

This document contains the West Virginia University Reed College of Media's 1) policy statement on evaluation, tenure and promotion and 2) guidelines for annual faculty evaluation and merit determination.

I. POLICY ON FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

INTRODUCTION

The Reed College of Media policy statement on evaluation, tenure and promotion is designed to provide an outline for implementing the guidelines set forth in West Virginia University's "Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure 2014–2015," available at <http://wvufaculty.wvu.edu/policies>. The policy is designed to ensure continuity of process as well as reasonable and regular reward of merit. Nothing in this College policy shall be construed to remove the procedural guarantees provided by the University's policy statement concerning tenure and promotion. The faculty may periodically review this College statement of policy.

PRINCIPLES

The College believes satisfaction of its mission is reflected in contributions of individual faculty members in three broad areas: (1) effective **teaching** through instruction, curriculum development and chairing graduate committees; (2) the generation of scholarly and applied **research and creative scholarship** that advances knowledge in the discipline and/or the profession; and (3) **service** to the College, University, State, at the national or global level, and/or professions through active participation on committees, in student and professional organizations, and through leadership roles in professional development programs.

Specific means of implementing these contributions are numerous and varied. It is unreasonable to expect any individual to participate equally among all the possible activities or for faculty members to share equally in all tasks. The evaluation of any individual must be made on the basis of both the individual's expertise and performance, as documented in the evaluation file, and the expectations and needs of the College.

A reasonable approach to academic advancement, therefore, requires some weighing of the criteria, as outlined in faculty's respective letters of appointment and annual work plans.

The intent of this document is to open avenues for promotion and tenure for faculty members whose backgrounds are professional, academic or a combination of the two.

FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (*Note: this section was changed/approved by faculty vote in May 2017*)

The College of Media Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of at least five members, the majority of whom must be tenured, and can include one Teaching Associate or Teaching Professor* and one tenure-track Assistant Professor in good standing in at least his/her fourth year, if he/she desires to serve.** The chair of the committee must be a tenured faculty member and will be appointed by the dean.

**The inclusion of a promoted teaching professor on the Faculty Evaluation Committee allows for Teaching Professor representation while ensuring the person has been vetted through faculty governance and evaluation processes. That is, tenure-track faculty are hired via a competitive*

national faculty search committee process; by virtue of their promotions, teaching associate/full professors have likewise been vetted by faculty through the faculty evaluation process.

***Note that the opportunity to serve is considered a professional development activity for the tenure-track Assistant Professor. Although a full committee member, he/she should be assigned a minimum number of evaluations (e.g. 1-2) on which to take the lead. An Assistant Professor may decline to serve without explanation or repercussions of any kind.*

Procedures

1. In the letter of appointment, which elaborates upon the position announcement, each new faculty member will be informed of the requirements of the position. Each new faculty member will receive, upon appointment, a copy of the University's and the College's promotion and tenure guidelines.
2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to maintain an up-to-date Digital Measures dossier (i.e., evaluation file). The dossier should contain both qualitative and quantitative evidence of productivity, such as copies of articles published, creative projects produced, papers presented or speeches given, honors and award citations earned, newspaper or other publicity notices, committee appointments that are external to the College, copies of all student evaluations, and other usable data. The faculty member will keep the Dean supplied with all relevant material through the evaluation file, except in cases where the faculty member may not have access to the information.
3. All faculty files must be completely updated by December 31 and only the material in the file (online via Digital Measures) by this date will be evaluated. Descriptors used by the University to assess faculty performance are *Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory*, which are defined below:
 - *Excellent: characterizing performance of high merit*
 - *Good: characterizing performance of merit*
 - *Satisfactory: characterizing performance to justify continuation of one's appointment, but not necessarily sufficient to support promotion or tenure, particularly if applied to an area in which significant contributions are required*
 - *Unsatisfactory: characterizing performance that does not support continuation of one's appointment*
4. In the absence of evidence for any mission area, a letter indicating failure to comply will be inserted in the faculty member's file by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Dean. The letter will explain that according to University policy, by not updating the file, an evaluation of "unsatisfactory" will be rendered, due to lack of evidence, and this may impact decisions regarding reappointment, retention, promotion and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical/professional leaves of absence and performance-based salary increases. In addition, not following this critical University policy to provide evidence of productivity could lead to a faculty member's dismissal.

In accordance with the University's evaluation policy, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will evaluate annually the dossiers of all faculty members and, if appropriate, will decide to recommend active consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Evaluation of the promotion or tenure candidate's research (or teaching dossier in the case of Teaching

Associate Professors going up for full) will be sought from faculty at other peer institutions who are at least at the rank being pursued. The Faculty Evaluation Committee and the candidate each will compile a list of six prospective evaluators, with information about each pertaining to rank, university/college, the institution's research classification, and the potential reviewers' areas of expertise. Promotion/tenure candidates will also include any personal or professional relationship/s with each potential reviewer. (Note that potential reviewers may not have served on a faculty member's thesis/dissertation committee and should not be recent co-authors, co-PIs, etc., to help ensure unbiased evaluations of the faculty member's work.) The Dean may supplement the list with additional names who meet the review criteria and who he/she deems qualified. The faculty member undergoing review has the opportunity to review all names and request that some names not be considered/pursued as external reviewers.

Teaching Associate Professors who qualify to be considered for Professor will go through an external review process that mirrors that of tenure-track faculty. Specifically, the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Teaching Associate Professor will each provide a list of six (6) possible fully promoted (Professor-rank) reviewers, who may be Teaching Professors (sometimes called Professionals of Practice or Clinical Faculty) and/or tenured Professors who are known for excellent teaching, and who are external to WVU. They must come from "peer" institutions (i.e. R-1--Very High Research, Big 12, or other institutions for which a case can be made that its College/School/Department is of "peer" quality). In the case of documented Service-oriented/assigned faculty, reviewers external to academe may be deemed appropriate to review the faculty member's service dossier. As with tenure-track faculty, each potential reviewer should include a description of his/her qualifications.

The Dean will request evaluations from at least four of the persons whose names appear on the lists. The candidate should not contact any of the persons on the potential outside evaluator list. Because of time constraints involved with securing outside evaluations, faculty who are being considered for promotion and/or tenure should provide their evaluator names no later than September 10, and they will be allowed to add material to their files for *internal* review until the December 31 deadline. However, because October 1 is the final day for the Dean to send out packets for *external* reviewers, material placed into the file after that date will not be distributed for consideration by outside evaluators.

Tenure-track faculty dossiers to be distributed to external reviewers should include a table of contents, a brief (one- to two-page) summary narrative that discusses their research stream/agenda and copies of only their research/creative materials. Links can be provided for longer and/or multimedia works to make the work available for reviewers through electronic access. In the case of books, a copy for each reviewer should be made available and express mailed, if full electronic access is not available. (The College's administrative staff will assist faculty in distributing any hard copy materials to reviewers, when needed.) In addition to pedagogical papers/presentations, teaching faculty may include syllabi of courses developed, peer observation of teaching, professional certifications, etc. as evidence of national/international prominence. Service faculty may include materials relevant to that category, such as grants, awards, impact statements/letters, administrative performance surveys, etc.

All faculty members pursuing promotion will submit two reports to Digital Measures by the Dec. 31 deadline: 1) an annual report, as usual, and 2) a summary report that covers the period of promotion review (i.e. typically the past six years or the years since the last

promotion). The latter will include a summary narrative that outlines/bullets their major accomplishments and includes a chart of summary SEIs for the period under review, which is typically developed in advance by Brenda Sisler, who will share it with the faculty member to copy and paste into their summary report.

5. In all promotion and/or tenure cases, the Dean will receive a recommendation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, after members have had an opportunity to review the faculty member's dossier. It is expected that the Committee will make a unanimous decision in favor or against awarding promotion and/or tenure. However, in rare circumstances, should there be a split decision, the Committee must provide a one to two paragraph rationale for why a unanimous decision could not be reached. All members of the committee must sign the document, and neither dissenting members nor their votes will be identified.
6. The Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward to the Dean a report of the committee's action and vote with supporting material. The Dean will add his or her recommendation and forward both recommendations and the supporting material to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs with copies to the candidate.

EXPECTATIONS OF TENURE-TRACK AND TEACHING CANDIDATES

A faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion in the Reed College of Media is expected to make significant contributions in two areas, typically teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity, in which the candidate must demonstrate achievement as well as strong likelihood of future contributions. At least reasonable contributions in service that further the educational interests of the College, as well as the interests of the broader academic and professional communities, are expected. In rare cases and possibly at the time of initial appointment, a tenure-track faculty member's two major assignment areas may be teaching and service, with reasonable contributions expected in research/scholarship/creative activity. If any changes to assignment areas are made, they must be agreed upon, formally documented by the Dean and approved by the Provost well before a faculty member's critical year.

Upon achieving tenure or promotion, a faculty member seeking subsequent promotion must continue to provide significant contributions in teaching and in research/creative activity, but may, under certain circumstances, direct greater attention to service than to research, as permitted by University guidelines.

Teaching professors are typically expected to make significant contributions in teaching, with at least reasonable contributions in service. At times, a teaching professor may work through the Dean to declare a portion of his or her time be dedicated to research/creative activity as well.

Teaching (Learning)

Teaching includes not only traditional modes of instruction, such as classroom lectures and lab instruction, but also includes other modes of teaching, such as online instruction, experiential and service learning-based instruction, thesis and professional project direction and various forms of professional and academic advising, including writing recommendations for awards, professional positions and graduate school. All faculty are expected to 1) be

competent in their subject matter expertise per Higher Learning Commission guidelines, 2) demonstrate effective teaching methods and 3) cover the generally accepted amount of course material in each course.

Although Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) surveys are required for and considered the foundation of the teaching section of a candidate's annual file, a holistic consideration of teaching activities will be considered by the evaluation committee. However, 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. Forms for all courses taught by the faculty member in the years prior to the time of tenure decision will be considered. Other evidence of teaching contributions might include senior faculty critiques, documented student success (such as winning awards for or large market publication of course content), documented recognition for innovation or impact (such as national or regional publicity), documented value to the community or profession (such as the receipt and successful completion of competitive course-related grant awards) or other related evidence.

In addition to regular teaching assignments, evaluation in this area also will consider the following faculty activities:

- developing new courses or enriching established courses
- developing/piloting innovative, collaborative courses (such as new courses involving external grants; collaborative special topics with other universities/WVU Colleges and/or professionals)
- developing or directing special student projects or theses
- working in professional positions with the media or relevant agencies/corporations. Such work should demonstrably enhance the faculty member's teaching, and faculty reporting of such enhancements is required.
- publishing textbooks or other teaching materials, whether in printed form or for online instruction, regardless of the medium of presentation
- receiving grants for course development or enhancement or for personal teaching development
- receiving teaching awards
- mentoring or directing students who win regional or national awards or competitions
- giving teaching-related presentations or participating on teaching-related panels

Research/Creative/Community-engaged Scholarship (Discovery)

The College values academic research activities that increase fundamental knowledge within the discipline, creative activities 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 defined by peer-reviewed publications, vetted creative works, and other externally reviewed impactful activities that contribute to the expansion of knowledge and benefit communities and, more generally, society. The significance of specific types of applied, community-engaged, and translational research that results in public-private and community partnerships, educational and community outreach, and innovative or entrepreneurial activity is also part of the evaluation of research and should be viewed on equal footing as traditional forms of scholarship.

Continued scholarship, including publication of the results of such scholarship, is an essential part of the academic environment. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider whether the faculty member's research productivity has been continuous over time. Normally, successful candidates will publish at least one significant piece of scholarship per year, with some of the research publications during the tenure-track period being in "top-tier" journals, meaning a journal with high visibility in areas aligned with the College's mission. For innovative/creative works, a significant portion or milestone should be completed each year, and dissemination should include national-level invited, competitive or juried screenings or broadcast/publication. For community-engaged, applied and translational research, significant progress should be made each year, and dissemination and/or knowledge sharing should include relevant community audiences/stakeholders and academic audiences, and should be vetted by appropriate experts/stakeholders/audiences/communities. For all research/creative activities, it is the faculty member's responsibility to make the case for a work's scholarly or professional status, by including such information as acceptance rate, impact factor, prestige, influence, vetting process and/or other relevant supporting information.

For co-authored works, the faculty member must specify and document the approximate percentage of work he or she contributed to the piece; for interdisciplinary activity, the faculty member should also make a case for the work's relevance, influence and visibility as it relates to media professions and/or scholarship. Note that a dual-authored work that appears in a relevant "top-tier" journal or that breaks new ground may be considered as significant as a sole-authored publication in a less influential journal. Tenure and/or promotion reviews place emphasis not only on the quantity of published works/creative activity, but also on their quality.

Community-engaged Scholarship

The College recognizes and values community-engaged, applied and translational research, its impact on West Virginia communities (and beyond), and its alignment with the University's land-grant mission. Engaged scholarship and applied research activities produce tangible results that serve and benefit society. This work relies on a high level of professional expertise and experience that informs the various rigorous traditional and applied research methods used to address real-world issues. Because of the nature of this applied work, sharing knowledge and application of findings are not confined to traditional forms of publication but may also be published and shared through other vetted forms to reach broader, key audiences for whom the work is intended. Further, due to its public-oriented focus, community-engaged scholarship may aptly rely on evaluations and validations beyond traditional peer review (e.g., reviews and evaluations from key internal and external stakeholders and expert community partners, as these reviewers would have a keen understanding of the work and its public impact). Thus, this type of scholarship bears the burden of demonstrating impact beyond citations, scores/rankings, h-index, and other measures associated with traditional research. More specifically, the impact of this work is validated by relevant stakeholders/communities, adoption or application of the work, and/or influences on others' practices in the field or within the academic community.

Public and community-engaged research and creative scholarship is characterized by intellectual and creative 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 film, writing, multimedia projects, and exhibitions; innovation and entrepreneurship activities, new business ventures and start-ups, 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 or research-based public work that is published in venues (e.g., media articles, op-eds, podcasts, websites and apps) that reach broad audiences or targeted key audiences for whom the work is intended to impact; dissemination and discussion of this scholarship and work via targeted presentations, workshops or publications; and exhibits/displays 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; this review should be regarded as meaningfully as traditional peer review.

Faculty should keep in mind that community-engaged research is distinct from engaged teaching and service practices. While traditional forms of teaching typically focus on audiences internal to the university, 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. For example, public and 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 engagement components, and online and off-campus education; pre-college courses for K-12 youth, occupational or discipline-based short courses, certificates, and licensure programs; educational enrichment programs for the public and alumni; educational, teaching- or instruction-related media interviews; materials to enhance public understanding; and self-directed, managed learning environments. Likewise, public and community-engaged service and practice are the use of University expertise to address specific issues identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. Public and community-engaged service and practice may include, but is not limited to, technical assistance, consulting, policy analysis, expert professional advice or practice, clinical practice and advisory boards, and other discipline-related service to community organizations. Any work falling under this area of public-oriented activities should be reported under Service, rather than Research.

While some community-engaged research and creative scholarship may blur traditional distinctions between instruction, research/creative work, outreach/extension, and service activities, its significance, as detailed above, should be validated through peer reviews by relevant internal and external communities, including expert 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 University and College missions. A special note to clarify examples of internal peer review: Typically, reviewers will be from relevant external communities; however, in limited cases within a university setting, there may be experts in another field or discipline who might review, validate, and/or adopt the

community-engaged scholarship or resulting product. In these limited instances, the internal expert reviewer may not be closely affiliated with the work under review (e.g., not be a co-PI or someone with a distinct position in a grant or project).

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 research-informed 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, and relevant communities.
5. Effective dissemination and presentation to community audiences.
6. Consistently ethical behavior.
7. Peer reviews.

Scholarship and publication may take many forms. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider the following:

- peer-reviewed or refereed books or articles or chapters that encompass or relate to any of the academic disciplines of the College. (Note that the College believes non-paid refereed published works to be valuable; however, journals published by our major professional associations, e.g. AEJMC, NCA/ICA, BEA, and those with high impact factors and more competitive acceptance rates will have more weight in the Committee's evaluations than publications outside of the College's primary professional areas or less competitive, lesser known or circulated publications.) If the work is multidisciplinary in nature, the faculty member should make a case for its scholarly or applied importance and visibility. Faculty must take care not to fall prey to non-refereed journal solicitations or acceptances, some of which pose as legitimate, refereed works or require money to ensure publication. (To learn more about predatory, open-access publishers, visit <http://scholarlyoa.com> or speak to a University reference librarian, who can help confirm or deny legitimate journal publications.) The faculty member should provide documentation that addresses the legitimacy and influence of possibly unknown or questionable journals. The Faculty Evaluation Committee also is expected to exercise due diligence in researching unknown journals to determine their quality, rigor and/or visibility. Any publications that appear in illegitimate journals will not be recognized as valid scholarship and neither the Committee nor the Dean will grant credit for such scholarship.
- the publication, broadcast or exhibit of creative works of journalism, including but not limited to books, articles, photography, documentaries and online projects and products (e.g. media apps, platforms, sites, publications). Works that are competitively selected, have attracted positive peer reviews or awards or reached a regional, national or international audience will be given greater weight in the evaluation process. It is up to the faculty member to demonstrate that the work involved a level of research similar to that of peer-reviewed academic work and to demonstrate the work's significance (i.e. information about the festivals, competitions, venues, outlets; how the work extends new knowledge or previous

theoretical approaches; how it applies new storytelling techniques).

- research/creative grants, particularly those external to the University that secure a significant amount of money (>\$100K) and result in new knowledge or applications
- juried, peer reviewed exhibitions of creative work that involved competitive selection or award processes and that involved a level of research comparable to that of peer-reviewed academic work
- book reviews, entries in reference books, presentation of conference papers, participation on scholarly/professional conference panels, or editing a scholarly publication
- comprehensive campaigns, strategies and tools that are informed by community-engaged, applied and/or translational research and that are aimed at addressing real-world issues and benefiting communities/society. This work should demonstrate evidence of appropriate community-engaged faculty research outlined previously in this document. The impact of this work is validated by key internal and/or external stakeholders/communities (because of their clear understanding of the work and its public impact), adoption or application of the work, and/or influences on others' practices in the field or within the academic community. Further, similar to timelines of traditional major works in progress, file evidence may include reports of in-process engagement and implementation, submissions/presentations for community/stakeholder/public review, and revised/final submissions of the work.
- community-engaged scholarly activity, including, but not limited to, community presentations, governmental agency/legislature presentations, training and technical assistance activities, participatory design, publications for community engagement and outreach, community and comprehensive or strategic plans, and descriptive programs, that includes sharing of knowledge and dissemination to relevant audience for whom the work benefits. Audience/scope, measures of impact, awards, external reviews and other metrics will be taken into consideration when evaluating this work.

Service (Engagement)

A principal expectation of any faculty member is that he or she makes meaningful contributions to the wide range of constituencies of concern to the College. The Faculty Evaluation Committee, therefore, will consider the role of the candidate in any of the following:

- professional contributions through service as an officer, committee chair, active committee/advisory board member, or in another administrative responsibility, or as an active committee member in appropriate scholarly and professional organizations
- development of or participation in programs, workshops or activities that contribute significantly to the interests of the College's professional, state and/or academic constituencies

- service to the University as a committee member or elected representative, through acceptance of other responsibility and participation in University activities

Service to the College also includes a faculty member's acceptance of special responsibilities-- often in a non-public way. Because of the importance of teamwork, the College traditionally has depended upon its faculty to provide service beyond normal teaching and mentorship responsibilities. Effective operation depends upon an equitable spreading of duties and special responsibilities.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee, therefore, will consider and give credit for a faculty member's service to the College in ways that include but are not limited to: administrative assignments; responsibility for equipment; serving as a subject matter expert for news media; organization of special school-sponsored events; special workshops, meetings or events for the purpose of recruiting students or developing relationships with professional contacts/potential student employers; consulting with other schools or mass communication businesses; presentation of speeches, workshops, etc.; and advising student organizations.

In addition, the Committee will consider the following as part of a faculty member's regular assignment: meeting with prospective students and their parents; participating in regularly scheduled school activities such as faculty meetings and College receptions; attendance at school-sponsored lectures and faculty recruitment activities; and attending the Honors Convocation and graduation ceremonies.

The College's Faculty Evaluation Committee is expected to not only review each faculty member's annual productivity but is also charged with providing a second level/phase of review to help guide faculty on their respective overall progress toward the next promotion or other action. This second "bottom line" should explicitly state expectations for each faculty member as outlined in his or her appointment letter and in College/University promotion and tenure documents, and should indicate progress toward meeting such expectations.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Candidates for tenure will ordinarily possess the following qualifications:

1. Holding or acquiring a doctorate or terminal degree as defined in the appointment letter, or
2. For long-time and successful members of the profession who become members of the faculty, relevant and extended experience will be viewed as the equivalent of typically attained degrees.

Specific expectations will be spelled out in the letter of appointment, and a thorough, more rigorous review normally will be conducted in the fourth year of appointment (or two years prior to the faculty member's critical year) to determine the extent to which the faculty member is making clear progress toward tenure and to outline what should be accomplished in the future to help ensure earning it. If a faculty member has not demonstrated adequate progress toward tenure by the end of his or her fourth year, the Dean may recommend a one-year terminal contract, giving the faculty member only one more year of College employment.

Assistant Professors typically must be considered for promotion and tenure in their sixth year of College employment, although credit for time spent at another institution may be negotiated in certain circumstances and applied toward this six-year period as allowed by University policy and supported by the Dean. Assistant Professors may, under certain extraordinary circumstances, choose to defer their promotion and tenure for a year or, if they possess extraordinary teaching and research records, be considered a year early. Such decisions must be discussed with the Dean, fully documented in advance, and comply with the University's Promotion and Tenure procedures and policies.

As noted previously, the principal criteria for promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) are significant contributions in teaching and research/creative activity. Further, the candidate will demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in state or national service to the academy, the University and/or the College's professional constituencies. In rare cases the faculty member's two major assignment areas may be teaching and service, with reasonable contributions expected in research/scholarship/creative activity. Any alternative assignment language must be determined well in advance of a faculty member's critical year and approved by the Provost's office.

In addition to meeting the criteria above, the candidate should be capable of assuming the greater academic responsibilities in furthering the mission of the College that is associated with the rank of Associate Professor.

The candidate for promotion to full Professor (with tenure) should have normally exhibited sustained significant contributions to research/creative activity during the most recent six-year period, as well as significant contributions in teaching, and at least a reasonable contribution in service (unless the faculty member's areas of expected contribution have been formally changed). In addition, the candidate should be capable of assuming the additional academic responsibilities in furthering the mission of the College as associated with the rank of full Professor at West Virginia University.

Rank and tenure should be considered separately; however, the award of tenure should normally be granted in conjunction with promotion to Associate Professor. Granting of tenure requires not only the potential for future achievement and continuing contribution to the goals of the College, but also a documented record of past achievement.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

From Assistant to Associate Professor

As in the granting of tenure, to achieve promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, a candidate must demonstrate significant contributions in teaching. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will look for documentation that the candidate is effective, innovative and thorough in his or her classroom work and dedicated to serving students through careful and knowledgeable advice and professional and academic support.

In addition, the College values faculty contributions that extend throughout the state, nation or globally. It is expected, therefore, that the candidate will have developed a record that clearly demonstrates contributions through refereed journal publications and/or highly visible research and/or innovative/creative activity and/or professional service. Faculty members should document in their files how these works were evaluated (e.g. juried or peer refereed reviews, national/international-level professional/expert assessment) and how the work is being used, applied or adopted.

Candidates for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure must demonstrate a consistent record of productivity, resulting in multiple products, such as refereed journal articles, exhibits, books, documentaries, applications, or other high-level works. The candidates must also demonstrate through the external review process that their work is of high caliber, equal to or better than work done by faculty who have recently received tenure at peer institutions and at WVU. It is incumbent upon the candidate to demonstrate the impact of his or her works on the field.

Candidates also will be judged by their potential to be productive researchers and creative scholars in future years, even after receiving tenure and promotion.

Teaching Assistant Professors (TAPs) may be promoted (without tenure) to Teaching Associate Professor without the requirement of significant contributions in research/creative activity. Instead, specific expectations for teaching contributions are based on the individual professor's work plan, which is typically assigned as 80% teaching and 20% in a combination of research and/or service, and the specifics of his or her offer letter. It is expected that TAPs' annual files include systematic assessment and reflection of their instructional processes, and that they apply such learning to enhance College programs.

In addition to a sustained record of effective classroom teaching, as demonstrated through student SEIs, the file should demonstrate significant curriculum and/or program development and important contributions to the University's teaching mission by solving problems and addressing College needs, priorities and initiatives. Therefore, considerations include quantity, quality and outcomes of teaching.

Although TAPs ultimately may be promoted to full Professor, they remain ineligible for tenure, and they are under no obligation to seek promotion. A TAP who wishes to seek promotion to Associate Professor must notify the Dean of this intent on or before September 30 in the academic year during which promotion is sought. TAPs must have been fully employed in their unit for at least five full academic years prior to seeking promotion; therefore, they may seek promotion no sooner than their sixth year of employment.

Such activities as new course development; effective mentoring; formal learning assessment; professional development; teaching, advising and/or student awards; teaching-related presentations, seminars, grants, and/or journal articles; and strong student SEI scores and comments can provide evidence in the dossier of significant teaching contributions worthy of promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.

Service that has district, statewide, regional and/or national/international impact that is provided as part of the missions of the College, University, State and/or profession also is expected of faculty. In addition to typical service to the academy and professions, the receipt of grants that help improve professional practice through service learning courses or other special projects could receive credit as both teaching and service activities.

Faculty who have had service approved as one of their areas of significant contribution must demonstrate how their service activities provide important benefits to the State, society, the academy, and/or the profession. Significant contributions in service should be documented to demonstrate positive change, improved performance or impact on societal or professional problems or issues. According to University policy, faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution are expected to spearhead and/or lead service activities primarily for

the benefit of the state's citizens. Such service to the State will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion purposes.

From Associate to Full Professor

Promotion to full Professor reflects contributions of the highest order to the College, the University, the State and the profession. For tenured faculty, it indicates excellence in multiple areas of teaching, a national reputation in scholarship (usually in a niche/particular area of expertise and/or through securing significant external grants and/or demonstrated professional practice enhancements or improvements) and significant contributions in service. A candidate for full Professor must thoroughly document his or her record. For TAPs, it designates that the faculty member's achievement merits national recognition for his or her instructional contributions to the discipline, such as that afforded through teaching-related peer-reviewed journal articles, textbooks, and/or professional publications; national-level presentations about teaching; professional or academic recognition of innovative or service-oriented approaches; or receipt of national-level awards or other related recognition.

Similar to the external review process for tenure-track faculty, a list of external reviewers shall be developed for Teaching Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor. Candidates wishing to go up for full Professor must notify the Dean in writing/via email no later than May 15. The candidate's teaching dossier, along with the College's promotion guidelines, will be sent for documented evaluation. Reviewers must hold at least the rank the candidate is seeking and must come from outside WVU. As described earlier in this document, a list of potential reviewers' names must be submitted by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the faculty member to the Dean no later than Sept. 10; dossiers to be sent to external reviewers must be completed and made available to the Dean no later than Oct. 1.

Associate Professors are typically eligible to be considered for full Professor after a minimum of five years as a highly productive Associate Professor. The counting of prior appointments at other academic institutions at the rank of Associate Professor or higher shall follow University policy and be documented by the Dean. In summary, the candidate for full Professor, within the principles outlined earlier in this document, should clearly establish a record of excellence in teaching and research/creative activity. Moreover, the Faculty Evaluation Committee should be convinced that this record contributes to the advancement of knowledge in disciplines encompassed and furthered by the College.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The Reed College of Media makes decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure in accordance with WVU's principles of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity by imposing only valid requirements for promotional, reappointment and tenure opportunities.

Approved by Reed College Faculty: May 2015

- *Updated:*
 - *Faculty Evaluation Committee make-up; TAP external reviewers for promotion to Professors--May 2017;*
 - *Additional details regarding promotion deadlines and dossier components--July 2019;*
 - *Community-engaged Scholarship additions—May 2023*

Approved by Provost's Office July 9, 2015; procedural updates approved by Provost's Office September 2017; community-engaged scholarship updates approved by the Provost's Office May 23, 2023.