

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES  
PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL EVALUATION,  
PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

**Approved by the Chancellor of Health Sciences 08/20/2025**

**Approved by Office of Provost 08/22/2025**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The ability of a university academic health sciences center to function, progress, develop excellence, and serve society depends on both the individual performance of each faculty member and the collective performance of the faculty. Thus, the success and reputation of a university academic health sciences center are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among its faculty and how effectively those talents are marshaled to accomplish the institutional mission. To achieve and maintain high quality, a comprehensive and transparent faculty evaluation system is essential to assure high-quality faculty work and to recognize and reward faculty accomplishments. Properly administered, this system encourages professional growth of individual faculty members, permits appropriate recognition of their achievements, and assures retention of those faculty members who demonstrate significant contributions to the West Virginia University (WVU) and the WVU Health Science Center (HSC) mission through impactful clinical care, excellent service, influential research, creative scholarship, and innovative teaching.

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

The WVU HSC in Morgantown and all affiliated campuses, as well as HSC experiential clinical sites, participates in WVU's tripartite mission of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Accomplishing this mission in an environment of respect for the strengths of all faculty requires a creative and collective intermingling of individual faculty talents. Annual evaluation, promotion in rank, and the granting of tenure are acts of critical importance both to members of the academic community and for the welfare of WVU. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and WVU and is both evaluative and developmental. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions reward individual achievement; they also shape WVU for decades.

This document is closely aligned with the WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure 2025-2026 (University Procedures) and has been customized to reflect the unique mission of the WVU HSC. In accordance with this framework, individual schools and divisions within the HSC are expected to supplement these guidelines with more detailed descriptions and interpretations of criteria and standards. Once approved by the Chancellor for Health Sciences<sup>1</sup> and subsequently by the Provost, these school-specific guidelines will govern faculty within the respective unit. While such guidelines may reflect the distinct expectations of individual disciplines and may be more rigorous than the WVU HSC guidelines, they may not be less so.

Faculty members must maintain a digital evaluation file. All considerations outlined in this document are based solely on materials submitted to and maintained in the faculty member's digital file. It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that this file is accurate, comprehensive, and regularly updated. Materials not included in the faculty member's digital file cannot be considered as evidence during the review processes.

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

### **A. The Faculty Evaluation Process**

The faculty evaluation process at the WVU HSC is designed to assist the institution in attracting promising faculty members, helping them reach their potential, rewarding their proficiency, continuing their productivity and professional development throughout their careers, and retaining only those who are meritorious.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chancellor for Health Sciences or designee.

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the WVU HSC community. Primary responsibility for evidence of the quality and presentation of an individual's work in the evaluation file rests with the particular faculty member. Faculty colleagues participate in annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure through membership on department and school, committees, and on the WVU HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Independent reviews at the school and institutional levels ensure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments and schools. The legal authority and responsibility of chairpersons, deans, and the Chancellor for Health Sciences also enter into the determination of academic personnel decisions, as do the needs and circumstances of the department, school, and Health Sciences Center.<sup>2</sup> The process is both evaluative and developmental and has three distinct components:

### 1. Annual Evaluation for Faculty of All Tracks and All Ranks

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives. It also forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that will encourage professional growth and provide support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. An important aspect of the annual evaluation is an assessment of one's progress toward tenure and/or the next promotion, as appropriate. Once tenure is awarded, post-tenure review occurs as part of the annual review process. These reviews are required for subsequent promotion in rank and the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement, when applicable.

Each school must specify the criteria by which ratings of "excellent," "good," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory" are assigned. Ratings of "unsatisfactory" are reserved for cases in which the faculty member is not meeting the school'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, (b) gross misconduct (e.g., job abandonment), or (c) failure to provide either an updated curriculum vitae or include sufficient supporting documentation within the submitted faculty productivity report. If any faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" rating(s) from the department committee and/or the department leader, that leader must notify the dean and develop a written performance improvement plan with the faculty member.

The performance improvement plan must be developed within 30 business days of the notification. The department leader must work with the faculty member on their performance improvement plan and monitor their progress, although the faculty member is ultimately responsible for meeting the requirements of the performance improvement plan.

### 2. Evaluation for Promotion in Rank for Faculty of All Tracks and All Ranks

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

For an award of tenure, tenure-track faculty undergo a comprehensive evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments. Two years prior to the comprehensive evaluation for promotion and tenure. A cumulative pre-promotion assessment of one's progress toward tenure will be completed, in addition to the annual review. The majority of annual reviews in the cumulative assessment in an area of significant contribution must be meritorious for retention.

### 3. Evaluation of Post-Promotion and/or Tenure for all Faculty (Tenured, Teaching-track, Service-track, Research-track, and Clinical-track)

---

<sup>2</sup>The term "department" refers throughout this document to departments, divisions, or other discrete units in schools. The term "chairperson" refers to department or division chairpersons, directors, or other unit heads who report to deans.

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the WVU community. The individual faculty member is responsible for providing evidence of the quality and impact of their work in their digital evaluation file. Faculty colleagues participate in annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure through membership on department and school committees as well as on the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Independent reviews at each level assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments and schools. The legal authority and responsibility of chairpersons, deans, campus presidents, the Chancellor for Health Sciences, and the Provost also enter into the determination of academic personnel decisions, as do the needs and circumstances of the department, school, division, and WVU.

For ordinary annual reviews, fully promoted faculty members are evaluated by their chairperson and may also choose to be evaluated by their department committee. The fully promoted faculty member must inform the department chairperson or equivalent, in writing, 90 days in advance of the faculty member's file closing. Specific dates must be specified within the individual school guidelines.

In post-promotion and/or post-tenure cases that do not follow the standard time intervals between promotions, a faculty member, department leader, or dean may request a cumulative review. The cumulative review will assess the faculty member's achievements since their last promotion or salary enhancement (normally five years since the last action) to determine the appropriate workload moving forward. When a faculty member achieves promotion and/or tenure, the criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching, research, and/or service may be modified on an individual basis to require significant contributions in a different pair of these mission areas, with reasonable contributions required in the third. Changes such as these will be based on the needs of an individual school, the appropriate balance of assignments within the school, consultation with the school, and with the approval of the chairperson, dean, and Chancellor for HSC. An associate/full professor could be considered for promotion and/or salary enhancements, if applicable, if a memorandum of understanding was developed and was subsequently in place for at least five full academic years prior to consideration.

## B. Criteria

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

Collectively, members of the faculty teach, advise, mentor, engage in research/scholarship and creative activity, publish and disseminate their research findings and new knowledge, and provide public, professional, and institutional service, clinical care, and outreach. The extent to which a faculty member's responsibilities emphasize the areas of WVU's mission will vary. All faculty members have an obligation to foster the quality, viability, and necessity of their programs. The financial stability of a program and recruitment of an adequate number of students depend in part on the faculty.<sup>3</sup>

In the faculty member's approved letter of appointment, a WVU official (usually the dean, or Chancellor for Health Sciences) responsible for hiring shall define the general terms of the faculty member's major responsibilities and identify the year by which tenure must be awarded, if applicable. Significant changes must be reflected in writing by amendment to the letter of appointment.

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

---

<sup>3</sup> WVU Board of Governors' Rule 4.1, Section 3.2.

Adjustments in the expectations for faculty members may occur in keeping with changing institutional and school priorities and professional interests. All faculty members in every track must do scholarly, creative, clinical care, or professional work that informs their teaching and/or service, as defined by the approved school guidelines.

### **III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS**

Teaching (learning), research<sup>4</sup>/scholarship/creative activity (discovery), and service (engagement) constitute the heart of the mission of WVU HSC Faculty responsibilities are defined in terms of activities undertaken in each of the three areas; faculty evaluation is based primarily upon a review of performance in these areas. Scholarship is an important indication of activity in each of the three areas; it occurs in a variety of forms and is not restricted to the research area. Depending upon one's discipline and the school guidelines, publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields.

#### **A. Teaching (Learning)**

Teaching stimulates critical thinking, dissemination of knowledge, and/or development of artistic expression. Teaching includes but is not limited to: traditional modes of instruction such as the in-person classroom lecture, other classroom activities, and modes such as clinical, laboratory, online, and practicum instruction, distance learning, thesis and dissertation direction, evaluation and critique of student performance, various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction, and advising/mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. Advising/mentoring is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process. It should be noted that the advising/mentoring of students may include elements of teaching, research, or service. The goals of the teaching-learning endeavor are to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits that should culminate in degree completion.

The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer knowledge, a commitment to deepen student learning, respect for differences, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, curriculum development, the development or use of instructional technology, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and school.

Supporting documentation for the evaluation of effective performance in teaching may also include evidence drawn from such sources as the assessment of student learning outcomes; the collective judgment of student advisees and/or mentees; peer and/or supervisor analyses of course content; peer and/or supervisor evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multimedia 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; early semester course feedback; or other evidence deemed appropriate by the department, school, or as outlined in Appendix A. Regardless of the activities defined as “teaching” assigned to a faculty member, faculty who teach are expected to be effective in their explicit teaching assignments. Criteria for the evaluation of teaching must be clearly stated in the school guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file rather than over-reliance on student feedback of instruction.

Public and community-engaged teaching are direct and meaningful formal and informal knowledge generating, transmitting, sharing, and/or applying for the benefit of external audiences. Community engaged teaching may include, but is not limited to, curricular development; developing, implementing and evaluating experiential, off-campus assignments for students, such as those in service-learning classes, as well as study abroad programs with community

---

<sup>4</sup> The term "research" is used in this document to include appropriate professional activities such as research, scholarly writing, artistic performance, and creative activities. These activities result in products that may be evaluated and compared with those of peers at other institutions of higher learning.

engagement components, and online and off-campus education; pre-college courses for K-12 youth, occupational short courses, certificates, and licensure programs; conferences, seminars, not-for-credit classes, and workshops; educational enrichment programs for the public and alumni; educational media interviews or translating written materials for general public audiences; materials to enhance public understanding; and self-directed, managed learning environments, such as museums, libraries, or gardens. Criteria for the evaluation of public and community-engaged teaching must be clearly stated in the school guidelines. A faculty member's achievements in these types of instruction must be documented by evidence in the file. Faculty must also highlight multi/trans/interdisciplinary teaching if applicable. Appropriately recognizing successful multi/trans/interdisciplinary work will require schools to adapt their promotion, tenure, or annual evaluation guidelines to recognize and reward these activities as well as the time and effort it takes for them to be completed.

## **B. Research/Scholarship**

WVU values academic research activities that increase fundamental knowledge within the discipline, creative activities (including performances and exhibitions) that reach out and serve humankind and applied research activities that yield tangible benefits to society. Therefore, the impact of an activity is part of the measure of its quality. Historically, the measure of academic research and creative activities has been well defined by each discipline, often through peer-reviewed publications and performances and exhibitions. The significance of translational or applied research that results in public-private partnerships, patents, licensing, and/or other forms of commercialization and entrepreneurial activity, educational and community outreach, should also be part of the evaluation of research. Research published in predatory journals will not receive credit. Additional examples of research are detailed in Appendix B.

Research may be discipline-focused and individual, or it may be multi/trans/interdisciplinary and collaborative. Schools must establish protocols for crediting co-authored work and faculty must document their specific contributions to these types of work. Faculty are encouraged to highlight multi/trans/interdisciplinary research, understanding that not all research fits into traditional disciplines. It is a critical component of the mission of WVU, contributing to and expanding the general body of knowledge, thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. It validates the concept of the teacher-scholar. Interdisciplinary and collaborative assignments must be identified in the appointment letter when possible, or in annual letters as assignments change. Reviewers throughout the evaluation process should recognize and credit interdisciplinary research that crosses multiple fields. School guidelines must address and adapt the evaluative process for these activities. It should be noted that the mentoring of students has elements of both teaching and research and in some schools is defined as research.

In most disciplines, refereed publications (print or electronic) of high quality are required as evidence of scholarly productivity. In some disciplines, the strongest such evidence may appear in published refereed proceedings rather than traditional journals; such cases must be recognized in the school guidelines. An original contribution of a creative nature relevant to one or more disciplines may be as valuable as the publication of a scholarly book or article. In certain disciplines, the ability to secure funding may be necessary for the realization of scholarly output. Depending upon the discipline, entrepreneurial and commercialization activities related to intellectual property and patents, which benefit WVU, also demonstrate scholarly output. While quantity of effort and output must be sufficient to demonstrate an active and peer-recognized presence in the discipline, quality of research is clearly of great value in determining the level of performance. Important evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance (such as a book or monograph) or a series of smaller, high-quality products such as refereed journal articles constituting a program of worthwhile research. Faculty members are required to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Criteria for the evaluation of research must be clearly stated in the school guidelines. Performance evaluations must be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

Public and community-engaged research and creative scholarship is characterized by creative intellectual work conducted in collaboration with and/or for the benefit of community partners. This work is based on a high level of professional expertise that is likely to inform and foster further scholarly activity. It may include but is not limited to community-based, participatory research, applied research, contractual research, demonstration projects, needs and assets assessments, and program evaluations; collaboratively created, produced, or performed music, performance,

sculpture, writing, spoken works, multimedia projects, and exhibitions; copyrights, patents, licenses for commercial use, innovation and entrepreneurship activities, university-managed or supported businesses ventures (business parks or incubators), new business ventures and start-ups, inventions, and social entrepreneurship.

Because of the nature of the enterprise, the forms of public scholarship evolve regularly and change more rapidly than do more traditional forms of scholarship (i.e., monographs, journal articles, and edited collections). Public scholarship is expansive in nature and includes, but is not limited to, print and digital forms of individual and collective scholarship, published in venues that reach broad audiences, such as media articles, op-eds, podcasts, websites and apps, and exhibits in public spaces. Public scholarship work may rely heavily on review and evaluation that involves community partners and other stakeholders outside of conventional academic or scholarly structures; for some schools, this review may be regarded as meaningfully as is traditional peer review.

While some community-engaged research and creative scholarship may blur traditional distinctions between instruction, research/creative work, outreach, and service activities, its significance must be validated through peer reviews by relevant internal and external communities, including community partners, or by adoption of creative products, protocol, or practices in the work of other peers in the field. This work may involve generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences (i.e., the community) in ways that are consistent with the WVU HSC and individual school missions. Criteria for the evaluation of public and community-engaged research, creative scholarship and commercialized activities must be clearly stated in the school guidelines. A faculty member's competence, achievements, and quality of excellence in community-engaged research/creative activity must be documented by evidence in the file.

Partial evidence of appropriate community engaged faculty research may include but is not limited to:

1. Clear academic and community change goals, including a final deliverable that will directly, positively contribute to the communities involved.
2. Appropriate use of scholarship to guide and inform community-engagement activities.
3. Disciplinary rigor and community engagement at all stages of each project.
4. Evidence of impact on the field/discipline, university (i.e., student learning, faculty scholarly outcomes, etc.), and relevant communities.
5. Effective dissemination and presentation to community audiences.
6. Consistently ethical behavior.
7. Peer reviews.

Faculty must also highlight multi/trans/inter-disciplinary research, if applicable, and schools must adapt their promotion, tenure, or annual evaluation guidelines to recognize and reward these activities as well as the time and effort it takes for them to be completed.

### C. Service (Engagement) and Clinical Care (as Applicable)

Service activities involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research/scholarly activities, and/or patient care to address the needs of society and the profession. These activities include service to the institution, state, region, and at national and international levels. Service to the institution includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department, school, and academic programs. Service at all levels of the Institution shall be valued. Faculty must actively participate in the life of their school. Examples of active participation include but are not limited to attending faculty meetings; service on committees; mentoring of learners and junior faculty, whether through formal or informal channels; facilitating relevant professional development opportunities, such as organizing reading groups; student and faculty recruitment; coordinating program-level assessment of learning and program improvement processes; overseeing specialized accreditation requirements; leading substantial curricular revision; and assuming leadership roles in the various activities listed above. Examples of active participation at the WVU/WVU HSC level include service on WVU/WVU HSC committees, advisory boards, and panels; service on Faculty Senate including leadership roles; and providing ad-hoc services to other schools. Faculty with clinical service are expected to deliver high-quality and evidence-based care, maintain licensure, foster patient satisfaction, and uphold

professional and ethical standards. They serve as role models for trainees, integrate clinical work with teaching and research/scholarship, and participate in quality improvement and team-based care.

In keeping with its tradition as a land-grant institution, the WVU HSC 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 and beyond is of special importance to WVU's mission.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to WVU, society, and the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients/patients, induces positive change, improves health and wellbeing, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal, professional, or institutional functions, problems, or issues. Important benefits to WVU include faculty participation in the governance system and significant and sustained participation in largescale improvement processes. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, approved by their academic leader, and performed with one's WVU affiliation identified. The definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of annual review, promotion, and/or tenure must be identified in the school's evaluation guidelines. Performance evaluations must be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

Public and community-engaged service and practice are the use of WVU/WVU HSC expertise to address specific issues identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. This work may include but is not limited to technical assistance, consulting, policy analysis, expert testimony, legal advice, clinical practice, diagnostic services, patient care, and advisory boards and other disciplinary-related service to community organizations. Additional examples can be found in Appendix C.

Criteria for the evaluation of multi/trans/interdisciplinary service, public and community-engaged service and practice must be clearly stated in the individual school guidelines. A faculty member's discipline-based achievements in multi/trans/interdisciplinary service and public and community-engaged service must be documented by evidence in the file.

#### **IV. CONTEXTS OF APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY**

##### **A. Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty**

A faculty member is usually appointed without tenure. Occasionally, appointment with tenure is possible. To be appointed with tenure, or to the ranks of associate professor or professor, the individual must have been interviewed by an official in the Chancellor for Health Sciences Office during the interview process; the individual's curriculum vitae must be reviewed in that office. A recommendation for tenure upon hire must be submitted by the department and school to the Chancellor's Office mirroring the school's promotion and/or tenure process. Appointments can be made without or with credit toward tenure for previous experience.

##### **1. Without Credit**

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

##### **2. With Credit**

It is not uncommon for a new faculty member to have had full-time experience at our institution or another institution of higher learning where they were engaged in teaching, research, and service. Depending upon the amount of successful experience in these mission areas at the intended rank or the equivalent, up to three years of credit toward tenure may be allowed, unless the candidate does not request such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative critical year, shall be identified in the letter of appointment. Where

potential credit years for prior experience are identified in the letter of appointment, the faculty member decides at the end of the second academic year whether to accept all, some, or none of the available credit years and to adjust the tentative critical year accordingly. The faculty member's dean will at this point confirm the faculty member's critical year in writing. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit must be added to the digital evaluation file. If no credit is accepted, during the fourth year the faculty member may petition the dean to bring the critical year forward by one year (to year five). The faculty member may not exercise both "with credit" and the "without credit" options.

If a faculty member's start date is after the beginning of the designated year, each school's guidelines will delineate the minimum number of months that may be applied toward credit for the first year (which cannot be less than six months or one semester).

If, by the end of the second year, the faculty member does not request modification of the tentative critical year identified in the letter of appointment, that year will become the recognized critical year. Action on tenure earlier than the thus-defined critical year will not be considered except as defined in the previous paragraph.

Specific criteria regarding what counts toward promotion and/or tenure from the prior institution must be defined in the individual school guidelines. Exceptions, as defined by the school guidelines, may be made to recognize truly exceptional situations.

#### B. Teaching-Track, Service-track, Clinical-track, Research-track

These faculty members are appointed without tenure. Occasionally, appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor is possible. To be appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the individual must have been interviewed by an official in the Chancellor for Health Sciences Office during the interview process; the individual's curriculum vitae must be reviewed in that office. A recommendation for associate professor or professor rank must be submitted by the department and school to the Chancellor for Health Sciences Office mirroring the individual school's promotion and/or tenure process. Appointments can be made without or with credit toward promotion for previous experience.

##### 1. Without Credit

An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful promotion, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the first year a faculty member may seek promotion. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the dean to bring the promotion year forward by one year (to year five).

##### 2. With Credit

It is not uncommon for a new faculty member to have had full-time experience at our institution or another institution of higher learning where they were engaged in teaching, research, and service. Depending upon the amount of successful experience in these mission areas at the intended rank or the equivalent, up to two years credit toward promotion may be allowed, unless the candidate does not request such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative promotion year, shall be identified in the letter of appointment. Where potential credit years for prior experience are identified in the letter of appointment, the faculty member decides at the end of the second academic year whether to accept all, some, or none of the available credit years and to adjust the promotion year accordingly. The faculty member's dean will at this point confirm the faculty member's promotion year in writing. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit must be added to the digital evaluation file. If no credit is accepted, during the fourth year the faculty member may petition the dean to bring the promotion year forward by one year (to year five). The faculty member may not exercise both the "with credit" and the "without credit" options. If, by the end of the second year, the faculty member does not request modification of the promotion year identified in the letter of appointment, that year will become the recognized promotion year. Action on promotion earlier than the thus-defined year will not be considered except as defined in the previous paragraph. Specific criteria regarding what counts toward promotion and/or tenure from the prior institution must be defined in the individual school guidelines. Exceptions, as defined by the individual school guidelines, may be made to recognize truly

exceptional

situations.

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

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

A tenure-track faculty member in the sixth year, or in the year determined to be the "critical" year, must be reviewed for tenure and must either be awarded tenure or given notice of termination of appointment and a one-year terminal contract. If a faculty member petitions successfully to bring the critical year forward and tenure is not awarded in that year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Such notice of non-retention shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested," first class mail and electronic mail. Under certain circumstances the critical year may be extended. See WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.5.<sup>5</sup>

In the case of a tenure-track (not yet tenured) full-time faculty member, the dean shall give written notice concerning retention or non-retention for the ensuing year by letter post-marked and mailed no later than March 1, with copy sent via electronic mail.

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

## **VI. DISCRETIONARY PERSONNEL ACTIONS**

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

- Promotion in rank when the critical year does not apply
- Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member
- Non-renewal of appointment for a non-tenure track faculty member;
- Non-renewal of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year;
- Non-continuation of the appointment of a non-tenure track faculty member on greater than one year contract;
- Non-continuation of the appointment of a tenured faculty member;
- Termination of the appointment of a faculty member for cause (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.2);
- Termination of the appointment of faculty member due to a reduction or discontinuance of an existing program, or financial exigency (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.7).

A tenure-track faculty member will be reviewed automatically in the critical year, unless the faculty member requests no review, in which case a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Otherwise, the faculty member must initiate consideration for a discretionary promotion. A faculty member whose application for promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least two full years after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

Evaluations and recommendations for the first promotion and/or tenure will be primarily based on contributions since appointment at WVU. Consideration of credit for work completed elsewhere must be identified in the letter of appointment. In the latter case, evidence of performance during the established years of credit should be included in the evaluation file.

---

<sup>5</sup> See also: <http://faculty.wvu.edu/policies-and-procedures/work-life-integration>, "Work-Life Integration."

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

While tenure and promotion are separate actions, persons may only be granted tenure if they are already at or above the rank of associate professor or being concurrently promoted to the rank of associate professor. It is WVU policy that the granting of promotion does not guarantee the award of tenure in a subsequent year. Neither promotion nor tenure shall be granted automatically or merely for years of service.

## **VII. FACULTY EVALUATION FILE**

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

An official digital faculty evaluation file shall be established and maintained for each faculty member. The record in the evaluation file must be sufficient to document and to support all personnel decisions. Each individual school must utilize an annual reporting form ("Productivity Report") appropriate to the work assignments in that school for use by all members of the unit, including the chairperson. The Productivity Report without supporting documentation is not sufficient for evaluation purposes. A productivity report without supporting documentation for a given area should receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" for that area upon an annual review. Evaluation file materials will be in electronic form, provided that the integrity of the information and the date of entry in the file are maintained.

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

1. The letter of appointment and other documents which describe, elaborate upon or modify one's assignment, including position description, 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. The workload plan is assigned and approved by the department leader.
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, including the publication itself, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of research, scholarship, and/or creative work; c) a list of service activities, a description of each activity, and the approximate time commitment for each activity.
4. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught, syllabi, student feedback of instruction and enrollments in each, graduate students supervised, clinical assignments, committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work.
5. For faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of the individual's performance to the home department. In such cases, the home department's evaluation should reflect the relative proportion of each dimension of the total assignment.
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 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 WVU, 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 ensuring 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. The Chancellor for Health Sciences Office may periodically issue more detailed instructions for the development and maintenance of faculty evaluation files. Those requirements may be supplemented or elaborated by school or department procedures.

## **VIII. COMPLETION OF AND ACCESS TO THE FILE**

The faculty evaluation file shall be updated in a timely manner according to the calendar that is circulated annually by the individual school. On the appropriate deadline date, the file shall be closed for the annual review period. Only materials submitted before the deadline will be considered for evaluation. If the appropriate school annual review deadline is prior to December 31, faculty seeking promotion will have until December 31 of that year to add information to their file for their promotion review.

Faculty members have the right of access to their digital evaluation files at any time without giving reasons. Faculty leaving the institution will have the opportunity to save information and materials from the digital evaluation file. All others shall have access to the file only based on a need-to-know. Members of a faculty evaluation committee or administrative officers responsible for personnel recommendations are assumed to have a need to know. Unauthorized access to or use of personnel files for purposes unrelated to faculty evaluation is prohibited and will be sanctioned up to and including termination of employment/appointment. When otherwise necessary, the appropriate administrative officer or the dean shall determine whether an individual has a need to know and what material is necessary to fulfill the need to know. All persons will treat the material from the file as confidential. The security of all evaluation files is to be assured. The confidentiality of each file is to be respected. Disclosure of file materials to those outside the evaluation process shall occur only under valid legal process or order of a competent court of jurisdiction.

## **IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS**

### A. General Description

The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at WVU. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time and benefits-eligible part-time faculty members, provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and documents that support recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. Less than benefits-eligible part-time faculty (including courtesy faculty) should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment. Annual reviews will be required for less than benefits-eligible part-time faculty, including courtesy faculty, seeking promotion. These faculty will be issued an evaluation file upon request and will be required to maintain the file for all promotion actions. The primary purpose of these annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the role and mission of WVU. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary, however, in accordance with the type of appointment, rank, and tenure status.

The evaluation procedures may be found in Section XIII, below. Annual evaluation for all faculty, whether tenure-track, tenured, teaching-track, research-track, service-track, clinical-track, or not eligible for tenure (including

lecturers), will be conducted at the departmental level by the chair and the faculty evaluation committee or at the school level, if appropriate, based on documentation in the evaluation file (see Section VIII). Evaluations will be placed in the digital evaluation file and notification will be sent to each faculty member and to the dean who may provide an evaluative statement.

A fully promoted faculty member (e.g., Professor or the equivalent) may be evaluated annually only by the department chair or equivalent unless the faculty member petitions the faculty evaluation committee to also conduct an annual review. If a fully promoted faculty member wishes to be evaluated annually by the appropriate faculty evaluation committee, they must inform the department chairperson or equivalent, in writing, 90 days in advance of the faculty member's file closing. Specific dates must be specified within the individual school guidelines.

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

The resultant annual evaluation will help guide the faculty member on areas for improvement, with particular focus on their overall progress toward tenure and/or promotion. If the evaluation is positive, it may also serve as the basis for merit-based salary increases or Salary Enhancements for Continued Academic Achievement, when applicable. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity to develop changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of WVU.

## B. Faculty Categories

Faculty members in all categories have full citizenship in the institution and have the rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility. This responsibility includes attendance at and participation in faculty meetings and in other dimensions of the concept of shared governance. They are eligible for appointment to any administrative office if they meet the requirements for the position as stated in the position announcement. Faculty in the tenure or clinical track must have two areas of significant contribution, one of which must be teaching. Schools must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor.

### 1. Tenure-Track Faculty

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

For faculty in their first year of appointment, the initial annual review period must include at least 4.5 months of work for 9-month appointments or at least 6 months for 12-month appointments. In such cases, the efforts and outcomes should be recalibrated for that shorter time period. If there is limited evidence, as defined by the individual school 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. In some cases, evaluations may lead to the termination of a faculty member's appointment before the critical review year. When appropriate, a terminal contract will be issued. In these cases, notice shall be given in accordance with WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.2.

### 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. Schools must set criteria for

promotion to full professor that are 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. 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 productivity and success. If the evidence of the faculty member's productivity is limited for a review, a "satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of insufficient evidence of the faculty member's productivity would normally receive an "unsatisfactory" rating(s).

### 3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted

Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating faculty members at these ranks is to describe their 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. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels. If the evidence of the faculty member's productivity is limited for a review, a "satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of insufficient evidence of the faculty member's productivity would normally receive an "unsatisfactory" rating(s).

### 4. Teaching-track Faculty

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

Normally, a teaching-track faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. The effort distribution addresses needs of the individual school and interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission; for example, the faculty assignment may be 80% teaching, 10% research, and 10% service. If percent efforts are adjusted so that a second mission area reaches 30% or more, that area will be considered an area of significant contribution. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness fulfill this expectation.

Teaching-track appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. No number of appointments at any teaching faculty rank/title shall create presumption of any contractual rights, nor the right of continued appointment or transition to another type of position.

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

The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion. 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 success and productivity. If the evidence of the faculty member's productivity is limited for a review, a "satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of insufficient evidence of the faculty member's productivity would normally receive an "unsatisfactory" rating(s).

Promotion to the rank of teaching professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues within the university, nationally, and/or internationally recognize the professor for their instructional contributions to the discipline. Schools must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria for promotion to associate professor. Examples of activities which might support promotion to teaching professor include significant teaching/program innovation, publications in teaching-related journals, authoring books on teaching, nomination/selection for participation in national educational initiatives for the discipline, and/or nomination/selection with national accreditation organizations.

#### 5. Service-track Faculty

Service-track faculty members have renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is service and are designated with the prefix "service," accompanying a traditional rank. Service-track faculty members are hired to respond to program and/or individual school needs.

Normally, a service-track faculty assignment will be at least 60% service. The balance might address needs of an individual school and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission; for example, the faculty assignment may be 60% service, 20% research, and 20% teaching. If percent efforts are adjusted so that a second mission area reaches 30% or more, that area will be considered an area of significant contribution.

Service-track appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. No number of appointments at any service faculty rank/title shall create presumption of any contractual rights, nor the right of continued appointment or transition to another type of position.

The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion. 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 success and productivity. If the evidence of the faculty member's productivity is limited for a review, a "satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of insufficient evidence of the faculty member's productivity would normally receive an "unsatisfactory" rating(s).

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a service track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a service-track faculty member and their chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For service-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of service excellence, the digital evaluation file is expected to show evidence of ongoing contribution to adding value to the individual school and addressing unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives, as well as needs of the institution and community. These contributions may be related to administration, governance, community outreach, or other areas of service outlined in the appointment letter.

Promotion to the rank of service professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues within WVU, nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for their service to the institution (at the program, unit, department, school, and/or university level(s), their discipline, and/or the state/region/nation). Schools must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria for promotion to associate professor.

#### 6. Clinical-Track Faculty

Clinicians are non-tenure track and must be committed to clinical service as well as teaching. Faculty members in the clinical track are not subject to the seven-year probationary period of the tenure track; promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability.

Clinical-track faculty will have service and teaching as their areas of significant contribution. There is a significant overlap between clinical service and clinical teaching. Typically, service and teaching will normally account for at least 80% of effort. The balance will address needs of an individual school and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission. Faculty with administrative roles may have a lower percentage based on their individual responsibilities.

Annual evaluation of clinical-track faculty members will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and in subsequent annual documents that identify departmental responsibilities in teaching, service, and scholarship. The annual evaluation will focus on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. The annual evaluation of a promotable faculty member must emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty members may attain promotion, annual evaluations shall assist them toward that goal. 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 success and productivity. If the evidence of the faculty member's productivity is limited for a review, a "satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of insufficient evidence of the faculty member's productivity would normally receive an "unsatisfactory" rating(s).

#### 7. Research -Track Faculty

Research-track faculty members have renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is research and are designated with the prefix "research" accompanying a traditional rank. Research-track faculty members are hired to conduct research.

Normally, a research-track faculty assignment will be at least 95% research and may be up to 100%. Researchers must be supported through external funding sources rather than internal/WVU Foundation funds. In rare cases, however, external funds may be routed through an internal/WVU Foundation account for distribution. In such instances, clear documentation demonstrating the external origin of the funding source as well as the research faculty's role in obtaining the funding must be included in the file. If applicable, schools may choose to use the balance (5%) to address the needs of the school and/or interests of the faculty member in service or teaching using state funding sources to compensate the research-track faculty member.

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

#### 8. Part-Time Faculty

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

their assignments. Annual reviews will be required for less than 1.00 FTE faculty, including courtesy faculty, seeking promotion.

### C. Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of one's performance in each of the mission areas to which one is assigned must be assessed as "excellent" [characterizing performance of high merit], "good"[characterizing performance of merit], "satisfactory" [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, when applied to an area in which significant contributions are required, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure], or "unsatisfactory" [characterizing insufficient performance]. Schools are responsible for determining and publishing criteria that detail minimum expectations for each rating. Thus, absolute standards for annual review must be defined in each school's guideline document. Criteria developed must be approved by the Chancellor of Health Sciences and the Provost. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "satisfactory" ratings in an area in which a significant contribution is required would not qualify for promotion nor tenure. A faculty member with a preponderance (as defined by the school) of "unsatisfactory" ratings in any area would not qualify for promotion or tenure and may result in non-continuation.

The assessments provided by annual reviews shall be a basis for those periodic recommendations which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action that are forwarded to the Chancellor of Health Sciences. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must be supported by both (a) a series of annual reviews above the "satisfactory" level, and (b) beyond those reviews, by performance and output which are judged to meet expectations identified in the appointment letter and subsequent documents, as well as the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" (see below). 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, if 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 termination (BOG Faculty Rule 4.7).

## **X. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE**

WVU criteria for the awarding of promotion and the granting of tenure described below are general expectations; they should be elaborated by school criteria which take into account the distinctive character of the faculty member's discipline. Absolute standards for promotion are defined in each school's guideline document. Copies of school criteria shall be available to all participants in the review process.

The faculty of an outstanding university is a community of scholars whose productivity is manifest in a variety of ways. These manifestations are commonly grouped into teaching, research, and service (including clinical service).

In order to be recommended for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions in the area(s) defined in their letter of appointment or subsequent memorandum of understanding.

The term "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in the HSC and school promotion and tenure guidelines. Tenure-track, tenured, research-track faculty, and service-track faculty with research as an area of significant contribution, must also receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their research (or other area of significance per Section XI) by external evaluators at peer or aspirational peer research universities, as defined by each school.

The department, subject to approval by the dean, determines peer or aspirational peer research universities. Candidates for tenure who are expected to make significant contributions in teaching, research, or service are expected to demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in the other area(s) defined in their letter of appointment or subsequent memorandum of understanding. Absolute criteria as developed by each school must be evaluated every five (5) years and approved by the Office of the Chancellor for Health Sciences. Changes to promotion and tenure guidelines will take effect July 1 of the academic year following approval. For changes in school level guidelines, probationary faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure may choose to follow the guidelines that were in effect when

they were hired. Faculty seeking a discretionary promotion within two years of the institution of new school guidelines may choose to be evaluated using previous guidelines.

Successful teaching is an expectation for faculty who are assigned to teach. If teaching is an area of significant contribution for either tenure and/or promotion, significant contributions must be demonstrated in teaching.

In order to be recommended or considered for promotion, faculty members who are not eligible for tenure but who are eligible for promotion normally will be expected to make significant contributions in the area(s) of their assignment as outlined in the letter of appointment or as modified in a subsequent memorandum of understanding. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "research," research will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "service," service will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "teaching," teaching will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. For clinical-track faculty, service, including clinical service and teaching will be the areas in which significant contributions are expected. Based on the offer letter, some specialty tracks may have two areas of significant contributions.

Service activities may include service to WVU as well as service to individuals, groups, and/or organizations at the state, national, and/or international levels that utilize disciplinary expertise and are assigned and approved by the department leader. A significant contribution in service may include the successful development, implementation, and participation in impactful programs. Such programs may include planned efforts or participation in activities to meet the needs of constituents, induce positive change in behavior or practice, impact societal problems and issues, effect policies or systems change, or lead to economic, civic, social, and/or environmental improvements. Programs may be on-going and carried out over a few years, or relatively short-term programs carried out over a few weeks or months. Service should not be measured just by the number of service roles and activities in which a faculty member is involved. The impact and innovation, replication, and/or dissemination of the service activity are keys to demonstrating significance and merit. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to WVU, the HSC, the profession, or on a national or international level. Such exceptions shall be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

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

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to an individual school other than the one in which the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or tenure, shall have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the department in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the dean and Chancellor for Health Sciences. An administrative assignment will be evaluated by the immediate supervisor rather than by an individual school committee.

## **XI. CHANGING AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION**

When a faculty member achieves tenure, the faculty or the chairperson may request that the criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching, research, and/or service may be modified on an individual basis to require significant contributions in a different pair of these mission areas, with reasonable contributions required in the third.

While such a modification may be initiated to reflect the faculty member's current areas of interest, the modification should also assist the department or the school in achieving its mission and goals, as it addresses the three areas of university concern. The faculty member must work under the modified mission area for a minimum of two (2) full years after the approval of the request before the individual could be considered for promotion using the modified mission areas. Such a modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, chairperson of the department, in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee, and the dean of the school, and must be stipulated in subsequent letters of agreement. The modification also must be approved by the HSC Chancellor.

A request for a change in areas of significant contribution(s) will be accompanied by a document which identifies both the types and quantity of the areas of significant contribution expected in the new context and the ways in which the quality of that significant contribution will be measured. Reasonable contributions must also be defined in both qualitative and quantitative terms. All documentation will be reflected in the faculty member's digital file.

#### A. Pathways to Professor Via Administrative Service

An Associate Professor of any track can achieve promotion to Professor using service as one of the two areas of significant contribution, although such an assignment has typically been focused on service provided externally, beyond WVU proper. In rare instances, such opportunity may be available to individuals who are or have been willing to serve in an administrative role and who may intend to have an administrative career. Academic Administrative Service as Department chairperson or associate dean (or the equivalent) for a normal term and executed at a high qualitative level may be interpreted as extraordinary and extended service to WVU for purposes of promotion from associate professor to Professor, with the support of the school's dean.

For clarification of the more specific conditions for such consideration under the presently approved process, the opportunity to seek this path for promotion would need to be approved by the dean at a time that would allow at least three years in the administrative position. Thus, for example, the candidate could receive approval during the second year of a five-year term, with the first two years being considered retroactively. Under these circumstances, significant contributions would be required in (administrative) service and one other mission area, with at least reasonable contributions required in the third. A document describing what is meant by significant contributions in administrative service must be generated and utilized at all levels in evaluating administrative service "for academic promotion". Achievement in teaching, research, and service must be demonstrated during the period under consideration, normally the last five years. Teaching, research, and service must be evaluated annually by the home unit; the administrative service must be evaluated annually by the dean, in addition to the immediate supervisor, if it is not the dean. Annual evaluations omitted during the evaluation period will not be considered and will therefore delay the application for promotion. A "360 review" of administrative performance is required.

The availability of this opportunity would be limited to those faculty who, based on the previous promotion, had achieved an appropriate level of success in their area(s) of significant contribution at that time.

Upon completion of a "360 review" during the final year of the term, resulting in an unequivocal reappointment in that role, the candidate could be considered for promotion using academic administrative service as the basis for making a significant contribution in service. A memorandum of understanding delineating these expectations in greater detail would be prepared upon appointment to the administrative role or at the point of approval of the dean, and subsequently by the Chancellor of HSC to pursue this option. External reviews of administrative service and the other area of significant contribution would be required. Documentation for these purposes must include annual goal statements and their metrics, as well as annual assessments of the achievement of the goals, prepared by the individual and validated by the dean.

## **XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS**

In years when a faculty member is being considered for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor or a tenured faculty member is being considered for promotion to professor, the digital evaluation file must contain external evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's area of significant contribution(s) as identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent memorandum of understanding. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered when evaluating tenure-track and tenured faculty members.

Although teaching, service, and clinical-track faculty seeking promotion to any rank are generally not required to seek external reviews, this requirement may be defined more specifically in individual school guidelines. If research is an area of significant contribution, external reviews are required for promotion at all levels. External reviews will be maintained in a separate section of the digital evaluation file. The various committees and individuals directly involved in the promotion and tenure review process shall be granted access to that section of the digital evaluation file as

needed. The faculty member shall have the right to petition the dean's office to see the reviews after any identifying information has been removed and the first level of review is complete. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall not be used in any subsequent personnel actions.

The names of persons who will be asked to provide external reviews must be selected with participation by the faculty member who is to be evaluated and the persons in the department who will conduct the evaluation. The suggested method for identifying external evaluators is for the departmental evaluation committee (either with or without participation by the chairperson) and the faculty member to propose a list of names of appropriate evaluators. These evaluators should be selected for their professional competence in the discipline. Each list should contain six names. A paragraph describing each evaluator should be submitted indicating qualifications to serve in this capacity. Any personal or professional relationship the faculty member has or has had with the evaluator must be identified. The chairperson or dean should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from both lists. A minimum of four external evaluations is normally required. If a minimum of four external evaluations is not met, the chairperson or dean must determine additional appropriate evaluators. If four evaluations are not received by the time the file is closed, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended with the written consent of the faculty member, chairperson, and dean.

Persons who have been closely associated with the person being evaluated, such as co-authors, doctoral research advisors, or advisees, may be asked for evaluations, but, as with all evaluators, must identify their professional or personal relationship to the candidate for promotion or tenure. The faculty member has the right to review the list of potential evaluators, to comment upon those who may not provide objective evaluation, and to request deletions. The faculty member's written comments and requests must be forwarded to the chairperson or dean and included in the external evaluation section of the digital evaluation file. With appropriate justification, any reasonable request for deletion will be considered.

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

The term "significant contributions" in research are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in WVU HSC and individual school promotion and tenure guidelines and receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their research efforts by external evaluators at peer or aspirational peer research universities.

If external reviewers of research from non-university settings are used, there must be an explanation of their professional competence in the discipline that led to their selection rather than the selection of a reviewer from a university setting. As a general principle, reviewers of research from non-university settings should be used only under very special circumstances and should be a minority rather than a majority among the reviewers selected. External reviewers of research from universities should be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought.

The chairperson, using letters approved by the dean (or designee), should request the external evaluations, stressing that the standard used as a basis for review should be the quality of the work and the impact or potential impact on the field. The specific area of significant contribution to be externally reviewed must be stated. Further, the other areas of contribution that should not be reviewed shall be explicit. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations must be included in the faculty member's file with identifying information removed. The external evaluator may also assess the faculty member's potential for continued excellent quality and impactful teaching, service, or scholarly development. For faculty, the standard should be based on one's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment, any relevant MOU, as well as HSC and school promotion and tenure guidelines. The assessment of whether the quantity of scholarly work is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a judgment best left to the school and WVU HSC. If an external evaluator comments on an area of contribution that was not specifically stated or provides information and characteristics unrelated to the criteria, those comments must be ignored. The evaluations should be forwarded to the dean and/or appropriate administrator by the external evaluators.

Tenure-track faculty members who received an approved extension of the tenure clock under Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5 should be evaluated on their overall record. The overall time since their original appointment is not a factor to be considered by the external evaluator.

### **XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS**

Evaluations of the achievements of faculty will normally be carried out at three levels of university organization: department, school, and Chancellor for Health Sciences. A judgment is made at each of these levels both by the faculty committee and by the administrative officer of the department and school. All full-time faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor can serve on the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel, regardless of their type of position. All faculty who serve on department and/or school committees also vote on each case, but the majority of voters for tenure cases must be tenured faculty members. In schools without departments, the school committee functions like a departmental committee. Faculty members shall neither initiate nor participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, annual evaluation, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate family or household or other qualified adults, and shall not participate in any other promotion and tenure decisions in a year in which a case so described is under consideration.

Each level of review will consider only the material in the candidate's digital evaluation file. Recommendations made in previous annual reviews are also considered, and may help inform the evaluation statements and recommendations. All recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their critical year will be forwarded through the complete review process. Recommendations against continuation of a tenured, tenure-track faculty member, or a non-tenure-track faculty member must receive review at all levels, including that of the HSC Chancellor. Participants at each level of review will exercise professional judgment regarding their assessment of the evaluation file in arriving at a recommendation or, in the HSC Chancellor's case, a decision.

If any member of the evaluation process believes that inappropriate and/or prejudicial remarks were made, as defined as Prohibited Conduct outlined in BOG Governance Rule 1.6 or for faculty utilizing BOG Faculty Rule 4.5, the member is obligated to raise their concern during the meeting, citing university rules. Further, the member of the evaluation process must discuss the issue with the appropriate leader which may be the chairperson, dean, or HSC Chancellor.

#### **A. Department Level in Schools**

1. Evaluation committees at the department level are engaged in two specific activities: annual reviews, with accompanying personnel action recommendations as defined in Section V of this document and reviews for purposes of promotion and/or tenure. Each department shall have a faculty evaluation committee, normally consisting of a minimum of five members. Membership must reflect the types of faculty positions excluding faculty equivalent/academic professional (FEAPs) (e.g., if units have non-tenure-track faculty, they are eligible to serve) within the unit. In the case of smaller schools or departments, the school-wide committee may substitute for departmental committees. The method of selection of members is left to the discretion of the program unit, but the chairperson of the department shall not be a member of the committee. If needed, a department may supplement committee membership with faculty members from a related discipline. This supplementation may occur where multi/trans/inter-disciplinary work is involved. Exceptions to the committee composition as described above must be approved by the Chancellor for HSC.

A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure is not eligible to serve on any committee reviewing their evaluation file. Members of the committee vote on tenure recommendations at the department level. The departmental committee will review and evaluate material in the faculty member's evaluation file. Based only on this evidence, the committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against continuation, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. The committee shall 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 department chairperson. If desired, committee members may include minority statements, which must be included in the body of the evaluation, without separate signatures. The total number of positive or negative votes must be recorded. A recusal must occur when there is a conflict of interest

as disclosed by the recusing member. Should opinions differ as to the presence of a conflict of interest, the chair will be consulted and a decision rendered. The chair's decision may be appealed to the dean. A committee member who recuses due to a conflict of interest should not be present during the review or vote of the specific file in question.

2. The department chairperson will review the evaluation file as well as the committee's evaluation statement and recommendation regarding each faculty member and will make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member. The department 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 of both the department committee and the chairperson at the same time. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's digital evaluation file and shared with the faculty member, including the signatures, votes or recusals, and minority statement from the department committee, if applicable. Should the chairperson have a conflict of interest, an appropriate designee (e.g., associate chair, associate dean) may conduct the review.
3. If the faculty member receives a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure from either the department committee or chairperson, the file is submitted for review at the school level. If both such recommendations are negative, the file is submitted to the dean for information, except in the critical year, when the file is reviewed by the school committee and the dean.
4. When a recommendation against tenure or promotion, or for non-continuation of appointment has been made, the faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations for review at the school level. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the dean within five (5) working days of receipt of the evaluations.
5. A faculty member may petition the dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations for promotion (i.e., when both the department committee and the department chairperson render negative recommendations). The petition must reach the dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. The dean shall forward the petition and any submitted rebuttal to the school evaluation committee as a matter of course for its recommendation. Negative department reviews of tenure cases or non-continuation cases are automatically reviewed by the school committee and the dean.
6. Responses to annual reviews must be forwarded to the chairperson and/or dean within ten (10) working days of receipt of the evaluation(s). The response will be added to the faculty member's digital evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the chairperson with an additional memo to the file. If the faculty member disagrees or otherwise takes issue with the evaluations or the assignment of descriptors, the faculty member may work informally with the chairperson. After working informally with the chairperson, the faculty member may ask the dean to review the evaluations or descriptors. However, any informal efforts to resolve any such issue will not serve to suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances. After considering the faculty member's request, the dean may direct the chairperson or the committee to reconsider their action based on a written justification that would be placed in the faculty digital evaluation file. Any subsequent adjustments would be documented in an additional memo to the file.

## B. School Level

1. Each school shall have a school faculty evaluation committee. In schools without department committees, the school committee functions like a departmental committee for both annual and promotion reviews. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or the award of tenure shall not serve on the school committee reviewing their personnel file. Each faculty evaluation committee shall normally consist of a minimum of five members. Membership must reflect the types of faculty positions excluding faculty equivalent/academic professional (FEAPs) (e.g., if units have non-tenure-track faculty, they are eligible to serve) within the unit. The method of selection of members is at the discretion of the dean of the school. No faculty member shall

serve on both a departmental and school committee and no chairperson shall serve on a school committee. Exceptions to the committee composition as described above must be approved by the Chancellor for HSC.

2. The school faculty committee will review departmental evaluations of the candidates, as well as their evaluation files as forwarded by the dean. The committee will prepare a written evaluation in each case with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, 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. Normally, the committee will review cases in which promotion, tenure, or non-continuation are recommended at the department level, although, at the dean's discretion, annual reviews may also be considered. A recusal must occur when there is a conflict of interest as disclosed by the recusing member. Should opinions differ as to the presence of a conflict of interest, the dean will be consulted and a decision rendered. The dean's decision may be appealed to the HSC Chancellor. A committee member who recuses due to a conflict of interest should not be present during the review or vote of the specific file in question. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the dean. 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.

The dean (or dean designee) will review evaluations and recommendations from the department and the school faculty committee and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The faculty member shall be notified by the dean (or dean designee) that the evaluations and recommendations of both the school committee and the dean are placed in the faculty member's digital evaluation file including the signatures, votes or recusals, and minority statement from the school committee, if applicable.

3. If either the school faculty committee or the dean supports a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty evaluation file, including both department and school recommendations together with external evaluations, is forwarded to the Chancellor for Health Sciences. If a request for discretionary promotion receives negative recommendations by both the school committee and the dean, the faculty evaluation file will not be forwarded to the next level, except when a rebuttal has been submitted by the faculty member.
4. A faculty member may include a rebuttal to the school-level recommendations for review at the next level. A rebuttal must be forwarded to the Chancellor for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of the recommendations. A faculty member seeking to rebut a negative decision for tenure based in any part on financial determinations shall be provided reasonable background information to assess the financial aspects of the decision.
5. A faculty member may petition the Chancellor for Health Sciences for a review of negative recommendations for discretionary promotion from the school level, i.e., when both the school committee and the dean (or dean designee) render negative decisions. The petition must reach the Chancellor for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of notification by the dean (or dean designee) of negative recommendations at the school level.
6. Deans (or dean designees) have the responsibility for determining whether all committee evaluations have been conducted fairly within the school and for assuring that comparable norms are appropriately applied in like units.
7. Recommendations by the dean (or dean designee) for tenure must include a statement indicating how the proposed awarding of tenure of a probationary faculty member will affect the long-range staffing pattern of the department and/or school, taking into account expected attrition, accreditation, budgetary limitations, and the need for flexibility.

1. The HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel will consist of at least one member from the Schools of Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy and Public Health. The School of Medicine, including Health Professions and Basic Sciences, will have a minimum of three (3) faculty representatives selected by the WVU Faculty Senate Executive Committee. No person who has reviewed faculty at the department or school level during the current cycle, or who is being considered for promotion or tenure, may serve on the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel.
2. The recommendations and faculty appeals will be reviewed by the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Primary attention will be given to the following four questions:
  - a. Has each recommendation been supported by objective evidence in the digital evaluation file to ensure that no faculty member is being treated capriciously or arbitrarily?
  - b. Have the review procedures at all levels been followed?
  - c. Is each recommendation consistent with the HSC and individual school policies and objectives?
  - d. Are the recommendations consistent with the department, school, division, and HSC criteria for promotion and tenure?
3. The HSC Advisory Panel will advise the Chancellor for Health Sciences regarding the cases considered and will prepare written statements addressing all concerns. The statement must be signed by all members of the panel, dated, and added to the faculty member's file. Panel members may include minority statements with the general statement.

#### D. Chancellor of Health Sciences Level

1. For the purposes described in these guidelines, the decision-making authority of the President has been delegated to the Chancellor for Health Sciences.
2. Decisions on promotion, tenure, and non-continuation recommendations will be made by the Chancellor for Health Sciences, after review of the recommendations by departments, schools, and deans (or dean designees), as well as the HSC Advisory Panel's findings. If the final decision by the Chancellor for Health Sciences is non-continuation a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Such notice of termination of appointment/employment shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested," first class mail and electronic mail.
3. The President or designee will report the decisions to the Board of Governors. This report will indicate the number of decisions as well as the individuals receiving positive action and will verify that the appropriate standards and guidelines have been met.
4. The faculty member, chairperson, and the appropriate dean will be notified in writing of the decision rendered.

#### E. Negative Decisions

1. Non-retention During Tenure-Track Period  
A faculty member may request from the President or designee, within ten (10) working days of receipt of the notice from the President's designee of non-retention during the tenure-track period, the reasons for the decision (Section 6.7 of WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2). Within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons, the faculty member may appeal the decision by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.
2. Tenure Denied; Termination of employment/appointment during Tenure-Track Period in the "critical year"  
A faculty member may appeal a decision on termination of employment/appointment within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.
3. Promotion Denied; Other Personnel Decisions

A faculty member may appeal a decision on promotion or other personnel decisions not included above by using W.Va. Code §6C-2, as described in Board of Governors Rule 4.2. The appeal should reach the office of the President's designee within fifteen (15) working days after receipt of the written decision.

WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2 and W.Va. Code §6C-2 are available in the offices of the dean and department/division chairperson, and may be obtained from the offices of the Provost, the Vice President for Health Sciences, the Campus Presidents, and the Wise, Evansdale, and Health Sciences Center Libraries. They are accessible on-line at <http://bog.wvu.edu>, and <http://pegb.wv.gov/.Faculty> may wish to check with the Division of

## APPENDICES

The appendices included in this document are intended to illustrate expectations and are not exhaustive. School guidelines must include more specific examples of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The classification of a particular contribution is determined in accordance with the established criteria and guidelines of the relevant academic unit. Such contributions must only be counted in one mission area.

### APPENDIX A

#### TEACHING EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Teaching at WVU takes a range of forms, and teaching workloads are multifaceted and diverse in their composition. Evaluations of teaching files should be responsive to the unique constellation of teaching contributions of each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement.

**Types of Contributions:** This document enumerates different types of teaching contributions (e.g., course teaching, clinical supervision, advising). The particular composition of an individual teaching workload will be determined by a range of factors (e.g., involvement in a graduate program, assigned advising responsibilities, clinical mentoring) and should be explicitly laid out in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments or individuals may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all teaching activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all schools in the same way (e.g., some schools count undergraduate advising as teaching and others as service). It must only be counted in one area.

**Considerations:** Because teaching takes a range of different forms, not all teaching activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of teaching a course, the course could be assessed on how much students learned, students' assessment of their experience, the course's design, and the instructor's demonstrated commitment to all their students. In the context of student advising and/or mentoring, the considerations might include advisor/mentor availability and responsiveness, student success in achieving program benchmarks on time, and advisee load.

Because no two teaching activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the teaching task.

Teaching that helps to enact accessibility for all may occur in many aspects of the teaching endeavor, including but not limited to program or curriculum development related to supporting an accessible student body, learning activities that support accessibility in the classroom, extracurricular activities outside of the classroom related to a field or program of study, and advising students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Faculty who seek credit for this work must document it in their digital evaluation file.

**Examples of Teaching:** By its nature, teaching is difficult to capture and measure. The most successful teaching files will present a range of examples that comprehensively convey each teaching activity and its impact. For example, the activity of teaching a course could be represented by the course syllabus, student feedback instrument or other University approved tool, anonymized student work, pre- and post-course test data, instructor-designed course evaluations, screenshots from the learning management system, peer observation, etc. Different examples communicate different types of information.

One consideration is the *example author or creator*. In other words, who generated or developed the example? Some examples are created by the instructor themselves. In the case of a course, this might include a syllabus, course assignment descriptions and associated rubrics, and learning management system shells. While the

information conveyed by these examples is important, to understand the impact of these examples (on student learning, for example), examples generated by students is essential. These might include anonymized student work, student feedback instrument responses, pre- and post-course assessment data, or a screenshot of an (anonymized) online discussion board. To help triangulate information gleaned from student-generated examples, the instructor could ask a colleague to observe a class or have a faculty associate from the HSC Faculty Development Program consult on a course. These peer- and expert-generated materials would provide a different perspective on the success of the course.

Another consideration is the ***example type***. In other words, what does this example accomplish in the context of the file? Some examples, like peer observation, explicitly evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction and the student feedback instruments provide feedback about the students' experience of the instruction. Other examples, like syllabi or student work, help to illustrate what happens in the course. Some materials, like a HSC Faculty Development consultation, are provided to demonstrate the instructors' professional development and learning related to their pedagogy. Finally, some file materials, like the teaching narrative, help to explain the course. Explanatory examples may be less formal, like a note in the digital evaluation file, which could explain that a syllabus revision was completed in response to the previous year's annual review letter or to student feedback.

Where ***evaluative*** examples are included, it is helpful to consider whether those were anonymous (as in the case of student feedback instrument responses or instructor-designed evaluations delivered through Qualtrics) or not (peer observation or student letters of appreciation). It is also helpful to note whether the example was formative (like an early- or mid-semester evaluation intended to inform instruction in progress) or summative (intended to provide feedback about the course and its effectiveness after it is completed).

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or letter of appointment, and – perhaps most importantly – the teaching narrative.

One key to a successful teaching file is that it balances a range of example types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized.

Rather than providing a list of examples that could be associated with each teaching activity, this document provides guiding principles to help faculty and evaluation committee members consider different examples and the types of information they convey. This appendix also lists a range of possible examples. **Again, this list is not meant to be prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.**

**Evaluative Tools:** What follows is a series of tools to help evaluators – those serving on faculty evaluation committees (FEC), as well as chairpersons and deans – assess faculty teaching files. Faculty themselves should also consult these tools when developing their files and their narratives. These tools are meant to be flexible and generative. If an FEC or chairperson recognizes a teaching activity often performed by their faculty but not captured here, they should develop that table and associated metrics. If the considerations or metrics enumerated in a table do not effectively capture that activity for a particular department, the faculty of that department should revise the table to better fit its needs. Included in this document are the following tools:

***Tables*** outline each type of teaching contribution and its associated metrics for consideration. ***Matrices*** could be used by faculty or evaluators as a way to check on the inclusion and balance of different types of evidence.

***This appendix*** lists examples of evidence types for each teaching activity. Once again, it is important to underscore the flexible nature of these tools.

**COURSE TEACHING\***  
**TABLE**

Activity	Considerations (not required to address each of these topics)	(Possible) Associated Evidence <b>Bold Required</b>
	<b>Student/Trainee Learning</b> (Do students/trainees demonstrate knowledge development over the course of the semester?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Anonymized student/trainee work</li> <li>● Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>● Accreditation and/or Annual assessment reports</li> <li>● Exam pass rates</li> </ul>
	<b>Student/Trainee Experience</b> (Did students/trainees feel positively toward the instructor, the materials, and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● University and/or HSC approved student/trainee feedback instrument</li> <li>● Early semester assessments</li> <li>● Student emails/correspondence</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all students/trainees in this course have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade data (with attention to D/Fs)</li> <li>● <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>● Screenshots of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>● Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>● Assignment descriptions</li> <li>● Anonymized modifications for students with individual needs</li> </ul>
	<b>Course Design</b> (Is the course deliberately designed to effectively develop knowledge among students/trainees?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>● <b>Screenshots</b> of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>● Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>● Assignment descriptions and rubrics</li> <li>● Student/trainee work</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University/HSC Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, unit specific mission, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program/accreditation standards</li> <li>● Program curriculum requirements</li> <li>● GEF descriptions</li> <li>● Credits associated with course</li> <li>● SpeakWrite documentation</li> </ul>

## **GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING TABLE**

*Note:* Graduate and/or professional student/trainee advising takes a range of forms: advising graduate and/or professional students/learners on program requirements, overseeing graduate and/or professional work in a clinical setting, laboratory or other assistantship, scholarly mentoring on a dissertation, capstone, or thesis, as well as advising students/learners on career paths. Some departments or individuals may count some of these duties towards teaching (e.g., dissertation mentorship, teaching assistantship oversight), others towards service (e.g., program requirement advising), and others towards research (e.g., laboratory assistantship oversight). Such contributions must only be counted in one mission area. The faculty member and their chairperson should agree upon the designation of each type of advising and provide a clear rationale that aligns with the faculty member's workload agreement, MOU, etc. The faculty member should explicate any ambiguous designation in their teaching narrative and/or electronic file. Quality and impact should be emphasized over quantity. Faculty should choose items of evidence that most effectively demonstrate the quality and impact of their teaching. There is no reward for simply increasing the quantity of evidence submitted.

Activity	Considerations *Not required to address each of these topics	(Possible) Associated Evidence * <b>Bold Required</b>
	<b>Student/Trainee Learning</b> (Do students/trainees demonstrate knowledge development?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student/trainee work</li> <li>• Papers, presentations or other scholarly activity produced by the student/learner</li> <li>• Participation as committee chair or member of graduate student penultimate paper</li> <li>• Job placement of trainees immediately upon program completion</li> <li>• Awards or recognition received by students or other trainees under the faculty member's direct mentorship.</li> </ul>
	<b>Student/Trainee Experience</b> (Did students/trainees feel positively toward the graduate advisor/mentor and the learning experience?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student/trainee feedback instrument (<b>when appropriate and/or more than five (5) students/trainees</b>)</li> <li>• Early semester assessments</li> <li>• Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Number of transfers into/out of student mentorship (not via graduation)</li> <li>• Number of students completing program</li> <li>• Nominations of faculty for mentorship awards</li> <li>• Student/learner assessment of mentor</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all advisees/mentees have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student/trainee emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Fulfillment of Expectations (MOUs), Research Contracts</li> <li>• Completion of grant work</li> <li>• Attendance/organization at specified seminars</li> <li>• Participation in the educational component of research grants</li> </ul>
	<b>Design</b> (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop knowledge among students/trainees?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>• Screenshots of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> <li>• Student/trainee work</li> <li>• Attendance/organization at specified seminars</li> <li>• Participation in the educational component of research grants</li> <li>• Structured engagement with students/trainees through meetings, lab meetings, journal clubs, etc.</li> <li>• Evidence of incorporation of research data or practice guidelines into mentoring/advising</li> <li>• Development of tools and guidelines that promote effectiveness; expectations agreements, lab contracts, etc.</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University/HSC Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>• Organization of departmental/unit/college seminar for graduate students</li> <li>• Service as graduate student advisor</li> </ul>

**UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING/MENTORING TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ADVISING/ MENTORING	<p>Student Experience (Did students feel positively toward the advisor, the mentor, the advice given, and the experience more broadly?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Feedback on the advisor/mentor with a survey</li> <li>● Number of transfers from/to advisor</li> <li>● Average wait time between the requested appointment time and appointment</li> <li>● Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>● Letters of recommendations including, but not limited to applications for internal/external awards, internship placements, graduate applications, nominations for mentoring awards</li> <li>● Independent study or advanced research/service project including Honors Excel program, SURE, McNair Scholars, internships supported through grants, lab experiences, etc.</li> <li>● Postgraduate job placement or acceptance into graduate or professional programs</li> <li>● General assessment of advisor</li> </ul>
	<p>Accessibility for All (Do all students have equal opportunity and access to advising and/or mentoring?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of students advised</li> <li>● Successful retention rate in the program</li> <li>● Successful retention rate in the University</li> <li>● Universal design in class materials</li> <li>● Attendance of training and certification (badges) to support accessibility for all</li> </ul>
	<p>Design (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop students?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development of specialized mentorship tools for retention</li> <li>● Development of mentorship tools for retention of first-generation students</li> <li>● Expectation agreements and guidelines</li> <li>● Structured engagement or meeting schedule, lab meetings, etc.</li> </ul>
	<p>Program/University/HSC Needs (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Metrics for advisement being met (# of times per academic year, etc.)</li> <li>● Timely progress towards benchmarks</li> <li>● Time to degree completion</li> </ul>

### COMMUNITY-ENGAGED TEACHING TABLE

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
	<b>Participant Experience</b> (Did participants feel positively toward the instructor, the materials, and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program assessments (minute papers, etc.)</li> <li>● Participant emails/correspondence</li> <li>● Periodic check-ins with all parties involved</li> <li>● Reflection exercise from participants</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all participants in this course have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of Participants</li> <li>● Scope of the training (local, state, national, international)</li> <li>● Design of alternate means of dissemination (hybrid, podcast, etc.)</li> </ul>
	<b>Design</b> (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop participants?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of work as facilitator (e.g., slideshow, handouts)</li> <li>● Evidence of work as a mentor to the program development (not a facilitator)</li> <li>● Syllabus or overview of the program</li> <li>● New program development (e.g., program materials)</li> <li>● Substantial revision of program (e.g. revised program materials)</li> <li>● Screenshots of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>● Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>● Assignment descriptions</li> <li>● Reflection exercise from all participants</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University/HSC/Stakeholder/Community Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation, certificate, or continuing education unit/CEU programs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>● Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>● GEF descriptions</li> <li>● Community Request for additional engagement</li> <li>● Stakeholder Request for Training</li> <li>● External Certification Requirements (new and renewals)</li> </ul>

**TRAINEE CLINICAL SUPERVISION TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
	<b>Trainee/Supervisee Learning</b> (Do students/learners demonstrate development over the course of the placement/rotation?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trainee/supervisee work</li> <li>● Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>● Mentor/On-site supervisor evaluation</li> </ul>
	<b>Trainee/Supervisee Experience</b> (Did trainees feel positively toward the supervisor and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trainee/Supervisee evaluations</li> <li>● Trainee presentations/publications/awards under mentorship of supervisor</li> <li>● Peer evaluations and/or observations</li> <li>● Awards for supervision</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all students/learners in this experience have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade data, narratives</li> <li>● Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>● Assignment descriptions</li> </ul>
	<b>Design of Supervision/Innovation of methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teaching tools</li> <li>● Evaluation tools</li> <li>● Supervisee work</li> <li>● Evidence of integration of scholarship of supervision methods into design</li> <li>● Evidence of design to support supervisee learning in multiple settings.</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/Accreditation Needs</b> (Does the supervision meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>● Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>● Credits associated with supervision</li> <li>● National survey program (ACGME, LCME, etc.)</li> <li>● Board pass rates</li> </ul>
	<b>Trainee/Supervisee Preparation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trainee/Supervisee satisfaction/efficacy</li> <li>● Completion of degree</li> </ul>
	<b>Alumni success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Job Placement data (short-term success)</li> <li>● Career trajectory (long-term success)</li> <li>● Letters of appreciation</li> </ul>

SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING &amp; LEARNING (SoTL) TABLE

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
SoTL	<b>Dissemination of professional knowledge on teaching and learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference presentations (peer reviewed, invited, not peer-reviewed)</li> <li>• Research paper (peer reviewed, invited, not peer-reviewed)</li> <li>• Podcast production</li> <li>• Interview on podcast</li> <li>• News media production</li> <li>• Interview on news media</li> <li>• Video of lesson study/workshop</li> <li>• Book or workbook</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University/HSC Needs</b> (Dissemination of scholarship at the behest of the department/school/HSC/University)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSC Faculty Development (Grand Rounds, Educational Morbidity and Mortality (M&amp;Ms))</li> <li>• HSC Teaching Scholars</li> <li>• Simulation Certificate Program</li> </ul>

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING/DEVELOPMENT TABLE

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (as a participant)	Increased professional knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Evidence of completion of graduate courses</li><li>● Evidence of completion of graduate degree</li><li>● Evidence of completion of other trainings or continuing education or workshops</li><li>● Evidence of completion of certifications through testing or alternate means (non-classroom)</li><li>● Evidence of completion of badging or certification</li><li>● Conference attendance</li><li>● Internal development opportunities</li></ul>
	Program/University/HSC Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Evidence of required professional development for certifications</li><li>● Internal/external awards</li></ul>

## TYPOLOGY OF TEACHING EXAMPLES EVIDENCE MATRIX

Activity	Example	Required	Anon. *	Solicited*	Author/ Creator					Type				Purpose*	
					S e l f	S t u d e n t	P e r e r	E x p e r t	A d m i n	Evaluative	Illustrative	Explanatory	Develop- mental	Formative	Summative

\*If evaluative

## TEACHING EXAMPLES

### COURSE TEACHING

#### Evaluation

- University and/or HSC approved student/trainee feedback instrument and/or Early Semester Feedback Tool
- HSC Faculty Development peer evaluation
- Department Colleague Class Observation
- Department Chairperson Class Observation
- Department Colleague Course Material Review
- Teaching Awards
- Evaluations by GTAs, GAs, RAs, or other instructional personnel

#### Design

- Syllabus
- Screenshots of learning management system
- Model Assignments Description/Rubrics
- Lesson Plans
- Class Activities (descriptions, notes, slides)
- Handouts
- Lecture/Seminar Notes
- Lecture/Seminar Slides
- Digital Learning Objects
- Simulation Case Scenarios

#### Trainee Learning

- Trainee Letter of Appreciation
- Anonymized Trainee Work
- Trainee Pre-/Post-Course Assessments
- Screenshot of Discussion Board
- Trainee external publications related to course work
- External awards for trainee course work

#### Other

- Sample anonymized feedback on trainee work
- Invitations to consult on teaching, provide workshops on teaching, etc.
- Self-reflection/teaching narrative
- Grants or funding for pedagogical innovations or teaching projects
- Formative feedback from external content experts
- External evaluations (if pursued, must be sought through the standard procedure outlined in Section XII of this document)

## APPENDIX B

### EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY PRODUCTION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Research at WVU takes a range of forms, and research workloads are diverse and multifaceted in their composition. Evaluations of research/scholarship files should be responsive to the specific nature of research/scholarly contributions by each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement.

**Types of Contributions:** This document enumerates different types of research/scholarly contributions (e.g., publishing, grant activity, performance, presentation). The nature of an individual research/scholarship workload will be determined by a range of factors and should be described in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all research/scholarly activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count graduate student mentorship in a laboratory or on a research project as research and others count it as teaching).

**Considerations:** Because research/scholarship takes a range of different forms, not all research/scholarly activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of procuring a major grant, the grant could be assessed on the prestige of the funding agency, the amount of funding awarded, the selectivity of the award, and the faculty member's role on the project (e.g., PI, Co-I, etc.). In the context of publishing an article, the considerations might include the selectivity and prestige of the journal, the authors' role (e.g., sole author, first author, etc.), the time dedicated to research represented in the article (e.g., multiyear ethnography vs. secondary data analysis), and if graduate students or mentored junior scholars were included as authors.

Research/scholarship that helps to enact accessibility for all may occur in many aspects of the research/scholarly endeavor, including but not limited to direct research about disadvantaged populations and engaging a variety of perspectives in the research team and research design. Faculty who seek credit for this work must document it in their digital evaluation file.

Because no two research/scholarly activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the research/scholarship.

**Evidence:** While some products of research/scholarly activity are obvious – like publications, posters, and submitted grant proposals – not all research/scholarly activity is easily communicated within a research/scholarship file. The faculty member should present a range of evidence types that help to convey the full scope of the research/scholarly activity.

One consideration is the *evidence type*. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like posters or published manuscripts, are explicit illustrations of research/scholarly findings. Other evidence, like unfunded grant reviews, IRB protocols, or agendas of grant writing workshops, help to show a research project or researcher's development. Finally, some file materials, like the research narrative, performance review, serving as PI/Co-I for a clinical trial, or a scholar's research index or impact factor, provide some context for the research activity. One key to a successful research file is that it balances a range of evidence types.

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or letter of appointment, and – perhaps most importantly – the research narrative.

Rather than providing a complete list of evidence that could be associated with each research/scholarly activity, this document provides a few illustrations to guide faculty and FECs in how to consider different evidence and the types of information they convey. Again, this list is not meant to be exhaustive or prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.

**TYPOLGY OF RESEARCH  
ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE**

Activity	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Journal article	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer review</li> <li>• Authorship order</li> <li>• Co-author, sole-author or corresponding author</li> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of outlet</li> <li>• Manuscript length</li> <li>• Inclusion of students/trainees or mentored junior faculty</li> <li>• Scale of research being presented (e.g., longitudinal ethnography vs. secondary analysis)</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> <li>• Acceptance letter</li> <li>• Reviews</li> <li>• Evidence of citations</li> </ul>
Invited article		
Book Chapter		
Book		
Book Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of publisher</li> <li>• Editor order (if more than one)</li> <li>• Prestige/importance of authors in volume</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> <li>• Acceptance letter</li> <li>• Reviews</li> <li>• Evidence of citations</li> </ul>
Book Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of publisher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> </ul>
Conference Proceedings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstracts</li> </ul>
Translations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literary and non-literary works as a noteworthy contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty members submitting translations for evaluation should include a statement clarifying how that work is appropriate to their research program and their field of study. The Department considers other types of translation, e. g., legal and commercial documents, as service.</li> </ul>
Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success of submission (funded or unfunded)</li> <li>• Amount of award</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant/contract proposal</li> <li>• Reviews</li> </ul>
Contract		

Foundation-supported funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Selectivity of award</li> <li>● Prestige of granting agency</li> <li>● Role on grant/contract (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-I, etc.)</li> <li>● Internal vs. external</li> <li>● New vs. renewal</li> <li>● Competitive vs. non-competitive</li> <li>● Nature of the grant vs. Contract</li> <li>● Research, Teaching or Service related grant</li> <li>● Clinical trials (investigator initiated or industry sponsored)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Acceptance letter</li> </ul>
Scholarly Presentations, Workshops, Public lecture about Expertise, Media Publication/Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reach of lecture (attendance, recording views)</li> <li>● Level of expertise used in presentation</li> <li>● Scope of exposure (regional/national/international)</li> <li>● Audience (scholars, general public)</li> <li>● Invited, keynote or plenary</li> <li>● Presentation submission</li> <li>● Workshop (invited, reach, federal agency)</li> <li>● Peer review</li> <li>● Co-author, sole-author, corresponding author</li> <li>● Feedback from a session about teaching practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Link to recording</li> <li>● Slides/Lecture transcript or notes</li> <li>● Notes of appreciation</li> <li>● Link to publication</li> </ul>
Composition, Performance, Exhibit, Design for Juried Competitions, Exhibitions and Collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scope</li> <li>● Venue/Location</li> <li>● Invitation/Commission</li> <li>● Sponsor</li> <li>● Collaborators/Ensemble</li> <li>● Creative/Artistic Innovations</li> <li>● Acceptance rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Recordings, Videos, Images</li> <li>● Scores</li> <li>● Multimedia/Digital Examples</li> <li>● Contracts</li> </ul>
Extension publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Peer review</li> <li>● Authorship order</li> <li>● Co-author, sole-author or corresponding author</li> <li>● Prestige, impact, and selectivity of outlet</li> <li>● Manuscript length</li> <li>● Inclusion of students or mentored junior faculty</li> <li>● Scale of research being presented (e.g., longitudinal ethnography vs. secondary analysis)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published manuscript</li> <li>● Acceptance letter</li> <li>● Reviews</li> <li>● Evidence of citations</li> <li>● Fact Sheets</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>● Originality/novelty in the field</li> <li>● Internal publications</li> </ul>	
Patents/Licensing Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Invention disclosure</li> <li>● Patent filed</li> <li>● Published patents</li> <li>● Licensing agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Record of Invention</li> <li>● Diagram(s)</li> <li>● Patent</li> </ul>
Innovation and Entrepreneurship Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● University managed or supported business ventures (business parks or incubators)</li> <li>● New business ventures and start-ups</li> <li>● Social entrepreneurship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Business plan</li> <li>● Proposal</li> </ul>
Non-disclosure Agreements with Industry Partners (Outside University)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Licensing agreements</li> <li>● Non-disclosure Agreements</li> <li>● In-kind support</li> </ul>	

Community-engaged Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> <li>• Participatory Design</li> <li>• Training and Technical Assistance Activities</li> <li>• Community Presentations</li> <li>• Governmental Agency/Legislature Presentations</li> <li>• Publications for Community Engagement and Outreach</li> <li>• Description</li> <li>• Measures of Impact</li> <li>• Community Plan</li> <li>• Awards</li> <li>• External Reviews</li> <li>• Audience/Scope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Preparation</li> <li>• In Process of Engagement and Implementation</li> <li>• Submitted for Community Review</li> <li>• Revised and Final Submission</li> <li>• Published/Completed</li> </ul>
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Evidence listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>
Multi/Inter/Trans Disciplinary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Evidence listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX C

### SERVICE EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Service is a core value at WVU, and faculty engage in service in a broad range of ways. Evaluation of service activity should be responsive to the unique service contributions of each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement in the area of service.

**Types of Contributions:** This document describes three areas of service contributions: *university*, *community*, and *profession*. The appropriate distribution of an individual's service contributions will be determined by a range of factors and should be explicitly laid out in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all service activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count advising as service and others as teaching).

**Considerations:** Because service takes a range of different forms, not all service activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of service to the profession, the activity may be evaluated according to the prestige of the professional organization, the type of expertise leveraged for the activity, and the scope of the organization's reach, along with the more standard assessments of how much time was devoted to the activity and if it entailed a leadership role.

Service that helps to enact accessibility may occur in many aspects of the service endeavor, including but not limited to recruiting trainees from disadvantaged groups and speaking engagements about lived experience. Faculty who seek credit for this work must document it in their digital evaluation file.

Because no two service activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the service task.

An important consideration, especially for those who have service as outstanding or significant contributions in their workload, is the *leadership* involved in the service activity. For example, if someone serves as a committee chair or an editor of journal, these are important demonstrations of leadership in service. Another consideration is the way in which the faculty member became involved – or their *entry* – into the service activity. If they were nominated by other committee members, voted on by their peers, or nominated by their chairperson or Dean, that suggests that the faculty member has earned prestige among their peers, which should be recognized.

Additionally, the *scope* of the service should be noted. For university service, is the service being performed at the departmental, college, or university level? For community service, are they working in the local town or county, contributing to state-wide or regional efforts? For professional service, is the scope regional, national, or international?

Faculty with clinical service are expected to support patient care, healthcare systems, and the academic mission of the university. They are expected to deliver high-quality, evidence-based care, maintain licensure, and uphold professional and ethical standards. They serve as role models for trainees, integrate clinical work with teaching and research/scholarship, and participate in quality improvement and team-based care. In performing these duties, clinical service may include direct patient care, supervision and teaching in clinical settings, clinical program development and innovation, on-call and consultative services, interdisciplinary/interprofessional collaboration, administrative and leadership roles related to clinical practice, community and outreach services, as well as participating in telemedicine and remote care. The balance of clinical service with teaching and research/scholarly work varies depending on the faculty member's track and needs of the department, school and university.

Evaluators are advised to consider the faculty member's developmental trajectory of service contribution according to scope, entry, and leadership. For example, a new assistant professor will not have extensive opportunities for college or university service, nor will they be expected to take on leadership roles or be nominated or voted into important service positions. Once faculty have established themselves and begin to work towards promotion, then

they should be supported and encouraged to take on service-related leadership roles across the institution, the community, and the profession, as appropriate for their unit, position, and expertise.

**Evidence of Service:** Evidence that represents service activity is not always obvious. The most successful service files will present a range of evidence that comprehensively convey each service activity and its impact. For example, the activity of serving on a university committee could be represented by meeting agendas, a subcommittee project, and a year-end report. The activity of serving on a journal's editorial board might include sample article reviews, a tally of the number of reviews assigned to colleagues, and a thank you letter from the journal editor. Different evidence communicates different types of information.

One consideration is the *author or creator of the evidence*. In other words, who generated or developed the artifact? Some evidences are created by the faculty themselves. In the case of a community outreach project, this might include agendas of community workshops, handouts provided at those workshops, and a copy of the community-service grant proposal that funded the project. While the information conveyed by self-generated evidence is important, to understand the full impact of this evidence, evidence generated by those benefiting from the service (i.e., the participants) is essential. These might include workshop participant evaluations and thank you notes from community organization staff. To help triangulate information gleaned from and participant-generated evidence, the faculty member could ask a project collaborator to describe the faculty's contributions to the project.

Another consideration is the *evidence type*. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like workshop evaluations or peer assessment, explicitly evaluates the effectiveness of the service. Other evidence, like an article review, helps to illustrate the service. Some materials demonstrate the faculty member's development and learning related to their service activity. Finally, some file materials, like the service narrative, help to explain the activity. Explanatory evidence may be less formal, like a note in Digital Measures.

Where *evaluative* evidence is included, it is helpful to consider whether those were anonymous (e.g., evaluations delivered through Qualtrics) or not (peer observation or letters of appreciation). It is also helpful to note whether the artifact was formative (like a mid-project evaluation intended to inform the project in progress) or summative (intended to provide feedback about the project and its effectiveness after completion).

All these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or letter of appointment, and – perhaps most importantly – the service narrative. One key to a successful service file is that it balances a range of evidence types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized.

Rather than providing a list of evidence that could be associated with each service activity, this document provides guiding principles to help faculty and evaluation committee members consider different evidence and the types of information they convey. Again, this list is not meant to be prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.

**Evaluative Tools:** What follows is a series of tools to help evaluators – those serving on faculty evaluation committees, as well as chairpersons and deans – assess faculty service files. The tables are populated with examples, but contents should be erased and re-entered for each faculty member. Faculty themselves should consult these tools when developing their files and their narratives. These tools are meant to be flexible and generative. If an FEC or chairperson recognizes a category of service activity often performed by their faculty but not captured here, they should develop that table and associated metrics. If the considerations or metrics listed in a table do not effectively capture that activity for a particular department, the faculty of that department should revise the table to better fit its needs.

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE - INSTITUTIONAL						
Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence	
Departmental Committee - Member	Dept.	Elected		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Committee chair letter	
					Sample work/agendas	
					Description	
College Wide Committee - Chair	College	Invited	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Dean letter	
					Sample work/agendas	
University Committee – Member; Faculty Senate service	Univ.	Appointed				
Advisor to Student Club	Univ.	Invited	x			
Advising Trainees	Dept.	MOU				
Service Learning Courses	Univ.	Volunteered				
Oversight of Trainees						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internships</li> </ul>	Dept.	Volunteered				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Learning</li> </ul>	Univ.	Volunteered			Anonymized Trainee Service Work Projects	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global Service Learning</li> </ul>	Univ.	Invited				
Meeting	Univ.					
Event	Univ.					
Special Event (e.g., art show, lab setup, software support)	Univ.					
Leader on trainee trips	Univ.					
Interprofessional Education (IPE) Facilitator	Univ.	Volunteered			Workshop materials	
					Participant evaluations	
Meeting	Univ.	Invited	x			
Coordinator/Director of Centers	Dept.	Volunteered	x		Not an administrative appointment.	
Recruitment and Retention	Dept.					
Representing University Externally	Dept.					
Advisor to Prestigious Scholarships	Univ.					
Writing Trainee Recommendations	Dept/School	Requested		Number of Letters	Listing of Trainees and recommendations written Thank you notes from trainee	
Faculty Mentoring	Dept/School	Appointed or Volunteer				

**TYPOLGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE - *COMMUNITY***

Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Outreach Project Coordinator	Comm	Appointed		If not included in teaching	
Service on Committee	Comm	Invited	x		Attendance, contributions
Attendance at Events	Comm	MOU			
Professional Service to Community	Comm	Volunteered			
Advisory/Nonprofit Board Member	Comm	Invited	x		
Event Development	Comm	Initiator	x		Agenda, program, website, press releases, social media posts, YouTube and other links
Capacity building activities with organizations and communities	Comm	Facilitator	x		

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE – <i>PROFESSIONAL SERVICE</i>					
Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Committee	Prof.	Elected		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Time devoted</li> <li>● Expertise leveraged</li> <li>● Reach of service</li> </ul>	Committee chair letter
					Sample work/agendas
					Description
Event/ Workshop	Prof.	Invited	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Time devoted</li> <li>● Expertise leveraged</li> <li>● Reach of service</li> </ul>	Dean letter
					Sample work/agendas
Grant Reviewer	Prof.	Appointed			
Advisor to Trainee Club	Prof.	Invited	x		
Advising Trainees	Prof.	MOU			
Student Mentoring	Prof.				
Panel Member	Prof.	Volunteered			
Invited talk	Prof.				
Media Interviews	Prof.	Volunteered			
External Evaluator	Prof.	Volunteered			Accreditation team participation; Anonymized Trainee Service Work Projects; Program Evaluation Report
Journal Editor	Prof.	Invited	x		
Journal Reviewer	Prof.	Invited			
Conference Organizer	Prof.	Appointed	x		
Paper Reviewer	Prof.				
Conference Panel Member	Prof.				
Conference Panel Organizer	Prof.	Appointed/ elected			
Conference Panel MC	Prof.				
Professional Organization Officer	Prof.	Elected	x		

GENERIC EVIDENCE MATRIX

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE EVIDENCE															
Activity	Artifact	Required	Anon *	Solicited *	Author/Creator					Type				Purpose *	
					Self	Student	Peer	Expert	Admin.	Evaluative	Illustrative	Explanatory	Develop- mental	Formative	Summative

\*If evaluative