

Departmental Procedures and Criteria for Promotion, Retention, and Tenure

Department of Communication Studies
West Virginia University
Approved by the Office of the Provost June 10, 2010

The Department of Communication Studies 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 Communication Studies Department'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 personnel 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 members 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 and research, 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 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 defines teaching and research as the two areas of significant contribution. Communication Studies Department annual workload plans normally define Tenure track faculty

assignments as 45% teaching, 45% research, and 10% service. 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.

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.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are normally a maximum of .80FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

Annual Assignment

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

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 45% teaching appointments in the Communication Studies department is five courses. "Research active" in this context is defined as not receiving the ratings of satisfactory or unsatisfactory for the category of "Research" two years in a row during annual evaluations. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to seven courses; for faculty not engaged in any research or scholarship and with 20% service expectation, the adjustment may be up to eight courses. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the tenured faculty member's expectations for promotion.

The percentages of the appointment allocated to teaching, research, and service that are applied in annual reviews and calculation of performance-based salary increases remain as they are described in the appointment letter unless approved by the Dean.

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 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 should be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty Personnel File

Faculty must annually update personnel files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On the department-specified deadline date, October 31, 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, except for candidates seeking promotion that year; who have until the last business day of the calendar year for further additions.

Each faculty personnel 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 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 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 personnel 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. 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 members receive annual evaluations. All faculty members should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process. All faculty members who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both a committee of faculty and by the Chairperson.

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. 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 Communication Studies Department's FEC shall be composed of five faculty in the Department holding the rank of Associate or Full Professor, the majority of whom are tenured, excluding the Department Chairperson and any faculty member serving on the College Personnel Committee.

If exactly five faculty members meet the above criteria, they shall constitute the FEC Committee. If more than five meet the criteria, the five receiving the most votes on a secret ballot by all promotion-eligible faculty in the Department shall constitute the FEC Committee.

If only four or fewer faculty members meet the above criteria, these individuals shall serve on the Committee. The Chairperson will then appoint individuals at the current rank of Assistant Professor, to meet the five person criteria. If there are not five members in the Department to serve on the FEC, the Chairperson will recruit the needed members from other departments at the university. These individuals will be either Associate Professors or Professors.

No faculty member shall participate in her/his own evaluation or that of members of her/his immediate family or household. If under consideration for promotion or tenure in that year, she/he shall not serve on the committee.

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

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.

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.

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 personnel 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 strongly suggests familiarity with WVU’s expectations for teaching, research, and service that are outlined in Appendix 2.

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. Files could also include course syllabi, developed course materials, peer evaluations, as well as other supplemental material.

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 or course development/revision. 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.

Faculty members should submit evidence of research or scholarly or creative activity evidence that includes, but goes beyond, publications. This evidence might include grant applications and presentations at professional meetings

Criteria for Evaluation of Research—Non-Tenured Tenure Track Faculty. The Department's minimum research criteria for retention of untenured Tenure track faculty are one refereed journal article and one competitively selected convention paper per year, beginning with the faculty member's date of employment in a tenure track position at West Virginia University. If credit toward tenure based on previous experience is offered in the appointment letter and accepted, this expectation would apply to a traditional six-year probationary period. Books, book chapters, and grant applications are applicable to these criteria also, depending on the FEC Committee's and Chairperson's judgments of their research merit. For a given evaluation period, a faculty member meeting the following criteria will be considered to meet the above minimum standards:

- (a) One single authored or co-authored refereed, published (or in press) manuscript in a Category A or Category B journal in which the faculty member's academic affiliation is specifically identified as the Department of Communication Studies, West Virginia University.
- (b) One single authored or co-authored competitively selected convention paper presented (or accepted for presentation) at a regional, national, or international convention in the field of Communication in which the faculty member's academic affiliation is specifically identified as the Department of Communication Studies, West Virginia University.
- (c) A book or book chapter considered by the FEC and the Chairperson to have significant research merit and in which the faculty member's academic affiliation is specifically identified as the Department of Communication Studies, West Virginia University may be substituted for (a) above.

A judgment will be made in terms of the faculty member's performance and potential for future research of sufficient quality and quantity to justify the granting of tenure and/or promotion. One

criterion which will be considered in this judgment is the outlet in which the faculty member's articles have been published. The following ranking of journals will apply:

Category A: Publications competitively selected in journals published by one of the main communication associations (ICA, NCA, ECA, CSCA, SSCA, WSCA, WCA).

Category B: Publications competitively selected in journals that regularly publish communication studies articles that are recognized as reputable journals for that specialty (e.g., *Health Communication, Communication Research, Journal of Business Communication, Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Family Communication, Journal of Gerontology, Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, Quarterly Review of Film and Video, Sex Roles, Small Group Communication*).

Category C: Publications in subsidiary journals (e.g., state communication journals, Psychological Reports). Also invited articles, essays, book reviews, and responses published in journals that fall under Categories A and B for competitively selected publication.

Category D: Publications of non-communication studies/non-academic outlets.

Criteria for Evaluation of Research--Tenured Faculty

No minimum number of articles or convention papers is set for tenured faculty because it is expected that any such minimum as set for untenured would be consistently exceeded by tenured faculty. Rather, research of tenured faculty will be evaluated for its overall contribution to the advancement of knowledge about communication as evidenced by such things as its programmatic nature, the significance of the results it generates, citations to the work in journal articles and books, and mentoring of graduate students.

Clinical faculty assignments (a minimum of 50% service) may include a 5-10% research component. A clinical faculty appointment asks for only a reasonable contribution in research, and the annual file will be expected to include one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference. Other instances of scholarly activity such as peer-reviewed articles are welcome, but are not required to meet the criterion of reasonable research contribution for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank. However, should Clinical faculty wish to stand for promotion, a record of publication is expected in order to meet the "reasonable contribution" standard.

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 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 members are encouraged to run consulting through the Office of

Sponsored Programs (OSP) in the form of a contract to the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

Faculty members expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and research are still expected to engage in service in each of the three contexts described below. For such faculty, the minimum requirement for satisfactory service is to engage in at least one act of service annually. The amount of service expected will normally increase with the rank of the faculty member. This service can represent any one (or more) of the following three contexts:

(a) Service to the department, college, and university: To the extent that such service does not interfere with their primary responsibilities, all faculty are expected to volunteer for a reasonable number of service activities (committees, workshops, guest lecturing, etc.) within the university. Thus, participation in any of these activities at the departmental, college, or university level would constitute evidence that the minimum standard for service has been met.

(b) Service to the profession: All faculty are expected to serve the profession by engaging in activities such as 1) reviewing manuscripts and serving on editorial boards for communication journals; 2) serving as officers in regional, national, and international communication associations; 3) giving invited presentations at academic meetings or at forums hosted by other communication departments; and/or 4) serving as paper readers, respondents, or conference planners for a regional, national, or international communication association meeting. Thus, evidence that a faculty member has engaged in at least one of these activities in the past year would fulfill the minimum standard for service.

(c) Service to the state: All faculty are expected to serve the state by engaging in activities such as: 1) providing consulting or technical services related to one's area of appointment to organizations or civic groups; 2) presenting workshops or talks related to one's area of appointment; and/or 3) submitting and/or administering applied research grants related to one's area of appointment the outcome of which is of direct benefit to the state and general public. Thus, evidence that a faculty member has engaged in at least one of these activities in the past year would fulfill the minimum standard for service.

Faculty for who service is not a major part of their contract can be evaluated as engaging in significant service if the number or the significance of their service activities substantially exceeds the minimum standard.

A faculty member with service as an area of significant contribution will be expected to document his or her contributions more extensively. The appointment letter (for Clinical faculty) or the MOU effecting this adjustment (for tenured faculty) will identify both the types and quantity of service expected and the ways in which the quality of that service will be measured. For Tenure track faculty this adjustment must be approved by the Provost's Office.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to University guidelines faculty members may write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the FEC and/or the Department Chairperson; the rebuttal must be forwarded to

the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

[<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4]

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the chair. If decision 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 simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussion 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 contact the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 304-293-9203.

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 most strongly reward performance of merit.

The Department of Communication Studies adheres to the College descriptor values. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution by rating. For example:

$$\begin{aligned} 40\% \text{ teaching} &= 45 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 112.5 \\ 40\% \text{ research} &= 45 \times 4.0 \text{ (rating of "Excellent")} = 180 \\ 20\% \text{ service} &= 10 \times 1.0 \text{ (rating of "Satisfactory")} = 10 \\ \hline \text{Merit Score} &= 302.5 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 80\% \text{ teaching} &= 80 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 200 \\ 20\% \text{ service} &= 20 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 50 \\ \hline \text{Merit Score} &= 250 \end{aligned}$$

[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) has a separate raise pool from 1.0 FTE FN/AP/NC employees.]

Fourth-Year Review

Tenure track faculty members 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 the expectation that the faculty member is to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. “Significant contributions” in teaching are normally those that 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 of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research 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.

FEC and Chairperson 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 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 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 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 personnel 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 or 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 Chairperson 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 her/his publication record.

Work literally "in press" or unequivocally accepted for publication 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.

For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

Criteria for Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A. Minimum Criteria

Tenure track faculty members are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and teaching, with reasonable contributions in service, for promotion and/or tenure. The following criteria are considered minimal for further consideration of a recommendation of tenure or promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor. Meeting these criteria is not taken to indicate the individual should be tenured or promoted. Rather, meeting these criteria indicates the FEC Committee should continue to consider the faculty member for promotion to Associate Professor.

1. Completion of a doctoral degree.
2. Publication of at least six refereed articles in Category A and Category B journals after completion of the doctoral degree or after appointment, whichever is first, when research is a major area.
3. Presentation of at least six competitively selected papers at international, national, or regional conventions in the field of Communication Studies after completion of the doctoral degree or after appointment, whichever is first, when research is a major area.

4. Student evaluations of teaching 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. At minimum, a preponderance of good and/or excellent annual evaluations is expected.

5. Faculty should perform a minimum of six acts of service to the department, field, and/or state that meet the requirements for a major act of service described above.

B. Additional Criteria

The following criteria, in no particular order of priority, will be considered by the FEC Committee in determining a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor for faculty members who have met or exceeded the minimum criteria outlined above.

1. The quality of the faculty member's teaching compared to other faculty in the Department holding the rank of Associate Professor.

2. The quality of the faculty member's research based on the criteria for evaluating the research of tenured faculty outlined above.

3. The service the faculty member has performed for the field of Communication Studies, the State of West Virginia, and society at large.

4. The number of quality research articles which the faculty member has published in which he or she appears as sole or senior author.

5. How this faculty member compares overall to other Associate Professors in research universities in the field of Communication Studies.

6. External letters evaluating the above criteria solicited by the Department in accordance with University policies and procedures.

Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

A. Minimum Criteria

Presuming that the quality of the faculty member's teaching continues to meet the standards expected of a senior faculty member, promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based primarily, but not exclusively, on outstanding achievement in research. The following minimal criteria apply. Meeting these criteria should not be taken to indicate the faculty member should be promoted to the rank of Professor. Rather, meeting these criteria indicate the FEC should continue to consider the individual for such a promotion.

1. Teacher evaluations consistently at exemplary levels for faculty in the Department consistent with the University document. The candidate's teaching record will have many strengths and few weaknesses.
2. A significant record of service to the field of Communication Studies as indicated by election to important positions in the professional associations in the field.
3. Publication of significant articles in one's area of expertise. Additional evidence of research could include books or book chapters based on research, as well as successful grant activity.

B. Additional Criteria

To be promoted to the rank of Professor is one of the most significant achievements to which a scholar can aspire. Awarding such a promotion should be considered an unusual act, one that should be undertaken only when a faculty member has achieved at an exceptional level in the field. To be promoted to the rank of Professor a faculty member's research program should be among the more significant in the field. The faculty member's research should be highly respected by other full professors of high standing in the field at peer research institutions. Evidence from communication professors at leading institutions in the field is also desirable. To determine the standing of the faculty member, the FEC Committee will seek external review of the faculty member by Full Professors in the faculty member's area of specialization and lean heavily on the quality of the candidate's research as expressed in those reviews in making a final decision to recommend or not to recommend promotion.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professors for Teaching Assistant Professors

A. Minimum Criteria

Teaching faculty members are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and service for promotion. The following criteria are considered minimal for further consideration of a recommendation for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor. Meeting these criteria is not taken to indicate the individual should be promoted. Rather, meeting these criteria indicates the FEC should continue to consider the faculty member for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.

1. The quality of the faculty member's teaching compared to other faculty in the Department holding the rank of Associate Professor. For a Teaching Assistant Professor, consistent ratings of Excellent in the most recent five- or six-year period preceding the request for promotion review would be expected.
2. Participating in teaching activities and committees at the college, university, and professional level.
3. The service the faculty member has performed for the field of Communication Studies, the State of West Virginia, and society at large.

4. Dissemination of scholarship involving teaching practices, instructional communication, communication assessment, advising, and other related topics.
5. Involvement in non-classroom activities with students, including, but not limited to, advising, recruitment, workshops for undergraduate teaching assistants, and club supervision.
6. External letters evaluating the above criteria solicited by the Department in accordance with University policies and procedures.

Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor for Teaching Associate Professors

Presuming that the quality of the Teaching faculty member's teaching continues to meet the standards expected of a senior faculty member, promotion from the rank of Associate to full Professor will be based on outstanding achievement in teaching, including a record of pedagogical scholarship. The following minimal criteria apply. Meeting these criteria should not be taken to indicate the faculty member should be promoted to the rank of Teaching Professor. Rather, meeting these criteria indicate the FEC should continue to consider the individual for such a promotion.

1. Teacher evaluations consistently at exemplary levels for faculty in the Department consistent with the University document. The candidate's teaching record will have many strengths and few weaknesses, and will include a sustained record of significant, assessment-based, programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission.
2. A significant record of service to the field of Communication Studies as indicated by election to important positions in the professional associations in the field.
3. An externally recognized record of dissemination of scholarship involving teaching practices, instructional communication, communication assessment, advising, and other related topics.

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 personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University. Procedures for soliciting external reviews are described in the College and University guidelines.

Procedure for modification of this document

These policies and procedures may be reviewed once each academic year after the completion of all activities of the FEC Committee for that year. Amendments may be made with a majority vote of the faculty.

All provisions of this document are subject to review and approval at the College and University administrative levels.

This document represents a revision and update of the guidelines adopted by the former Department of Speech Communication in 1972. This document was approved unanimously by the faculty of the Department, April 1, 1985. Subsequent revisions were approved unanimously by the faculty on February 12, 1986, August 31, 1988, August 25, 1989, December 1, 1989, September 16, 1991, November 1996, and February 28, 1998, January 12, 2001, and July 22, 2009.

<<< end >>>