

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL**

Approved by Department December 14, 2010

Approved by the Office of the Provost June 30, 2011

Revisions approved by Department May 4, 2012

Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost July 9, 2012

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

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

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual assignment, the faculty evaluation file, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track, and promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the areas of expected significant contribution, normally teaching, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations in one's letter of appointment by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service.

For Tenure track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Designated research-intensive appointments may be 30% teaching and 50% research, normally with two significant grants, as principal investigator or major co-investigator, required for award of tenure in research-intensive appointments.

For Teaching faculty, responsibilities are defined as 80% teaching and 20% service.

For Clinical faculty, Board of Governors Policy 2 stipulates the appointment must have the majority of the assignment be assigned service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary.

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

Research faculty may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as principal investigator in externally funded research. Per BoG Policy 2, classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary. Teaching must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. There may be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

Annual Assignment

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and Chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Clinical faculty, Research faculty, Teaching faculty, and Tenure track faculty participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process.

The allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Annual appointments in the Eberly College and Department of Geology and Geography are normally:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Teaching Faculty	80%	— ¹	20%
Clinical Faculty	Maximum of 14 credit hours	5-10% max	50+%
Research Faculty		100%	

¹ Evaluation in a Teaching faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU P&T policy, "faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For Teaching faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Geology and Geography department is four courses. "Research active" in this context is defined as continuing regular membership on the Graduate Faculty. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to five courses for up to three years subsequent to loss of regular membership on the Graduate Faculty. If by the end of the three years they have not been reinstated as regular members of the Graduate Faculty, their annual course assignment will be adjusted to seven courses. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the tenured faculty member's expectations for promotion.

Annual percentages may be adjusted in accord with circumstances documented in annual workload plans; however, regardless of percentages, expectations for promotions and/or tenure remain as they are described in the appointment letter unless adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Dean and the Provost's Office.

For faculty members approved for sabbatical or professional development program leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the leave period.

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

Faculty on a full year's professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester's leave, a Tenure track faculty member's annual evaluation would typically be 60%-70% teaching, 20-30% research and 10% service. Teaching faculty would typically be 90% teaching and 10% service.

Faculty on a full year's sabbatical leave would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester's sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

Copies of the approved leave application and plan (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

Research faculty typically have a workload assignment of 100% research, but the assignment may include other expectations defined in the appointment letter or subsequent Memoranda of Understanding. Research faculty are usually supported on research or other grant funding. Research faculty may teach, but teaching should be secondary to research, and must be compatible with the funding source.

For Clinical faculty, the majority of the assignment is service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. The expectations of the position are defined in the appointment letter and/or subsequent Memoranda of Understanding.

The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must annually update evaluation files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On the department-specified deadline date, which for Geology and Geography is the last business day of the calendar year, the file shall be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Each faculty evaluation file must have an inventory of its contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, all faculty files and file inventories in the Eberly College will be organized following a sample format that maintains four separate inventories for (1) the administrative file, and for (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service documentation. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

1. The administrative file includes: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; (d) annual CVs and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the Chairperson or Dean may wish to include.

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify which file each piece of documentation is submitted to. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is highly recommended.

Each document should be tagged with its inventory number.

Once an item is entered into the evaluation file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. Generally speaking, files may not leave the administrative office suite where they are housed.

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Clinical faculty, Research faculty, Teaching faculty, and Tenure track faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process. All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both a committee of faculty and by the Chair.

Annual review of postdocs is performed by the faculty member supporting the research efforts in consultation with the Chair or Associate Chair

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

The department/division FEC will normally include a minimum of five members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his evaluation file. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty. The committee composition should be inclusive of categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g., Clinical faculty, Teaching faculty, Tenure track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases.

All members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting.

The Geology and Geography Department Faculty Evaluation Committee is composed of five members of the tenured faculty and up to two members of the untenured faculty. These members will be selected by vote of the entire faculty. The tenured faculty members and the untenured faculty members will be selected separately. Faculty may vote for as many candidates as there are openings in each category. A run-off election will be held in case of tie vote totals for a position on the committee. The committee must be formed by September 1 of each year. The tenured faculty members will consist of two geologists and two geographers and the fifth member may be elected from either program. Tenured faculty members of the committee will serve staggered terms of three years. A majority of the committee must be tenured faculty.

Untenured tenure track faculty members and non-tenure track Assistant Professors are eligible to serve a single, one-year term on the FEC committee, but are not required to do so. Non-tenure track Associate or Full Professors may serve one-year terms without limitation if elected as described in the remainder of this paragraph. Up to two untenured faculty positions on the Faculty Evaluation Committee may be filled, in addition to the five regular positions for tenured faculty, but these two positions will only be filled if candidates are elected by a majority of votes cast. If more than two untenured faculty members receive a majority of votes cast, the two individuals receiving the most votes will serve. There will be no attempt to balance the numbers of untenured committee members between the Geology and Geography programs. Untenured committee members have the same voting rights as tenured members, and are expected to participate fully in all discussions and decisions of the committee, with the following exception: untenured faculty members have a reduced evaluation letter writing assignment, which will be limited to writing evaluations for tenured faculty and non-tenure track faculty.

Faculty in their first year at WVU and faculty given a terminal appointment will not be eligible to serve on the FEC. The Chairperson of the Department shall not serve as a member, nor shall a person who is

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

applying for promotion and/or tenure. Faculty whose sabbatical leave, or any other approved leave, occurs during their elected term are temporarily replaced until their return when they will complete their term.

The chair of the FEC is selected by the committee. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC.

Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. Faculty members who serve on the College committee may not serve on departmental evaluation committees.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed as Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or Unsatisfactory.

The annual review normally covers performance only for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement, and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable to their appointment, or continuing to remain productive.

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

Ratings affect annual salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. Both "excellent" and "good" are meritorious ratings. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to "satisfactory" or lower is appropriate.

Meritorious work should be fully documented; for example, if information is provided for one course when one's assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating for the entire assignment should be questioned.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide for the file evidence (1) that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the evaluation file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the reader's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I [we] must conclude that the faculty member's work is unsatisfactory."

To assist faculty members in assembling annual file materials and to assist the Faculty Evaluation Committee in making informed and consistent evaluations, the College suggests the following framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes in the areas of teaching, research, or service. One, some, or all of the following criteria may apply:

1. **Significance or Impact:** To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *benefit* or affect students, our department, our college, our university, our profession, or other communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect *originality and development* within a body of work?

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

2. **Engagement:** To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *generate, apply, and/or use knowledge* and insight consistent with current directions in our field of study? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate *thoroughness, reliability, and availability*?
3. **Context:** To what degree are the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *consistent with goals* important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) *rely on knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations*? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or *keep current* with changes?

Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. It is expected that student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. It is expected that syllabi for all courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the evaluation file.

In the Department of Geology and Geography, we view teaching as involving the dissemination of knowledge, the stimulation of critical thinking, and the development of scientific expression. Teaching in the Department includes a number of different modes of instruction: traditional classroom lecture, laboratory instruction, thesis and dissertation direction, academic advising, contributions to teaching/classroom infrastructure, supervising Graduate Teaching Assistants, the development of new teaching materials, continuing-education classes, presentations of teaching workshops, and field trips. Currently the normal teaching load of formal courses for research-active tenure track faculty is two three-credit courses per semester, or the equivalent, as approved by the Department Chair.

The assessment of teaching varies as to the activity, but one of the sources for the evaluation of faculty performance comes from the collection of quantitative and qualitative student evaluations. **Faculty members are expected to conduct SEI surveys for the students in their courses each semester.** Unsolicited letters from students are also important in evaluating teaching ability. It is anticipated that each faculty member will score in the good to excellent range in student evaluations after having taught a course for several years. Failure to conduct an evaluation may be interpreted that the faculty member expected an unsatisfactory evaluation from the students in that class.

Other supporting documentation may comprise the judgment of colleagues who have visited the faculty member's classes, student exit surveys, solicited letters from students evaluating a faculty member's advising role or thesis direction, analysis of course content, the evaluation of new teaching materials, and the receipt of an important teaching award or teaching grant. **Faculty members may also provide self-evaluation of their teaching performance.** This may involve analysis of their course materials, revisions made to improve courses, student outcomes, and the faculty member's responses to feedback from students and colleagues. Each faculty member should strive to provide a continuing and significant contribution to the intellectual achievement of students. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to demonstrate their teaching abilities across a spectrum of courses.

Meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) teaching contribution normally requires some combination of the following: a) evidence of good to excellent student evaluations; b) evidence for active and productive graduate research supervision as chair or member of student thesis/dissertation committees; c) active and effective course development, including updating existing courses or creating new courses; d) external reviews by other faculty; e) receipt of teaching award; f) receipt of teaching grant; g) peer-

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

reviewed publication of pedagogical studies; h) publication of a nationally-adopted textbook or laboratory manual.

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For Teaching faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the department. It is expected that faculty will include in the file print copies of all publications to be counted for the review period. The unit may accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance by the publication.

In the Department of Geology and Geography, we see research as involving the creation and synthesis of knowledge, the creation of new approaches to understanding and explaining phenomena, the development of new insights, critical appraisal of the past, and the application of knowledge and expertise in addressing needs in society, the profession, and the University. Research is a critical component of the mission of the Department, contributing to the general body of knowledge and thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance.

As a department encompassing two disciplines spanning the natural and social sciences, the assessment of research productivity must accommodate a wider breadth of scholarly activities than is typical of other departments. Moreover, no single formula provides a fair, equitable representation of the diversity of skills and talents that produces excellence in research. The burden of proof of productivity, however, lies with the individual member in a properly maintained evaluation file.

The first and foremost evidence of scholarly productivity is through the publication of peer-reviewed papers of high quality. Avenues of publication normally include journal articles, scholarly books, book chapters, monographs, and edited volumes with a national or international reputation. Quality is considered more important than mere-quantity, with peer-reviewed journal articles the best demonstration of research leadership.

Papers written jointly with other authors are considered to be of equal importance with those written by a single author as long as there is a mix of publications in which the faculty member may be sole, senior, or junior author. A statement of the proportion of contribution the faculty member made to a multi-authored paper should be included in the evaluation file. This is particularly important when a faculty member publishes with a student, or post-doc, and allows the student, or post-doc, first authorship even when the faculty member's contribution is greatest. When publishing with students and post-docs, it is important for the faculty member to identify themselves as the lab or team leader. When publishing with colleagues (peers), the order of authorship is presumed to reflect the ranking of contribution, unless there are other protocols, such as listing authors in alphabetical order, which should be clearly explained. Nonetheless, it is important that the faculty member demonstrate a clear record of research leadership in their publication record. One way to do this is to be first or sole author on some of their papers. Faculty need to show that they have initiated their own research program, or agenda, and have not simply been a junior collaborator with other researchers on the majority of their publications. New faculty members should note that the Department requires candidates for promotion and tenure to have a strong publication record that

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

normally includes a **minimum average of one peer-reviewed publication per year**. Research-intensive faculty may have a higher minimum rate of publication specified in their appointment letter, or a subsequent agreement letter from the Dean's Office.

Establishment of the level of reputation of a publication will be through the collective judgment of colleagues, citations of the work in other publications, reviews, and other supplementary materials. These guidelines recognize the existence of gray areas whereby any particular work may not fall into an immediately recognizable category. In such a case, the faculty member must establish the appropriateness of that work with supporting materials in the evaluation file.

Faculty members are expected to develop and demonstrate a continuing program of research by regular publication in their chosen field of expertise. Publication may be in the form of a major work of considerable importance or as a series of smaller studies that collectively contribute to the research program. Fluctuations in publication output are anticipated in the normal cycle of research activity, and one's productivity will be considered within the context and framework of the faculty member's research program. Assistant Professors must still meet the standards of quality and quantity noted above.

Additional major evidence of scholarly productivity is through the receipt of research grants and contracts from an outside public or private source, but the ultimate goal of grants is still the publication of research results.

A specific record of performance in securing outside research grants may be stated explicitly in a faculty member's appointment letter. In particular, the expectation of grant awards may be important for a faculty member who receives University start-up funds to initiate his or her research program. Evidence of excellence in research may therefore reside in a faculty member's cumulative record of publications, grants, and contracts (where appropriate for the individual and the research area). Only those grants that include the faculty member as a Principal Investigator (or Co-PI), and have funding awarded through Geology and Geography via the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, will be included in the research record of the faculty member. Faculty members collaborating on research grants with Principal Investigators in other units at WVU, or other institutions, should be sure to have their share of funding routed through Geology and Geography in order to receive proper credit.

Elements of merit in grantsmanship include scope of the study and reputation of the granting agency (national, regional, or local), competitiveness (requiring peer review or not, what is the acceptance rate for such awards?), monetary size, and support bestowed to the Department's research infrastructure (equipment, research assistantships, staff salaries).

Other expressions of scholarly productivity include (1) peer-reviewed articles in regional or local publications, (2) receipt of an internal grant from WVU or affiliated agency, (3) the earning of a College, University, state, or professional research award, (4) non-reviewed publications such as articles in a proceedings volume or technical reports, (5) oral/poster presentations at society conferences, lectures to professional audiences, or exhibits, and (6) patents applied for and granted. These other activities, however, must be in addition to the production of major peer-reviewed works.

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) research contribution normally requires, in addition to expectations listed in the appointment letter, some combination of the following: a) evidence of a continuing research program as shown by submission, acceptance, and publication of research papers; b) presentations at professional conferences; c) submission of research proposals for external funding; d) the award of external research funding.

Evaluation of Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, college, university, or profession. Service should thus be documented in a

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, or profession.

Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Faculty are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

In the Department of Geology and Geography, we consider service activities to involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society and the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of students and the faculty, induces positive change, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal problems and issues.

The evaluation of service will include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the University, society, including the state of West Virginia, and/or profession. One important benefit to the University is faculty participation in its governance system at all levels, and it is expected that every faculty member will perform his/her fair share of College and Department service to sustain its proper operation. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with one's University affiliation identified.

Acceptable service for promotion and tenure purposes comprises the continuing participation and contributions to Department, College, and University committees (those that require more than routine involvement); service to other departments in the University; public service at local, state, regional, national or international level; the receipt of a service grant or award; service to one's profession as an elected officer, by committee work, or through reviewing journal or book manuscripts and grant proposals; and contributions toward research infrastructure. These services must be properly documented in the faculty member's evaluation file.

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution normally includes evidence of leadership in and/or outcomes of assigned service responsibilities.

Per the University *Procedures* document, service activities that are acceptable when one is expected to make contributions characterized as reasonable should be differentiated in the unit's guidelines from those activities expected when service is an area of significant contribution. In the Geology and Geography Department, service expectations for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution (40% or more) should be clearly specified in the appointment letter, or memo of understanding, involving such service. Untenured faculty may not use service as an area of significant contribution. Tenured Associate Professors with an appointment involving service as an area of significant contribution must have an appointment letter, or memorandum of understanding, that defines the service expectations necessary for promotion to Full Professor. Service as an Associate Chair (normally 30%) does not fall in the category of significant contribution, and service as Department Chair (normally 50%) is evaluated by the College. Where service as an area of significant contribution is part of a faculty member's appointment, such service will normally be outside the department in an administrative role that is evaluated by the College or University administration for purposes of promotion and merit pay.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to University guidelines [<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4] faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the FEC and/or the Department Chair; the rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the chair. If decisions have been made that are construed as arbitrary or capricious, or in violation of a rule, then a grievance might be appropriate. In such cases, to be prudent, faculty should work informally with the chair while

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the fifteen-day window for filing a grievance will be met.

Appeal of a departmental descriptor (i.e., seeking action to have a descriptor changed) could be treated as described in the previous paragraph, and, if simultaneously grieved, must follow the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at pegboard.state.wv.us/ or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 293-9203.

Performance-Based Salary Policy

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations.

Every unit is required to develop a performance based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college.

Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

Unless otherwise specified in the department's approved Performance-Based Salary Policy document, the College descriptor values are the default values. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0; "Unsatisfactory" = 0.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating; e.g.

40% teaching = 40×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 100
40% research = 40×4.0 (rating of "Excellent") = 160
20% service = 20×1.0 (rating of "Satisfactory") = 20
Merit Score = 280

80% teaching = 80×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 200
20% service = 20×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 50
Merit Score = 250

[Note: Under the University's current performance based salary policy, separate amounts are allocated in each unit by employee category type. That is, employee category FT – Tenure track faculty—have a separate raise pool from 1.0 FTE FN/AP/NC employees.]

If the Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations, unless the unit's approved guidelines provide for a different resolution.

The Geology and Geography department uses the College descriptor values.

Fourth-Year Review

Tenure track faculty are subject to a more rigorous fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment.

"Significant contributions" in teaching are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. "Significant contributions" in research are normally those which meet or exceed those

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract prior to the critical year.

Department/Division committee and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. For Tenure track faculty at the fourth year point, the Dean reviews the set of annual evaluations to date. Where concern arises regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the Dean will follow up with a request that the entire file be forwarded for assessment by the college committee.

Promotion and/or Tenure Review

In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual's sixth year on the faculty, the "critical year," as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience may in the appointment letter be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University should be included in the evaluation file.

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

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

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion. Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses.

For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a "continuous program" of scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record.

For consideration of promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with the awarding of tenure, assistant professors should provide clear evidence of **initiating a continuing research program** as demonstrated by meeting the minimum requirements listed under "Evaluation of Research/Scholarship" and in their appointment letter. The minimum time in rank will be specified in the appointment letter.

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

Candidates for promotion and tenure must have made significant contributions in Teaching and Research as indicated by summary evaluations for the probationary period as Good or Excellent. The summary evaluation for Service should minimally be Satisfactory. Candidates for promotion and tenure should note that University guidelines require that contributions in teaching should meet or exceed those of peers recently promoted (the previous two-year period) at West Virginia University, and that contributions in research should meet or exceed those of peers recently promoted at peer research universities.

For consideration of promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor the summary evaluation for Teaching across the review period must be Good or Excellent, with a preponderant ranking of excellent teaching in the most recent years. It is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives. The summary evaluation for Service should minimally be Satisfactory.

For faculty with service as an area of significant contribution, who wish to stand for promotion, a positive recommendation for promotion should be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of service, and by a cumulative and sustained record of outcome achievements in areas described in the appointment letter and in subsequent annual documents that define expectations in service. Such evidence will normally include assessment of growth and/or impact, examples of innovations and/or effectiveness, and explanation/endorsement of how the service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, University, State, and the external public-at-large. External reviews of service will be expected.

For consideration of promotion from Associate to Full Professor; associate professors are expected to have produced a research record demonstrating they have built a **national reputation in their area of specialization**. Their research record as an Associate Professor should build upon their record as an Assistant Professor, and should at least exceed the minimum required for their previous promotion, in both quality and quantity, during the five- to six-year period immediately prior to seeking promotion. Their research record should be comparable to, or exceed, that of recently promoted Full Professors in the Department and at peer institutions. The summary evaluation for Research should be Excellent, Teaching should be Good or Excellent, and Service should minimally be Satisfactory.

For consideration of promotion from Associate to Full Teaching Professor, the summary evaluation for Teaching must be Excellent. In addition to the continuation of the kinds of expectations required for promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate they are a "Master Teacher." This may be accomplished in one or more ways such as: (a) receipt of an "Outstanding Teacher Award" from the Eberly College, (b) a teaching award from the WVU Foundation or a national organization, (c) peer-reviewed publication of pedagogical studies, or (d) publication of a nationally-adopted textbook or laboratory manual.

Work literally "in press" or unequivocally accepted for publication (as documented by a formal letter from the publication's editor) may be appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print (in print means either paper and ink, or digital publication).

For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print (in print means either paper and ink, or digital publication).

External Review

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Guidelines (7.9.12)

Procedure for modification of this document

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

<<< end of document>>>

For Reference

Sample Chronological Inventory of Evaluation File Entries

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Administrative and Other Entries

(The letter "A" precedes the number of administrative and other entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
See search files for this position for letter of application, reference letters, etc.			
A-01	4/15/08	Offer letter from Dean Sotope	4/12/08
A-02	10/14/08	Curriculum vitae	10/1/08
A-03	12/29/08	Faculty Productivity Report	Fall, 2008
A-04	1/8/09	Annual review letter from Promotion and Tenure Committee	1/8/09
A-05	1/11/09	Annual review letter from Chair	1/10/09
A-06	5/18/09	Summary sheet from application for Faculty Development Grant funding to attend ASEA meeting	5/15/09
A-07	10/20/09	Faculty Productivity Report	10/20/09
A-08	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Evaluation Committee	11/3/09
A-09	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Chair	11/5/09

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Teaching Entries

(The letter "T" precedes the number assigned to teaching entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
T-01	8/24/08	Syllabus for SE 240	Fall, 2008
T-02	8/24/08	Syllabus for SE 340	Fall, 2008
T-03	10/14/08	Report of Professor Trumble of classroom observation	10/12/08
T-04	12/3/08	Report of Professor Trumble of classroom observation	12/1/08
T-05	12/15/08	24 Student evaluations of SE 240, Section 1 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-06	12/15/08	26 student evaluations of SE 240, Section 2 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-07	12/15/08	10 student evaluations of SE 340 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-08	1/11/09	Syllabus for SE 62	Spring, 2009
T-09	1/11/09	Syllabus for SE 340	Spring, 2009
T-10	2/20/09	24 Senate evaluation forms for SE 240, Section 1 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-11	2/20/09	27 Senate evaluations forms for SE 240, Section 2 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-12	2/20/09	10 Senate evaluation forms for SE 340 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-13	3/10/09	Report of chairperson's observations of classroom instruction	3/7/09
T-14	3/15/09	Memo from S. Smart to Chair McKee clarifying some issues raised in report of teaching observations	3/14/09
T-15	6/22/09	30 Senate evaluations for SE 62, Summary sheet and summarized student comments	6/18/09

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Research Entries

(The letter "R" precedes the number of research entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
R-01	11/5/08	Application for Senate Research Grant	11/1/08
R-02	3/6/09	Notification of award of Senate Research Grant	3/1/09
R-03	3/20/09	Letter indicating acceptance of article in <u>The Social Ecology Reporter</u> and copy of article	3/14/09
R-04	3/22/09	Memo of congratulations from Chair on article acceptance	3/22/09
R-05	4/2/09	Copy of article submitted to <u>The Professional Ecologist</u> for possible publication with cover letter	3/29/09
R-06	7/30/09	Letter from Dr. P.C. Bees to Editor of <u>The Social Ecology Reporter</u> commenting on Smart's article	7/10/09
R-07	9/3/09	Report on research conducted in summer on Senate Research Grant	8/30/09

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Service Entries

(The letter "S" precedes the number of service entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
S-01	9/15/08	Memo from Chair appointing to Departmental Curriculum Committee	9/10/08

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

For Reference

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University [11-08-07]

- A.** Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to teach must be able to:
1. Communicate effectively with students;
 2. Provide feedback to students, including but not limited to the timely return of assignments, papers, and examinations;
 3. Maintain an instructional environment that is conducive to student learning, based upon open communication and mutual respect;
 4. Disseminate knowledge and information at a level appropriate to the level at which the subject is taught;
 5. Stimulate critical thinking;
 6. Demonstrate intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students.
- B1.** Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to conduct research must be able to:
1. Disseminate their research findings in appropriate venues;
 2. Prepare grant proposals that can be understood by the potential reader;
 3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
 4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
 5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
 6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in research activities;
 7. Engage in research that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.
- B2.** Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in scholarly activity must be able to:
1. Disseminate their scholarly findings in appropriate venues;
 2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
 3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
 4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
 5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
 6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in scholarly activities;
 7. Engage in scholarly activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.
- B3.** Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in creative activity must be able to:
1. Disseminate the results of creative activity in appropriate venues;
 2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
 3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
 4. Undertake a continuing program of creative activity;
 5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary projects when possible;
 6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in creative activities;
 7. Engage in creative activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.
- C1.** Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the institution must be able to:
1. Contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college;
 2. Take part in the department, college, and institutional shared governance process;
 3. Assume an obligation to the unit's future;

Faculty Evaluation Geology & Geography Addendum

4. Accept the expectation to help solve problems and respond to special needs in order to help with the future of the degree granting program.

C2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the profession must be able to:

1. Seek opportunities to serve appropriate professional organizations at a variety of levels, including but not limited to state, regional, national, and international organizations;
2. Represent the interests of West Virginia University in ways that reflect positively upon the institution.

C3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the external community must be able to:

1. Make contributions that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified;
2. Seek opportunities that apply the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society.

D. Faculty members at West Virginia University should strive to integrate all aspects of their assignment so that each dimension of the mission affects and informs the other dimensions.

NOTE: Some of these expectations could have ADA implications regarding providing accommodation.