

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL
DEPARTMENT of FORENSIC and INVESTIGATIVE SCIENCE**

**Approved by Faculty on February 4, 2015
Approved by Office of the Dean on July 8, 2015
Approved by the Office of the Provost on July 13, 2015**

Introduction

The Department of Forensic and Investigative Science Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (see Addendum A) and the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion, and Tenure (see Addendum B). 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, and Department.

The Department of Forensic and Investigative Science's faculty evaluation process is intended to (1) guide faculty toward enhanced success; (2) clarify faculty goals that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; (3) include faculty in discussions and decisions; and (4) 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.

All faculty members are subject to annual review. 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.

For Teaching faculty, responsibilities are defined as at least 80% teaching, 5 - 20% service, and 0 - 15% research.

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. In Forensic and Investigative Science, the responsibilities for Clinical faculty are normally defined as 10% research, 40% teaching, and 50% service.

Research faculty may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is usually 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.

For appointment to the rank of Clinical or Teaching Assistant Professor, a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in forensic science or a related discipline is expected. For appointment to the rank of Teaching Assistant Professor, significant experience in forensic science can be used in lieu of a terminal degree if the candidate is in possession of at least a relevant MS degree. Significant experience normally involves a period of ten (10) years, although other factors, such as the quality of the experience, also are used in this determination.

Appointment to the rank of Teaching Instructor requires at a minimum a relevant MS degree and some noteworthy experience in forensic science.

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 faculty must participate in annual assignment planning and feedback.

The allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. 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 adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding 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, annual evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

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

The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must annually update evaluation files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On 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 during the time period of closure for the review.

Each faculty evaluation file must have an inventory of its contents to ensure the integrity of the file. The faculty file is composed of four separate files, including an administrative file, and separate ones containing documentation of teaching, research, and service. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

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 Chair or Dean may wish to include.

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

Each document should be marked with an inventory number.

Once an item is entered into the evaluation file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. In the Department of Forensic and Investigative Science, all files are kept in the Chair's Office. Generally speaking, files may not leave the administrative office suite. These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

The University's Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation and Promotion and Tenure document (included as Addendum A) provides more information about which items should be entered into the Faculty Evaluation File (see pages 7 and 8).

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development.

All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases receive an annual evaluation by a committee of faculty and the Department Chair and participate in a formalized feedback process with the Chair.

Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and 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 FEC shall normally consist of five (5) faculty members. The composition of this committee shall reflect the composition of the faculty. To the extent possible, at least four (4) members will be from the department and at least three (3) members will be tenured. If there are insufficient tenured faculty members in the department, tenured faculty members in other departments with a relationship to the program may be asked to serve on the committee by the Department Chair.

The Department Chair, or any representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or a person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure may not serve as a member of the FEC.

Membership of department faculty on the FEC will be determined by vote of all full-time faculty members within the Department from the pool of those eligible to serve on the FEC. The Chair will appoint external faculty members after consultation.

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

Any changes in membership of the FEC requiring a new election of members of the committee will also require a new election for the chair of the committee.

Elections will take place within four weeks of the start of the fall semester. Normally, all members of this committee shall serve for a two-year term. The terms of service shall alternate with two new members elected each year. Normally, no member may serve more than two (2) consecutive terms.

This committee shall make recommendations annually regarding the annual performance of faculty members in accordance with the regulations of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, as described below. This committee shall also make recommendations for salary merit raises as described by the University and College guidelines and will evaluate applications for promotion and tenure.

The FEC shall meet as often as necessary to perform its evaluation of the Adjunct Faculty as necessary, Lecturers, Teaching Instructors, and Tenure-Track, Clinical, Teaching, and Research Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. All members of the committee must attend all meetings. Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating someone where there is a conflict of interest (e.g., themselves, a partner, spouse, or other immediate

family member) in the annual evaluation process and in promotion and tenure reviews. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation.

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

Annual Evaluations, Tenure and Promotion Review Process

The annual review normally covers performance in each area to which one is assigned for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine if the individual has responded to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, or continuing to remain productive. The committee should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are appropriate.

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide for the file evidence (1) that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the reviewers of the quality of their work. The evaluation must focus on the evidence in the file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the committee's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, 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 following framework for documentation and evaluation is suggested – To what degree do the faculty member's activities in teaching, in research, or in service benefit our students or affect our department, college or university?

The eligible voting members of the committee will discuss the faculty member's contributions and assign an evaluation of 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 to each activity: teaching, research, and service.

The committee chair will forward a summary of the committee's deliberations along with its recommendation, signed by all members of the committee, and the candidate's dossier to the Department Chair. The written recommendation will indicate a retention in rank (for/against).

Review for tenure and for promotion includes independent recommendations for or against

tenure and/or promotion. Thus, each recommendation requires a separate and independent vote by the members of the FEC. The following procedure will apply to each action. Each eligible voting member of the FEC is expected to vote Yes/No/Abstain and voting will be by unsigned ballot. The committee chair will protect the anonymity of the vote and openly count all votes at the Committee meeting. A majority vote of the voting members, excluding abstention votes, is required for a recommendation for tenure or for a recommendation for tenure and for promotion from the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The committee chair will forward a summary of the Committee's deliberations along with its recommendation (s), signed by all members of the committee, and the candidate's dossier to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair will forward these materials, plus his or her written recommendation(s) to the Dean of the College.

Tenure-track faculty are required to have external reviews of their research as part of promotion and tenure decision process while clinical faculty must have external reviews of their service as part of the promotion process. Significant research/service contributions are those which meet or exceed the quality and quantity of researchers and clinical faculty recently obtaining tenure and /or promotion within the department and normally in like departments at peer or aspirational peer institutions. It is important to note that the Department only has a Master's level graduate program. As there are no recent promotion or tenure decisions within the Department, by default the comparison will be to those faculty in STEM departments recently promoted and tenured within the Eberly College.

External reviewers will be selected with input from the faculty member under review and the faculty of the Forensic and Investigative Science Department. The reviewers will be tailored to provide an appropriate basis for evaluating the individual; given the diverse nature of the forensic field, these reviewers are likely to include practitioners, academicians, and researchers at private or government laboratories.

Professional Expectations and Evaluation

The quality of performance in teaching, research, and service shall be the primary basis for annual evaluation, for awarding of tenure, and for promotion in rank.

Evaluation of Teaching.

Teaching is at the heart of a faculty member's responsibility. Teaching involves the dissemination of knowledge and the stimulation of critical thinking. Teaching includes not only traditional modes of instruction such as the classroom lecture, but also laboratory and practicum instruction; thesis and dissertation direction; various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction; advising, which is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process; and evaluation and critique of student performance.

While teaching can 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 course syllabi and student evaluations of instruction for all courses taught during the review period will be included in the file for annual review.

The Department will evaluate the quality of the teaching by each faculty member based upon their assigned teaching duties. Metrics used to provide such evidence include: analyses of the syllabus and tests, student evaluations of instruction, peer evaluation of classroom performance, responses to student and peer evaluations, measures taken to improve teaching effectiveness, effectiveness of the use of instructional technology and/or computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, submission and funding of teaching grants, and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate research.

The quality of teaching for all faculty is expected to tend toward meritorious ratings.

Teaching faculty are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works; this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution to 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 program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Department-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Evaluation of Research

Tenure-track faculty in the Department of Forensic and Investigative Science Program are expected to establish and maintain an active research program in forensic science consistent with the terms of their letter of appointment. Included in this expectation is the demonstrated evidence of a continuing program of studies or investigations.

Refereed publications of high quality and successfully funded grant proposals are the most important, but not sole, evidence of scholarly productivity. Significant evidence of scholarly productivity may be a single work of considerable importance (such as a book) or a series of studies (articles in refereed journals) constituting a program of worthwhile research.

Scientific awards, non-peer-reviewed publications, patents, development of a technique or product which advances science, invited talks, invited chapters, and presentations at scientific meetings also represent evidence of research or scholarly activity. An invitation to serve as a peer reviewer for national/international publications is also as an indication of national/

international recognition of the high quality of research performed and reported by the faculty member and be evaluated under 'Research.' The act of serving as a reviewer in these capacities is evaluated under the heading of 'Service.'

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented so as 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 Department will accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance by the publication. Non-tenured faculty may include unsuccessful grant applications, along with scores and/or evaluations, as evidence of the development of their research program.

Evaluation of Service

The Department of Forensic and Investigative Science values service to the unit, the College, and the University; service to the forensic science profession (e.g., refereeing papers, reviewing proposals, organizing conferences); service in education and training; and service in representing the profession and the University in the broader community.

Faculty should document their own efforts and successes on the annual productivity reports and in the evaluation file. The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified. The nature and extent of acceptable service to society includes, but is not limited to invited presentations to off-campus groups, tours, field trips, talks to professional and service groups, and professional advice to individuals.

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, service as a committee member or chair at the departmental, college or university level.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, the review of grants and manuscripts, and committee and chair service to professional societies and panels.

Evidence for quality of service could include but is not limited to such things as (1) service grant submission and funding, (2) conducting special events for the department, university, or general public, (3) obtaining favorable publicity for departmental facilities, and (4) other documentation of exceptional contributions to the service mission of the department.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to University guidelines, responses to annual reviews may be submitted at any time and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the Department Chair with an additional memo to the file. If the faculty member disagrees or otherwise takes issue with the evaluations or the assignment of descriptors the faculty member may work informally with the Department Chair or ask the Dean to review the evaluations or descriptors. However, any informal efforts to resolve any such issue will not serve to suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances. After considering the faculty member's request, the Dean may direct the Department Chair or committee to reconsider their action, based on a written justification that would be placed in the faculty evaluation file. Any subsequent adjustments would be documented in an additional memo to the file.

Performance-Based Salary Policy

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

The performance-based salary policy of the Department of Forensic and Investigative Science is outlined below.

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.

The Department accepts the College's descriptor values; these values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by using the product of the appointment distribution and the rating; for example,

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

If the Evaluation Committee and the Chair present different ratings descriptors, the merit score is an average of the two evaluations.

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 an 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 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 at WVU and at peer or aspirational 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.

The Faculty Evaluation 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.

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 circumstances that apply under the Family and Medical Leave Act or that apply for other reasons, may request an extension of the tenure clock as provided by the West Virginia Board of Governors Policy 51. 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 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 Review

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, the candidate must demonstrate that he/she has a "continuous program" of scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record, and a record of grant funding.

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.

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.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in Research, Clinical, 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 promotion-eligible Teaching, Clinical, or 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.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty

The criteria for achieving tenure are described in the University and College Guidelines.

As there are no recent promotion or tenure decisions within the Department, by default the comparison will be to those faculty in STEM disciplines recently promoted and tenured within the Eberly College, with the recognition that the Department only has a Master's level graduate program..

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor normally requires significant contributions in both teaching and research and reasonable contributions in service. An exception occurs when prior approval has been received to change the areas requiring significant contributions, as prescribed in the University guidelines.

The term “significant contributions” in teaching means performance in classroom teaching, academic and research advising, or in other settings which meets or exceeds that of peers recently promoted in the Eberly College.

The term “significant contributions” in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently promoted in the Eberly College and in forensic science departments at peer or aspirational peer universities. The quality of the research, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the mere quantity. Research accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professor is based on accomplishments while an associate professor and is not granted merely for years of service. This promotion requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. Annual evaluations should guide faculty toward that achievement.

To be recommended for promotion to professor, an associate professor is normally expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research, significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or in other settings, and reasonable contributions in service. An exception occurs when prior approval has been received to change the areas requiring significant contributions, as prescribed in the University guidelines.

The Eberly College Guidelines state that the criteria for promotion to professor must be different from those for promotion to associate professor. An important aspect of this Department is its research and the associated graduate program. Graduate education necessarily implies an active and significant research component; thus there is added emphasis placed on research for promotion to professor, including a stronger record of publication than used to achieve promotion to associate professor and a continued record of grant funding. Research accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

Because graduate instruction is so essential in maintaining a MS level forensic science program, promotion to professor in the Forensic and Investigative Science also requires both of the following expectations since the previous promotion: demonstrated success in teaching at least one but preferably two different forensic science graduate lecture courses at the 500 or 600 level, and the development of an active research laboratory that includes multiple graduate students, with the supervision of at least three MS or PhD students to completion.

Criteria for Promotion of Teaching, Clinical, & Research Faculty

Clinical faculty, Research faculty and Teaching faculty are not eligible for tenure. 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 promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, or 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.

Promotion of a Teaching Instructor to Assistant Professor

Teaching Instructors are eligible for promotion if they hold a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree in forensic science or a related discipline or, as noted on p. 2 (“The Appointment Letter”), they have a relevant MS degree and significant experience in forensic science. These individuals are expected to undertake a continuing program of improving the teaching mission of the Program. 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 priorities of the Department.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Teaching Associate Professor. Teaching faculty are expected to undertake a continuing program of improving the teaching mission of the Program. 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 for a Teaching Assistant Professor 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 priorities of the Department.

Clinical Associate Professor. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor requires significant contributions in teaching and in service (and reasonable contributions in research), as specified in the letter of appointment. There is special emphasis on service.

The term "significant contributions" in service means performance which meets or exceeds that of peer faculty with service expectations recently promoted to Clinical Associate Professor in the Eberly College and at peer or aspirational peer institutions. The quality of the service, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the quantity. Service accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

Research Associate Professor. Promotion to Research Associate Professor requires significant contributions in research (and reasonable contributions in teaching and service, if specified in the letter of appointment).

The term "significant contributions" in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peer faculty with research expectations recently promoted to Research Associate Professor in the Eberly College and at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

The quality of the research, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the quantity. Research accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses.

Teaching Professor. To be recommended for promotion to Teaching Professor, a Teaching Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and in service.

The term “significant contributions” in teaching and in service means performance in classroom teaching and in service which meets or exceeds that of peers (both tenure-track and non-tenure-track) recently promoted to Teaching Professor in the Eberly College.

Clinical Professor. Promotion to Clinical Professor requires significant contributions in teaching and service and reasonable contributions in research (as stated in the letter of appointment).

The term “significant contributions” in teaching and service means performance which meets or exceeds that of peer faculty with teaching and service expectations recently promoted to Clinical Professor in the Eberly College. The quality of the service activities, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the quantity. Service accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars at peer or aspirational peer institutions

Research Professor. Promotion to Research Professor requires significant contributions in research and reasonable contributions in teaching (and service, if stated in the letter of appointment).

The term “significant contributions” in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peer faculty with research expectations recently promoted to Research Professor in the Eberly College. The quality of the research, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the quantity. Research accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars at peer or aspirational peer institutions.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Tenure, Promotion, or Termination Recommendations

When a recommendation for tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment has been made, the faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations for review at the college level. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five (5) working days of receipt of the evaluations.

A faculty member may petition the Dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations for promotion (i.e., when both the department committee and the Department Chair render negative recommendations). The petition should reach the Dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. The Dean shall forward the petition to the college evaluation committee as a matter of course for its recommendation. Negative department reviews of tenure cases are automatically reviewed by the college committee and the Dean.

Appointment and Review of Adjunct Faculty and Course-by-Course Lecturers

Adjunct Faculty. Adjunct faculty members in Forensic and Investigative Science are courtesy appointments to complement the teaching, research, or service expertise and needs of the department. Such appointments are normally for three year-terms and renewable.

Adjunct faculty must be either academically qualified with at least a master's degree or professionally qualified through experience. Formal letters of appointment as an adjunct are made by the Dean of the Eberly College after a review of the individual's vita by the faculty and a vote of confirmation.

If the adjunct faculty member has a teaching assignment, he or she will receive a letter from the Chair indicating the teaching assignment, and the expectations for submitting their syllabus, soliciting student evaluations, and engaging in a self-reflective review of the learning outcomes of the course. In addition, the adjunct faculty member will be expected to meet all scheduled class sessions, set clear expectations for student performance, maintain clear records of grades, and hold regular office hours and be accessible to students at other times through face to face, email or telephone contacts with the opportunity for students to schedule appointments. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will review the individual's performance and make a recommendation for continuation. The individual may receive compensation.

Course-by-Course Lecturer. An appointment as a lecturer for a specific course in Forensic and Investigative Science is done to complement the teaching needs of the department. Such appointments are on a course by course basis with compensation.

Lecturers must be academically qualified with at least a master's degree and/or professionally qualified through experience. A formal letter of appointment as a lecturer is made by the Chair of the Department after consultation with the faculty.

The letter of appointment from the Chair will indicate the teaching assignment and the expectations for submitting their syllabus, soliciting student evaluations, and engaging in a self-reflective review of the learning outcomes of the course. In addition, the lecturer will be expected to meet all scheduled class sessions, set clear expectations for student performance, maintain clear records of grades, and hold regular office hours and be accessible to students at other times through face to face, email or telephone contacts with the opportunity for students to

schedule appointments. A lecturer should update their faculty file at the end of the semester in which they are teaching. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will review the individual's performance and make a recommendation for continuation.

Changes to this document

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Chair will then bring the proposal to the Faculty for discussion. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a two-thirds vote of eligible voting faculty, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.

ADDENDA

The following addenda are included for reference. They are not formally a part of the Department's approved Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual. They are included here for completeness.

Addendum A

Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure
West Virginia University
See <http://wvufaculty.wvu.edu/policies>

Addendum B

**GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION, PERFORMANCE-BASED
PAY, PROMOTION AND TENURE
EBERLY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**
See http://eberly.wvu.edu/faculty_staff/policies

Addendum C

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University

Addendum D

Department of Forensic and Investigative Science Faculty Academic Productivity Report