's appointment letter or memorandum of understanding as well as departmental evaluation guidelines. At least reasonable contributions at a "satisfactory" level are required in service and/or research.

   Promotion to a professorial rank—that is, from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor—normally requires a terminal degree. As described in Section II.B of these *Guidelines*, the Center director may grant an exception to this, in which case significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree.

   For promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to the rank of Teaching Professor, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evidence showing that professional colleagues, both within the university and/or <u>nationally or internationally</u>, acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline. Departmental evaluations can document the judgment of colleagues within the university. To document the judgments of colleagues nationally or internationally, the candidate for Teaching Professor has two options: (a) The file must include evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's programmatic contributions in teaching from persons external to WVU, as described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the WVU *Procedures* document and Section IX of these *Guidelines*, and/or (b) the file must include a record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature, and/or a record of pedagogically related presentations at professional conferences of national or international stature, and/or evidence of student mentorship, professional development, or consultations.

   Note that external evaluations are *not* needed as part of the Faculty Evaluation File for faculty members seeking promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor.

VII.   REBUTTALS AND RESPONSES TO FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to their evaluations from the Center Faculty Evaluation Committee, Chair-designee, or Center director. The reactions fall into two general classes: "responses" in

the general case and "rebuttals" in specific situations. These are described in more detail in the WVU *Procedures* document.

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

Rebuttals

When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding termination of appointment or nonrenewal of appointment, the evaluation should include a statement advising the faculty member of their right of rebuttal at the next level. In a Center-level evaluation, the statement should say, "If you wish to challenge this evaluation, you may submit a rebuttal to the Director of the Center for Excellence in STEM Education within five working days of your receipt of this evaluation." In a college-level evaluation, the statement should replace "Director of the Center for Excellence in STEM Education" with "Provost."

Responses

Responses to annual reviews at the Center level may be submitted at any time. Evaluations without a recommendation regarding promotion, tenure, cumulative pre-promotion review, termination of appointment, or nonrenewal of appointment should say, "You may, at any time, submit a response to this evaluation to Chair-designee or Director of the Center for Excellence in STEM Education, in accordance with Section XIII.A.6 of the WVU *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.*"

VIII.   EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

External evaluations of some aspects of faculty achievement are considered when:

- a Service faculty member seeks promotion (external evaluations of service are required),

- a Research faculty member seeks promotion (external evaluations of research are required), or

- a Teaching faculty member seeks promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor and exercises the option for documenting national or international recognition of their achievements through external evaluations.

In other words, all faculty members seeking promotion must have external letters with the exceptions of Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor or Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor. Faculty seeking promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Full Professor may choose the documentation of national impact as discussed in Section VII.2 above.

The general procedures for identifying suitable external evaluators are described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the WVU *Procedures* document. In the Center, this task is shared by the Center committee tasked with faculty evaluation and promotion recommendations and the Chair-designee using the process that follows. Additional details, such as the timeline for completing the steps, are subject to change and distributed annually.

A.   Evaluator Qualifications

The faculty candidate and the Faculty Evaluation Committee, acting independently, each give the Chair-designee a list of four to six evaluators from peer institutions. Per the WVU *Procedures* document, "A paragraph describing each evaluator should be submitted indicating qualifications to serve in this capacity. Any personal or professional relationship the faculty member has or has had with the evaluator should be identified. The Chairperson [Chair-designee] or Dean [Center director] should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from two or more persons on each list. A minimum of four external evaluations ordinarily is required."

The WVU *Procedures* document recognizes that "peer institution" can be context dependent.[3] A "peer institution" with a Carnegie Classification that matches that of WVU is by default a peer, but in the context of the role of a Center faculty member without a research expectation, the term could also apply to an institution that is, for example, also a member of the same major national teacher education replication effort. To propose an evaluator who is at a college or university that is not a Carnegie or replication peer, justification is required. Such justifications include but are not limited to the interest in inclusion of: (1) an individual who, by virtue of their scholarly specialization or standing in the discipline, is uniquely qualified to judge the faculty member's contribution, or (2) a senior scholar who spent the bulk of his or her career at a peer institution and thus is capable of making appropriate judgments from the standpoint of a colleague at a peer institution.

When research or programmatic contributions in teaching is to be evaluated, all or nearly all evaluators should be from academic departments at peer institutions. When service is to be evaluated, however, individuals in non-academic settings may be appropriate as evaluators.

Each proposed evaluator in an academic department must be at or above the rank to which the faculty candidate aspires.

In the case of a Service Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Service Associate Professor, the external evaluators should be faculty members at peer institutions who hold the rank of at least a Service Associate Professor. A Service Associate Professor seeking promotion to Service Professor should be externally evaluated by Service Professors at peer institutions (or the equivalent, acknowledging that this title construction is not common).

In the case of a Teaching Associate Professor seeking promotion to Teaching Professor, the external evaluators should be faculty members at peer institutions who hold the rank of Teaching Professor or the equivalent.

B.   Faculty Member's Feedback

According to timelines specified by the University, upon receiving the committee's list, the Chair-designee shares it with the faculty candidate and solicits the candidate's written comments.

In a written, signed, and dated statement, the faculty candidate gives the Chair-designee comments regarding the committee's suggested evaluators, in particular the appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of the suggested evaluators in terms of the faculty member's area of research, as well as any conflicts of interest. If the candidate has no comments, this should be indicated in writing as well.

C.   Chair-designee's Proposed List of Evaluators and Letter of Invitation

The Chair-designee should consider any comments provided by the faculty candidate but is not obligated to eliminate a potential evaluator simply because the candidate has objected.

The Chair-designee prepares: (a) a final list of proposed evaluators, and (b) a sample copy of the letter to be sent to the evaluators, based on a template provided by the Center director. The Chair-designee's list should have individuals from both the faculty candidate's list and the committee's list. The final list should include six potential reviewers and up to six substitutes in event a potential reviewer declines the invitation. Unless a proposed evaluator is unacceptable, the Chair-designee's list should exhaust the names from the candidate and committee's lists. The Chair-designee's list is confidential.

Following the Center director's approval, the Chair-designee invites six of the potential evaluators on the list to prepare an evaluation letter. If someone declines, the Chair-designee should invite another

---

[3] "The department, subject to approval by the Dean, determines peer or aspirational peer research universities." (WVU *Procedures*, 2014-15 version, p. 13.)

prospective evaluator from the list until agreements are secured from at least four evaluators (ideally six). In addition, the Chair-designee should send reminders to the evaluators 30 days before the deadline for receipt of the evaluations. To preserve the anonymity of the evaluators, the list of agreed evaluators must not be shared with the faculty candidate.

If the faculty candidate has been granted an extension of the tenure clock under BOG Faculty Rule 4.5, the letter inviting the external evaluations includes a special passage, "Please note that Dr. X received an extension to his/her tenure clock by virtue of university policy. Under these circumstances, the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than for faculty whose tenure clock has not been interrupted. Therefore, we would appreciate that in evaluating this candidate, you consider the merits of quality and impact, not the time taken to achieve those accomplishments."

D.   Center Director's Review and Approval

The Center director reviews the proposed evaluators and the sample letter. The Center director may seek additional information from the Chair-designee, strike one or more individuals from the list of potential evaluators, or require revisions to the letter. When the materials are approved, the Center director will notify the Chair-designee in a timely fashion.

E.   Final Departmental Procedures

The Chair-designee uploads a copy of the approved sample letter in the candidate's Faculty Evaluation File in the faculty member's electronic File. Because the identity of the evaluators is confidential, the approved list of evaluators is placed in the Confidential Letters of External Review section of the File.

The candidate provides the Chair-designee with a package of materials to be sent to the external evaluators. The package should include a curriculum vitae; a research narrative (for faculty with research as a significant area of contribution; for Teaching faculty this would be a teaching narrative and for Service faculty a service narrative), and up to five documents/work products (e.g., PDFs of published articles or PDFs of original products related to service or teaching) that document the candidate's achievements in research, service, or programmatic contributions to teaching. These materials must be included in the candidate's Faculty Evaluation File. A list of the materials (e.g. table of contents) sent to the evaluators should be filed. The faculty member needs to upload all materials to the File.

Upon the Center director's approval of the Chair-designee's final list, and before sending the evaluation materials to the evaluators, the Chair-designee should make preliminary contact with the approved evaluators by email or telephone to verify their willingness to participate in the process.

Faculty may request (through the Center director's administrative assistant) to view redacted versions of the external letters once the reviews have been forwarded to the Center director.

IX.   PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES

The assessments provided by annual reviews are the primary basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available. Due to the small size of the Center faculty, decisions about performance-based salary increases will be made by the Center director, but these decisions must be justified by referring to the annual evaluations of the faculty considered.

X.   PROCEDURE FOR 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 Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair-designee. The Committee and the Chair-designee will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the Faculty. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Center director and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.