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POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR SCHOOL OF PHARMACY FACULTY EVALUATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The annual review process to determine continuance, promotion or tenure is of critical importance for the individual faculty and the University. Faculty and administrators share serious responsibilities unique to their respective positions at all levels of the process.

All faculty and administrators involved in the evaluation process are expected, in the spirit of fairness and equability, to offer appropriate recommendations for the faculty member's further development, as well as to acknowledge the faculty's achievements and successes, based upon information contained in the personnel file. Under no circumstances should discrimination due to gender, race, age or nationality be allowed to enter the process.

This document applies to all faculty (full-time, part-time, adjunct) that contribute to the mission of the School in the areas of Research/Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. The nature and the extent of review varies as a function of the faculty member’s appointment, assignment, rank, and title as delineated herein.

II. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The following Policies and Procedures are intended to complement the West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation and to emphasize certain pertinent guidelines. Faculty should thoroughly familiarize themselves with the current University documents (http://provost.wvu.edu/faculty.htm) as well as the School of Pharmacy Policies and Procedures.

1. All faculty are required to undergo a yearly written department level evaluation by the department chair and department evaluation committee. In addition to department level review, faculty with tenure-track status or full time non-tenure-track status will undergo school level review by the school-wide evaluation committee and the Dean when the department chair or department evaluation committee recommends the faculty member for personnel action other than continuance in rank and title. Probationary faculty are also subject to department and school-wide evaluation committee review. Chairpersons should meet with all part-time and full-time faculty members in their respective departments each year to discuss goals, scope of work, professional development opportunities, and progress toward promotion and tenure.

2. Each department shall choose a minimum of five (5), or at least three (3) with the Dean’s concurrence, faculty members for the department evaluation committee. The final committee must have an odd number of members to avoid tie votes. Any department unable to provide the representative number of members may choose members considered peers from related disciplines within or outside the School with the prior approval of the department faculty, chair, and Dean. Appointment of department committees should occur in a timely manner consistent with the School of Pharmacy promotion and tenure calendar.

3. The School-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee will be composed of five (5) members and will consist of at least one member elected from each department and two additional members from within or from outside the School in relevant disciplines to be appointed by the Dean with concurrence of a majority of the department chairpersons. This committee will review department level faculty evaluations: (a) when the department chair or department evaluation committee recommends the faculty member for personnel action other than continuance in rank and title; (b) for faculty with probationary status prior to a tenure decision; (c) when the department chair and department evaluation committee make differing recommendations with regard to continuance, promotion, or tenure; (d) when the Dean requests a review; or (e) at the specific request of the faculty member under review.
4. The department evaluation committees will be composed of faculty members at the Assistant Professor to Professor ranks. During the years in which promotion decisions are being made for a non-tenure-track faculty member, at least one non-tenure-track faculty member, preferably at the Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor level, should serve on the department committee. For those departments in which the availability of non-tenured faculty is limited, and in those years when no such faculty are being considered for a critical decision, exceptions to the composition of the department evaluation committee may be made with the concurrence of the Dean, chair, and faculty of the affected department. The school-wide faculty evaluation committee will consist of faculty members at the Assistant Professor to Professor ranks, with the majority being tenured. In those years when no critical decisions are being made for a non-tenure-track faculty member, a non-tenure-track faculty member shall serve as an ad hoc member of the committee. In those years when a critical decision is being made regarding a non-tenure-track faculty member, at least one member shall be a non-tenure-track faculty member, preferably at the Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor level. Those faculty holding administrative appointments should not have an opportunity for dual input and therefore those with the designation chair or dean in their title should not serve on either faculty evaluation committee. However, assistant or associate chairs may serve on department evaluation committees of departments other than their own if requested to serve as a peer from outside the department as described in (2.) above. Faculty members being evaluated for promotion or tenure may not serve on their department committee or the school-wide committee but may serve on a department committee other than their own.

5. Following University guidelines, a faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations (either the department evaluation committee or chair evaluation) for review at the next level. The rebuttal must be placed in the file within five (5) working days of receipt of the recommendation. A faculty member may also petition the Dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations (i.e., when both the department evaluation committee and the department chair render negative recommendations). The petition must reach the Dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendation. Non-retention or termination recommendations automatically receive review at all levels.

6. The Personnel File will be composed of four (4) folders or sections: 1) Teaching, 2) Research/Scholarship, 3) Service, and 4) Personal Documents. Faculty members must indicate, to their Departmental office, into which folder submitted entries should be placed. The Personnel File will be updated each year with information requested in the University guidelines.

Space for the faculty Personal Documents folder will be designated and maintained for each faculty member in the Office of the Dean. The Dean’s Office may also maintain additional personal files (e.g., administrative confidential file, payroll file, personal health-related [HIPAA-compliant] file). The remaining faculty folders (Research/Scholarship, Service, and Teaching) will be maintained by the faculty member’s department office.

The Personal Documents folder will contain:

a. The letter of appointment and other documents that describe, elaborate upon, or modify one’s assignment, including position description, work plans, memoranda of understanding and subsequent letters of agreement. Letters of appointment for non-tenure-track faculty members shall outline the areas of emphasis regarding annual evaluation.

b. An up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography containing:
   i. critical dates relative to education, employment, change in status, promotion, leave of absence, etc.;
   ii. a list of publications with complete citations, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of
scholarship;

iii. a list of service activities.

c. Annual Activity Reports. An activity report must be completed each year by the deadline specified in the annual School calendar; the template to be used is available elsewhere. The activity report alone is insufficient for evaluation purposes. Supporting documentation must be placed in the Research/Scholarship, Teaching, or Service folders, as appropriate, to document the quality and extent of faculty activities in each area.

d. For faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of performance.

e. A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses.

f. Other information and records that the faculty member’s Chair or Dean may wish to include. Faculty members are to be notified of any materials the Dean or chair adds to their personnel file, and faculty members may include written responses to such material.

g. A continuing chronological inventory of entries into the Personal Documents folder to assure the integrity of the file.

The faculty member is responsible for assuring completion of items (b), (c), and as needed, (f). The Chair or Dean shares responsibility for the remaining items.

The faculty personnel files including Research/Scholarship, Service, and Teaching, will be kept in their respective departmental offices. Each Departmental office will be responsible for maintaining a chronological inventory of entries in each file to assure the integrity of the file. The department office will also maintain a record of those accessing a Personnel file. Once an item has been inventoried in any of the Personnel files it may not be removed. The number assigned to each document submitted for the file and the date received should be recorded directly on the document. The Dean’s Office will alert the faculty during October to update their Personnel files in preparation for the annual review.

The contents of the Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service Personnel files are the responsibility of each faculty member. Information that bears upon the quality of the faculty member’s performance in all pertinent areas should be included. This information may include, but need not be limited to, teaching evaluations, professional presentations, published materials, grant applications and awards, research in progress and the preparation of unpublished materials, other creative scholarship, and service to the university.

While faculty members may submit entries to be placed in their personnel file on any working day throughout the academic year, they are encouraged to submit materials on a quarterly basis. The Personnel file will be officially closed on the last working day of December to permit the annual review process to be conducted. The file will be re-opened at the conclusion of the review process. Simultaneously, faculty will also make their annual activity report, CV, and supporting documentation for the current year available electronically on a site established and maintained by the School. Except for the exceptions noted in the University guidelines (e.g., external review letters) additional entries into the Personnel file after the deadline cannot be made or considered in the current year’s annual review.

The faculty member may have free access to their Personnel file though they will have to follow appropriate procedures established by their department (Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service files) or the Dean’s office (Personal Documents folder); others will have access only on a need to know basis upon request to the faculty member’s departmental office and at appropriately scheduled times. Files are not to be removed.
from the departmental office except during the evaluation process when an action is required or requested (e.g., promotion, tenure, annual review). During such evaluations the files may be moved to an agreed upon and secure location.

7. A copy of each written review conducted by the department and school-wide committees, the department chair, and the Dean will be sent to the faculty member being evaluated at the same time the written review is placed in the Personnel Documents folder. Department chairs will also receive copies of reviews by the evaluation committees and the Dean. For School of Pharmacy faculty who hold additional faculty appointments in other departments/schools, the primary School of Pharmacy department affiliation will be designated in their appointment letter or in subsequent letter of agreement. Annual reviews conducted by other departments/schools or letters of evaluation from other department chair/section chief(s) will be included in a faculty member’s Personal Documents folder if received before the Personnel file is closed for review and are subject to the current year’s review. Evaluations received after the closing of the Personnel file will be placed in the Personal Documents folder and be available for review in subsequent years.

8. The quality of research, teaching, and service will be reviewed by faculty peers in the internal review process. In addition, the quality of research or service must be externally reviewed for promotion and tenure considerations for faculty for whom either research or service is identified as one of their areas of significant contribution. University guidelines established for the external evaluation of research or service will be followed.

9. Fourth year review: After the end of the third year, tenure-track assistant professors shall undergo a more extensive review by the department chair and department and school-wide evaluation committees. Department chairs or the evaluation committees may seek additional assessments from outside the department and the University regarding a candidate’s professional accomplishments, stature as viewed by peers, and scholarly potential. All evaluations should identify any problem areas that may preclude the granting of tenure. The review may also recommend termination. For faculty members who join the school at the rank of associate or full professor in the tenure stream but without being granted tenure, the maximum period for obtaining tenure will be specified in their letter of appointment.

10. Faculty to be considered for promotion or tenure shall have had placed in a separate section and location of their Personnel file, external evaluations regarding the quality of their research/scholarly activity, or, if applicable, service activities. A list of five to six external reviewers, preferably affiliated with peer institutions and at or above the rank to which promotion is being sought, shall be provided by both the faculty member and the department evaluation committee. If an external reviewer is not university affiliated (e.g., industrial scientist) there will be an explanation of their relevant qualifications. University-affiliated reviewers will comprise a majority of external reviewers of research. In the case of external review of service, the previous sentence need not apply. Any personal or professional relationship the external evaluator has with the faculty member should be identified, and a brief explanation given as to the reason for using that evaluator as an external reviewer. Faculty members under consideration are allowed to review departmental lists and request in writing to the Dean or chair, by September 10 of the year the request for promotion or tenure is made, that certain names from the list not be used. The chair may consider the faculty member’s comments and requests, but the faculty member does not have the right to veto any potential evaluator or the final selection of evaluators. The chair and Dean will select at least three names from each list. Responses from four evaluators are minimally required; however, all external evaluations that are received (maximum six) must be considered. The final list of names and any comments and/or requests should be forwarded to the Dean by September 10 and requests for external reviews mailed by October 1.
External reviewers will be asked to limit their evaluations to the quality of the faculty candidate's research/scholarship or service. For external review of research the information portfolio provided by the faculty will usually contain only lists of publications, grants and contracts, reprints of publications, and evidence of scholarly activities (e.g., study sections, editorial boards). All external review letters obtained are to be stamped with the date received and promptly entered into the files. The Dean's Office will be assigned the responsibility of tracking the requests and receipt of the letters, initiating appropriate follow-up, and assuring that the letters are placed in the files. Following the annual review process, faculty members may request in writing to review the external reviewers' letters. To ensure confidentiality, identifying marks and signatures will be removed before they are reviewed by the faculty member. The faculty member's chair or the Dean may send letters soliciting evaluations, but evaluators will be asked to return letters directly to the Dean. A log of mailings, return dates and other correspondence will be kept in the Dean's Office and made available on a need-to-know basis. After the review, all letters will be sealed and may not be used for any subsequent personnel action.

11. Consideration for discretionary promotion must be initiated by the individual faculty member. Ordinarily, the interval between promotions will be at least five years. In addition, a minimum of three years as a full-time employee at the WVU School of Pharmacy is generally required for promotion to any rank. In order to meet the deadline for seeking external reviews, the faculty candidate seeking promotion or tenure must ultimately communicate in writing to the Dean no later than July 1 preceding the annual review and evaluation period.

Faculty whose initial appointment begins after the normal academic year (starting date of July 1) but on or before January 1 may choose to include or not include the first partial academic year toward the critical year clock. For initial first-year appointments after January 1 this fraction of the academic year will not count toward the critical year. After discussion with the candidate the critical year will be specified in the initial appointment letter. This degree of flexibility in faculty choice is provided for in Board of Governors Policy 2 and is subject to the guidelines that are detailed in the following paragraph.

The Dean will then notify the department chair, who in turn will inform the chair of the department evaluation committee of the faculty member's intent and place the written request in the Personnel file. Promotion to Associate Professor normally would occur at the end of the critical (sixth) year unless otherwise stipulated in the faculty member's initial letter of appointment. In the fourth year of service, a faculty member may petition to bring the critical year forward one year. However, in any case, if tenure is not awarded in the critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued.

12. Non-tenure-track faculty are not subject to the seven-year probationary period applied to tenure-track faculty. Promotion of non-tenure-track faculty to a senior level is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability.

13. In general, for promotion to Professor, greater productivity in all areas of university concern is expected and must include evidence of significant scholarly contributions and national recognition. Evaluation for promotion or tenure will be primarily based on work achieved since the faculty member's last promotion. For faculty who are hired to the WVU School of Pharmacy from positions at other institutions, evaluation for promotion or tenure will be based primarily on work achieved since the faculty member's appointment at WVU. For faculty whose initial appointment is made with expectation for significant contribution in areas other than teaching and research, a written description of their areas of productivity or significant contribution must be contained in their Personnel files. Significant contribution, as defined in the University guidelines, is required for promotion or tenure in two of three areas of University concern with reasonable contribution required in the third area. The University area of service, as an area of significant contribution, is normally agreed upon in writing by a prospective faculty member at the time of hiring or soon thereafter. This agreement must be made with the approval and concurrence of the Dean and department chair. For those whose primary area of faculty responsibility involves service rather than research, significant
contribution is evaluated by the impact that it has on the well-being of their constituents either locally, regionally, nationally or globally with special importance given to service to West Virginia. Such service can best be assessed by colleagues who are involved in similar activities and by recipients of the service performed.

III. FACULTY PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED (MERIT) SALARY CONSIDERATIONS

A. Introduction

1. General Considerations

Faculty members of the School of Pharmacy are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in at least two of the three areas that constitute the heart of the University’s mission — teaching/instruction, service, and research/scholarly activity. Although the types of activities in each of these areas might differ in some respects among faculty in the various departments and between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, contributions to the overall mission and goals of the School and University community should be comparable. Faculty activities should also be compatible with the unique expectations of their individual departments.

The faculty evaluation process is extremely important and must be undertaken seriously and critically. It is the responsibility of department chairs and faculty evaluation committees to carefully evaluate the nature of a faculty member’s work when assessing productivity. Guidance by chairs and constructive criticism by faculty evaluation committees is particularly important during the first few years to ensure that junior faculty establish themselves as productive members of the academic community.

The WVU Board of Governors Policy 2 states, "There shall be no practice of granting promotion routinely or because of length of service, or of denying promotion capriciously." Below is a description of the expectations for faculty members in the School of Pharmacy and the guidelines to follow during evaluations for faculty reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions, and performance-based (merit) salary considerations. It is intended to supplement the annual West Virginia University "Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluations" document and it should be used in conjunction with it. Specific faculty expectations and evaluation considerations in each of the areas of the University’s mission follow. Departments may develop documents further clarifying the guidelines. Such documents must be approved by a majority of full-time faculty in the department, by the department chair, and by the Dean of the School of Pharmacy. Faculty are encouraged to consult both the University and Department guidelines, if available, in addition to this document.

2. Faculty Required to Undergo Annual Review

All full-time and continuing part-time faculty members are to be reviewed on an annual basis. Occasional or clinical part-time and adjunct faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment. A complete description of the annual evaluation of faculty with any one of these appointments can be found in section IX. B. of the University’s “Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluations” document. The annual evaluation is to be based on one’s assignment and performance in light of the initial letter of appointment, any subsequent modifications to the appointment letter, and documentation in the Personnel file. It is to be both formative and summative and not limited to the year preceding the evaluation. It is to be a review based on the annual evaluations from previous years too, so it can be determined whether or not suggestions for improvement in previous evaluations have been acted upon. The annual assessment will be used as a guide for the faculty member concerning areas in which
improvement is needed or expected, areas where performance is at or above the level expected, and, when positive, as a basis for performance-based (merit) salary raises.

3. Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of performance in each of the research/scholarly activity, teaching, and service to which a faculty member is assigned (as described in their letter of appointment and related documents) is to be assessed using one of the following four descriptors: Excellent [characterizing performance of high merit], Good [characterizing performance of merit], Satisfactory [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure], or Unsatisfactory. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" ratings, particularly in an area in which a significant contribution is required, would not qualify for promotion or tenure. Positive recommendations for promotion and tenure require a series of annual reviews above the Satisfactory level and performance judged to meet the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" as described below. A form that can be used to summarize faculty ratings in Teaching, Research and Service is available elsewhere.

B. Administrative Appointments

Faculty members may have specific administrative appointments within the School of Pharmacy. Evaluation of administrative functions is the responsibility of supervising administrators. However, the workloads involved need to be considered by faculty committees during the yearly evaluation process. The administrative responsibilities of School of Pharmacy faculty should be clearly defined by the Dean in writing and a copy of these responsibilities, including a proportionate value (percent effort) of the appointment, placed in the Personal Documents folder of the individual.

C. Teaching/Instruction

1. Expectations for Teaching/Instruction

Exemplary teaching/instruction is one of the goals of West Virginia University. In keeping with this goal, the expectations for, and the types of teaching activities undertaken by, tenure-track and non-tenure-track full-time faculty may include but are not limited to:

a. Instructional activities
   i. Didactic instruction for health professionals, professional students, graduate students, resident or fellow trainees.
   ii. Experiential instruction for professional students and resident or fellow trainees in the health professions.
   iii. Laboratory instruction for professional or graduate students.
   iv. Active participation in multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teaching efforts within the Health Sciences Center and University community.
   v. Active participation in off-campus, distance learning, and continuing education efforts.

b. Components of effective instruction by faculty include:
   i. Possessing a depth and breadth of knowledge in their specialty area and communicating this knowledge to others.
   ii. Keeping up with the most current developments in their field and relating them to their teaching.
   iii. Stimulating imaginative thinking among students.
   iv. Enhancing problem-solving and lifelong learning skills among students.
v. Monitoring their teaching continuously and implementing methods to improve it in delivery and/or content as required.
vi. Serving as a role model for students during their didactic, experiential, and laboratory training.

c. Graduate thesis and dissertation advising activities
   i. Serving as a major advisor.
   ii. Serving on a student’s committee.

d. Supervision of professional student research/investigation projects

e. Supervision of resident or fellow trainee research/investigation projects

It is recognized that faculty members might not be engaged in every teaching/instruction activity listed above at any given time. However, all of the previously listed activities relevant to the faculty member’s specific appointment responsibilities and their discipline must be undertaken by a faculty member in order to be promoted, unless a given activity has been precluded by factors beyond the faculty member’s control (e.g., there are no graduate students in the faculty member’s discipline). In such cases the precluding factors must be explained and supporting documentation included in the file.

2. Evaluation of Teaching/Instruction

The evaluation of faculty teaching must be accomplished through the use of a method that reflects the diversity of the various instructional components. The teaching personnel file, which includes (but is not limited to) student evaluations, peer evaluations, and measures of teaching improvement/innovation provides a means to measure such diversity. Evaluations are used to help assess the quality of teaching. Included as part of the evaluation process will also be consideration of teaching quantity (section III.C.2.c).

Teaching Personnel File. Each faculty member will be asked on a yearly basis to critically assess his/her teaching activities and to update his/her teaching personnel file for both professional and graduate teaching/instruction. The teaching personnel file should consist of the following items:

a. Required items in teaching personnel file
   i. A reflective statement of teaching goals, responsibilities, and approaches. The statement will be completed using the annual activity reporting form. The form will ask the faculty member to state their specific teaching goals over the next year. These goals should be consistent with the short and long-term goals for the department, School, and Health Sciences Center. In addition, the faculty member will be asked to analyze the extent to which teaching goals for the previous year were met. The department chair will be expected to review the completed statement with the faculty member and to either approve or modify, after discussion with the faculty member (if necessary), the specific goals and plans for the next year.
   ii. A list of courses taught, with enrollment numbers, and the number of contact hours.
   iii. Number of graduate and professional advisees.
   iv. Number of post-doctoral fellows, residents or fellows mentored.
   v. Course syllabi, which should include course descriptions, with details of content, objectives, methods, and procedures for evaluating student learning. This material will be uploaded onto the SOLE website for access by faculty evaluation committees and others. When updated, the old materials may be removed from this file.
   vi. Representative exams, quizzes, videotapes and other materials employed in assessment of student performance.
   vii. Representative handouts, problem sets, and lecture outlines.
viii. A listing of seminars or professional meetings attended in relation to teaching.

ix. Student evaluations of teaching, including response rate and students' written comments and overall ratings. These will include formal student evaluations from didactic courses, experiential rotations, other courses (e.g., team-taught, multidisciplinary) in which the faculty member had significant responsibility. Research/ investigation project supervisory functions will be evaluated at the discretion of each department.

x. Peer and departmental chair on-site evaluations. Peers can provide valuable assessment of teaching quality with a perspective not possible from students. Peer evaluations will be expected to provide positive feedback when appropriate, constructive criticism where needed, and specific suggestions for continued improvement of teaching skills.

The on-site peer evaluation process will be conducted for each non-tenured tenure-track and non-promoted non-tenure-track faculty member every other year and for tenured faculty or promoted non-tenure-track faculty at least once every three years. Each department chair will appoint a reviewer from a list of three individuals, mutually agreed upon by the faculty member under review and his/her department chair. The final selection of a peer reviewer will lie with the department chair. Peer reviewers may come from the same or an outside department of the faculty member being reviewed. It is recommended that: 1) faculty be evaluated in the environment in which they do most of their teaching, and 2) all faculty participate as peer reviewers.

The peer evaluator will, at times separate from the department chair, directly observe at least two didactic lectures. In addition, for the clinical department, the chair or associate chair will ask another member of the clinical department to observe the experiential teaching of PharmD students by the faculty member on at least one occasion during the review cycle. Any related experiential materials prepared by the faculty member being evaluated, as well as a summary of the amount of time spent meeting with and directly observing students in the practice setting, should be provided to the evaluator.

The teaching of the departmental chairs will be evaluated by two faculty members, one from within and one from outside of their department, to be selected by the Dean.

The teaching of the Dean will be evaluated by two faculty members from outside the School of Pharmacy, to be selected by the School-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee.

In addition to the peer evaluation process, the department chair or assistant/associate chair will directly observe at least two didactic lectures from each faculty member. These evaluations will be conducted at least every other year for non-tenured, tenure-track faculty or non-tenure-track full time faculty who have not been promoted, on a staggered schedule. Tenured faculty and promoted non-tenure-track full-time faculty will be evaluated at least once every three years.

All faculty and chair evaluators will use special evaluation forms (one for didactic courses, one for experiential rotations) for preparing their assessments; these forms are available elsewhere. Copies of syllabi, relevant handout materials and examinations in the teaching personnel file will also be made available to the evaluators.

Completed peer evaluation forms will be returned to the department chair, who will review and forward copies of the results to the faculty member.

xi. Measures of teaching improvement/innovation. Development and incorporation of significant course changes or development and incorporation of innovative teaching methods are important and
desirable activities if they lead to improvement of teaching. Examples include:

1. Development and incorporation of new, creative educational techniques in a variety of formats to provide didactic material to students either on- or off-site, (e.g., computerized material, problem-based learning, video or videodisc)

2. Development and incorporation of new, creative methods by which to conduct or enhance experiential teaching either on- or off-site.

3. Development and incorporation of new, creative multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary efforts in either didactic or experiential teaching and consistent with the needs of the unit.

4. Development and implementation of a new course, or part of a new course, that utilizes innovative teaching methods or concepts and that is consistent with the needs of the unit.

5. Significant instructional improvement projects or methods. These types of teaching activities should be described in the Personnel file. Feedback should also be obtained from peers and/or the involved students as to the benefit/impact of these activities, and this information should also be provided in the Personnel file.

b. Optional items in Teaching Personnel file

i. Descriptions of uses of computers or other technology in teaching.

ii. Scores on standardized or other tests of skills and/or competencies, before and after instruction.

iii. Description of the development of student experiential programs.

iv. Description of assistance provided to colleagues on teaching.

v. Publications in teaching journals.

vi. Funds/equipment obtained for teaching labs and programs.

vii. Description of training graduate students for careers in teaching.

viii. Description of the design of new courses.

ix. Description of the design of interdisciplinary or collaborative courses or teaching projects.

x. Description of use of new methods for teaching, assessment of learning, or grading.

xi. Preparation of a textbook or development of other course materials to facilitate learning.

xii. Teaching awards.

xiii. Descriptions of any invitations or requests, based on teaching reputation, to consult, conduct workshops, write articles, provide advice, etc.

xiv. Results of exit interviews with students or interviews with alumni regarding effectiveness of faculty teaching.

c. Teaching Quantity. Teaching quantity should be taken into account during an overall assessment of a faculty member's achievements, and consideration should be given to the types of teaching activities undertaken. Faculty with heavier teaching loads relative to others in their department should be recognized and rewarded for these extra efforts. Those with relatively light teaching loads are expected to show a comparably greater level of proficiency in either service or research/scholarly activity, depending on the type of position they hold and the resulting "area of significant contribution." Consideration of teaching quantity should include the following types of activities:

i. Direct teaching responsibility for an entire course or the major contributor to the teaching of a course. The types of student assessments used (essays, projects versus standard objective measurements) will also be considered.
ii. Total number of didactic hours provided.
iii. Number of experiential rotation blocks provided to students and number of students per block.
iv. Number of PhD graduate students supervised.
v. Coordinator of a team-taught course, seminar course, or module.
vi. Number of MS graduate students supervised.
vii. Total number of pharmacy residents or fellows precepted.
viii. Professional degree students supervised during research, investigation, or special projects.
ix. Formal education or training provided to practicing pharmacists or other health care professionals.
x. Total number of in services/presentations provided to pharmacists or other health care professionals.

3. Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Salary (Merit) Considerations

A significant contribution in the area of teaching is expected for promotion and tenure regardless of faculty rank unless the faculty member’s letter of appointment specifies otherwise. The most important factor in the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching performance involves an assessment of quality. Within the Teaching Personnel file, proportionate weight should be given to each of the following required items:

a. Student evaluations: Evaluations from all the teaching environments in which the faculty member participates should be considered in order to gain perspective on teaching effectiveness.

b. Course syllabi and other supporting materials (e.g., representative exams, quizzes, handouts): These should demonstrate that the faculty member provides relevant, well-written information and is knowledgeable about current concepts and developments in their discipline.

c. Peer and departmental chair evaluations: These evaluations should be considered together when making an overall assessment of quality.

d. Measures of teaching improvement/innovation: Faculty members should continually strive to improve their teaching and stimulate student interest in learning. Techniques or aids to improve teaching should be of high quality. Teaching innovations should be thoughtfully used, and methods to determine and/or measure their success should be pursued by the faculty member. Teaching innovations may or may not prove to be successful and credit should be given for all attempts made on sound principles.

The other required and optional items in the teaching personnel file should also be given consideration, since they provide evidence of the depth and breadth of a faculty member’s teaching activities and can provide further supporting evidence for the assessments listed above. Assessment of the self evaluation material in the Personnel file should focus on the extent to which the previously prepared plans were accomplished, although the other statements present should also be considered.

D. Research/Scholarly Activity

1. Expectations for Research/Scholarly Activity

All faculty members are expected to engage in research/scholarly activity, although the extent to which this occurs depends upon whether the faculty member is tenure track, non-tenure track, or with consideration of other responsibilities as outlined in the letter of appointment.
Scholarship can take several forms, including discovery, integration, application, and teaching. A key component of the definition of scholarship is that it results in publications in peer-reviewed journals or other products that can be readily evaluated and compared with those from peers at other schools/colleges. Activities encompassed by each type of scholarship are as follows:

a. **Scholarship of discovery.** Faculty members have responsibility for both the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. The creation of new knowledge constitutes the scholarship of discovery. Faculty members, regardless of whether involved in laboratory, field-based, or practice-related projects, should engage in research that has applicability to health care. Examples include, but are not limited to:

   i. Drug design and discovery: Drug development, elucidation of the biochemical causes of disease, drug metabolism and pharmacokinetics, biopharmaceutics, pharmacodynamics, drug delivery and the design of drug delivery systems.
   ii. Health services research (e.g., delivery, access, quality and cost): Social and behavioral aspects of therapeutics relative to pharmacy practice, patient outcomes research, innovations in patient-centered care, pharmacoeconomics research; health promotion, and disease management research.
   iii. Outcomes research: Research into methods for optimizing drug therapy or drug delivery, with an emphasis on the treatment of conditions prevalent in West Virginia and the region; research into methods for enhancing patient care; research into methods for enhancing information provision to practitioners; research into new types of therapy for the treatment of conditions prevalent in West Virginia and the region.

b. **Scholarship of integration.** As a result of the explosion of published information, it is often difficult to differentiate critical facts and original research findings from those that are less important or that contain serious methodological flaws. The scholarship of integration refers to the comprehensive, analytical review of the literature in a particular area or field, with critical interpretation of the results and conclusions. Examples of this type of scholarship include, but are not limited to:

   i. Preparation of instructional materials for workshops, short courses, or symposia; authorship of books, solicited or peer-reviewed review articles, book chapters, or monographs.
   ii. Comprehensive (and analytical) review of literature in a particular area published in a peer-reviewed journal, including meta-analysis.
   iii. Publication of the development, implementation, and evaluation of practice guidelines that are prepared based on the published literature.

Publication of brief or less in depth reviews, unsolicited non-peer reviewed review articles, case reports, letters, and similar materials, while not representing the scholarship of integration, will still be considered during the evaluation of scholarly activity.

c. **Scholarship of teaching.** Publications about new or innovative teaching methods that are developed and which can be critically reviewed and evaluated are considered to be scholarly. Examples of this type of scholarship include, but are not limited to:

   i. Evaluation of the effects of different teaching methods on student learning, development of course materials using new or different technologies, and evaluation of these materials.
   ii. Evaluation of different methods for providing continuing education.

d. **Scholarship of application.** The provision of patient-centered care involves the application of research findings and other knowledge for the improvement of health. For this to be considered scholarly, the
faculty member must apply knowledge in a manner that provides new insight or understanding. When the knowledge application can be critically evaluated by the beneficiaries of the service (e.g., patients, other health care professionals, the public) and colleagues, it can be considered scholarly. Examples of this type of scholarship include, but are not limited to:

i. Technology transfer of basic to applied science.
ii. Implementation of intervention programs in health care including patient-oriented services such as health promotion and disease management and the evaluation of these programs.
iii. Development and evaluation of a new type of practice model on patient care or other health outcomes; assessing the effect of clinical pharmacy services on health practitioners’ knowledge or care provision; evaluating the impact of previously prepared practice guidelines on health care; and applying a practice model developed in one setting to another rural or remote site, with evaluation of the resulting impact.

2. Evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity

a. Components and weight. As described previously, all faculty members are expected to be scholars regardless of the type of appointment. Thus, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty who have teaching and service as their primary areas of responsibility are also expected to engage in scholarly activities, making either significant or reasonable contributions depending on the nature of their appointment or as specified in their letter of appointment. Thus, evaluation of the research/scholarly activity performed by faculty is critical. In order to evaluate scholarship, regardless of the type, there must be evidence of the work performed that can be evaluated by colleagues both internal and external to the institution. The nature of the scholarship (e.g., discovery vs. integration) is not critical. However the standard of significant contribution requires that a faculty member ultimately develop a body of work that results in their recognition locally and nationally as an expert in their chosen field.

Evaluation of research/scholarly activity should focus on the quality of the work presented as evidence (e.g., originality, impact on the field) rather than simply on the quantity of work presented. For promotion or tenure considerations, the quality and quantity of a faculty member's research and scholarly activities will be evaluated by departmental and school-wide faculty evaluation committees. The quality of the work will also be evaluated by external peers for faculty whose appointments require that they make significant contributions in this area. Further, both publications and extramural funding must be part of the evidence of research/scholarly activity by a tenure-track faculty member seeking to demonstrate that he/she has made significant contributions in research/scholarly activity.

b. Evaluation of research/scholarly activity. Evaluation of research/scholarly activity generally includes review of the following evidence:

i. Grants, Contracts and Other Funding. All tenure-track faculty members must seek funding for their research/scholarly activities. Funding for research/scholarly activities can be obtained from a variety of sources, both intramural and extramural. Obtaining intramural funding to initiate projects or to change research directions is encouraged and should be recognized. However, success in attracting competitive extramural funding is required for promotion/tenure when research/scholarly activity is an area of significant contribution. Competitive awards are given greater weight than noncompetitive awards and serving as a principal or co-principal investigator is given greater weight than other roles (e.g., co-investigator, consultant). Investigator-initiated grants/protocols are given more weight than those initiated by the funding source. Nationally competitive awards are given more weight than state or local awards.
Non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty are expected to pursue grants, contracts, or other funding sources to support their scholarship, as outlined in the letter of appointment. However, unlike the weighting given to funding sources for faculty with research as an area of significant contribution, for faculty who have this area as one of reasonable contribution, the source of the funding (e.g. competitive vs. noncompetitive, intramural vs. extramural, investigator-initiated vs. sponsor-initiated) is not weighted. For example, although pursuing extramural sources is encouraged, it is acceptable for these faculty to obtain only intramural, noncompetitive, or state or local funding (if this is an area of reasonable contribution). It is also acknowledged that some types of scholarship do not require the procurement of additional funding.

ii. In addition to the above weighting, the following should be used when assessing funding:

1. Although it is unrealistic to expect that all grant/contract applications will be funded, there should be a record of continuing success in this area. Grants approved but not funded (e.g., an NIH application that is scored by not funded) are evidence that a faculty member’s ideas are sound, but are not a substitute for funded grants. The ability of a faculty member to obtain sufficient funding to be productive in their scholarly endeavors is more important than the absolute dollar amounts of funding obtained.

2. It is not appropriate for a tenure-track faculty member to only pursue intramural grants or protocols developed by the source providing the funding.

3. The ability of a tenure-track faculty member to perform independent work is of critical importance. When serving as co-investigator on a grant/contract, faculty must provide evidence of his/her particular intellectual contribution to the project.

iii. Publications. All tenure-track and non-tenure-track full-time faculty are expected to publish the results of their research and/or scholarly activities in peer-reviewed journals. When evaluating each publication, greater weight will be given to publications on which the faculty member is the primary author, the journal Impact Factor (where applicable), and whether they are applicable to health care, rural practice, or the State of West Virginia. For those publications in which faculty members are not the primary author, they must describe their specific contribution to the publication in their Annual Activity Report. The majority of a faculty member’s publications should reflect achievements in the scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and/or teaching. In addition to these factors, the following relative ranking of the “value” of each type of publication, in decreasing order, should be used:

1. Books and peer-reviewed articles of original research findings in national/international journals considered prestigious in the field.

2. Book chapters, edited books, peer-reviewed review articles, case reports, or case series articles in national/international journals.

3. Non-peer reviewed articles of original findings, reviews, case reports, or patents.

4. Abstracts of presentations, all other types of publications.

Non-tenure track faculty and tenure-track faculty with scholarship/research as an area of reasonable contribution are expected to publish the results of their research or scholarly activities in appropriate journals. Non-tenure track faculty and tenure-track faculty with scholarship as an area
of reasonable contribution might have a predominance of review articles or case reports. Regardless of the type of publication, faculty with scholarship as an area of reasonable contribution should strive to publish in peer-reviewed works.

iv. Professional/scientific meeting and other scientific presentations. These include presentations of the results from research/scholarly activities at regional, national, or international meetings. This should be differentiated from providing a professional seminar at meetings for primarily education purposes, which would constitute teaching activity. The weight of scholarly presentations, in decreasing order, is as follows:

1. Invited presentation
2. Podium/poster presentation
3. Research seminar at other institutions
4. Internal (WVU) research presentation (e.g., seminar)

v. Inventions. To receive consideration as scholarly activity, documentation demonstrating the usefulness of the product patented, licensed, or copyrighted must be provided.

3. Promotion, Tenure and Performance-Based Salary (Merit) Considerations

Evaluation of research/scholarship is focused on quality, not mere quantity. It is difficult to place exact numbers on the quantity of publications and grants/contracts considered to represent either reasonable contribution or significant contribution since the comprehensiveness and quality of various research/scholarly activities can be quite variable.

a. Non-Tenure Track Full-Time Faculty with Research/Scholarly Activity as an Area of Reasonable Contribution. It is difficult to place exact numbers on the quantity of publications expected for non-tenure track faculty since the comprehensiveness of the activities can be variable. Evaluation of the scholarly activities of non-tenure track clinical assistant professors must take into account the time since initial appointment and progress made since the last evaluation. For merit considerations, clinical assistant professors must demonstrate that scholarly activities have been initiated and should document efforts to obtain funding for their scholarly work. To facilitate development of their scholarship, non-tenure track faculty are encouraged to participate in collaborative research, if appropriate.

For promotion to the rank of clinical associate professor, a sufficient quality and quantity of publications should exist to establish expertise in an area. For merit considerations, clinical associate professors should demonstrate evidence of sustained scholarly contributions. Funding at levels sufficient to maintain their scholarly efforts should also be demonstrated.

For promotion to the rank of clinical professor, evidence of sustained contributions in their area(s) of expertise must be demonstrated. For merit considerations, clinical professors must provide evidence of sustained achievements in scholarly activities consistent with the nature of their academic appointment.

b. Tenure-Track Full-Time Faculty. Evaluation of the research efforts of tenure-track assistant professors must take into account the time since initial appointment and progress made since the last evaluation. For merit considerations, assistant professors must demonstrate that sound scholarly activities have been initiated and document consistent efforts to obtain extramural funding to support their scholarly activities. Collaborative efforts are increasingly important in research, but junior faculty must take care to develop a clearly-defined area of expertise such that their independence as scholars is evident to all
evaluators.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor and the granting of tenure, assistant professors with research/scholarly activity as an area of significant contribution must have obtained extramural funding and published work of sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate to both internal and external reviewers that their research/scholarly activities are independent, sustainable, significant to the field, and likely to lead to national recognition.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor and the granting of tenure, assistant professors whose appointments require reasonable contributions in research/scholarly activity must publish work of sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate to their colleagues within West Virginia University that they have established themselves in an area of expertise.

For merit considerations as associate professors, faculty members must have demonstrated evidence of sustained scholarly achievement comparable to that required for promotion to this rank. Faculty with research/scholarly activity as an area of significant contribution should demonstrate sustained competitive extramural funding at levels sufficient to maintain their scholarly endeavors.

For promotion to the rank of professor, faculty members with research/scholarly activity as an area of significant contribution must have a sustained record of outstanding achievement in scholarly activities. A track record of successes should be evident and a clear area(s) of focus should be apparent. The primary determinant for promotion to the rank of professor is national recognition of the faculty member’s research/scholarly activity. Such recognition can be documented by citations of the author's work in national/international peer-reviewed journals and invitations to speak at national/international meetings. The rank of professor is among the highest honors that the university can bestow on a faculty member and should be granted only to those who have distinguished themselves in their respective disciplines. Other factors such as consultancies, invited editorships and lectureships, and holding of professional societal offices are important elements in assessing accomplishments and the achievement of national or international recognition.

For promotion to the rank of professor, faculty members whose appointments specify reasonable contributions in research/scholarly activity must demonstrate sustained scholarly productivity in their given area of expertise.

For merit considerations as professor, faculty members must provide evidence of sustained achievements in their research and scholarly activities consistent with the nature of their appointments.

E. Service

1. Expectations for Service

The term service refers to the work that faculty members perform for the nation, state, University, School, department, and public organizations that contributes to the welfare of others. High quality service provision should be encouraged, recognized, and rewarded. Examples of service activities include but are not limited to (in alphabetical order):

a. Appointment or election to offices in professional organizations.

b. Committee or task force memberships.
i. Departmental
ii. School
iii. Institutional (e.g., hospital)
iv. University
v. Local
vi. State
vii. Regional
viii. National
ix. International

c. Consultant activities.
d. Coordination of School Continuing Education Programs.
e. Editor, editorial board, referee activities.
f. Grant reviewer for funding agencies.

   i. National agencies (e.g., NIH, NSF, American Cancer Society)
   ii. Professional organizations (e.g., AACP, AAPS, ACCP, American Chemical Society)
   iii. State organizations (e.g., WV Heart Association, WV Lung Association)
   iv. Local sources (e.g., WVU Faculty Senate Grants)

g. Mentorship of junior faculty. Participation in the mentorship of junior faculty is an activity that should be shared by all senior faculty. These faculty members should be available and willing to provide advice, guidance, and assistance to junior faculty in their teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service tasks.

h. Patient-centered care provision. The practice of pharmacy through the provision of patient-centered care is considered to be service to the School when it contributes to the overall mission of the University. Specific responsibilities of faculty in this area, if any, are defined by their department chair and Dean.

i. Presentations to lay public and community groups. Examples of presentation types include health fairs, speaking engagements, "brown bag" medication review sessions, and media presentations/interviews. When the same presentation is provided multiple times to different public or community groups, such presentations will generally be considered as service if they contribute to the overall goals and mission of the institution and are performed for no, or minimal, remuneration.

   Presentations to professional organizations should generally be considered as teaching activity (e.g., workshops or continuing education seminars, programs, discussions) or research/scholarly activity (e.g., presentation of research findings at national meetings) as most appropriate.

j. Service on graduate committees and professional student committees. This activity should be considered as either teaching or service, depending on the extent to which the committee member is involved in actual teaching of the graduate student.

k. Special project assignments from the Dean, department chair, other administrators.

l. Student advising - professional degree students, student organizations.
2. **Evaluation of Service**

   a. **Components.** The evaluation of service includes an assessment of the extent to which the activities benefit the citizens of West Virginia, the School, the University, or the profession. According to University guidelines, "service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's University affiliation identified." Several criteria as described below will be used to assess service activities.

   i. Patient-centered care provision. Criteria used to evaluate patient-centered care provision include:

      1. Evaluation of service by colleagues or others in position to observe outcomes.

      2. Development of a practice portfolio. Each year, faculty members engaged in patient-centered care provision will prepare service documentation for their personnel file that includes the following information: (1) a brief description of the types of practice-related activities provided; and (2) completion of the self-assessment form for service.

      Faculty with service as an area of significant contribution, or faculty without service as an area of significant contribution who have a relatively large percentage [30% or more] assigned to service, who provide patient-centered care should also include the following items: (1) the extent of their involvement in each type of service activity provided; (2) documentation of any patient care related innovations initiated; and (3) documentation of any assessments of patient care outcomes conducted. All of the materials in the practice portfolio should be filed in the faculty member's Service Personnel file.

      3. Scholarly publications/presentations describing service related activities. Faculty should endeavor to engage in practice-related service activities that can also be considered scholarly in nature. Evidence of the development of unique or innovative service activities can be assessed by documentation of publications/presentations resulting from such efforts.

   ii. Obtaining grants, contracts, or other extramural funding to support service activities. This includes both competitive and noncompetitive funding and is of greater significance for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution. Documentation should include the type of funding received, the agency providing the funding, the amount received, the percent effort, and a description of the faculty member's role in obtaining the funding.

   iii. Committee or task force memberships; student, resident, and fellow advising; service on graduate committees; service on hospital residency or fellowship committees; holding of professional offices; continuing education coordination; editor/referee activities; consultant activities; mentoring of junior faculty; and presentations to public and community groups.

      Faculty members should clearly indicate in their Annual Activity Report the number and extent of their contributions to various committee, task force, or other memberships; their specific advising/graduate committee activities; the professional offices held and specific responsibilities of these offices; the number and type of editor/referee and consultant activities undertaken; and for each presentation, the date and title of the talk, type of audience, and location.

   iv. Special project assignments from the Dean, department chairs, or other administrators. Special project assignments (other than those carried out as part of a committee assignment) that require a
significant amount of time and effort on the part of an individual faculty member should be briefly evaluated by the administrator(s) responsible for assigning them.

3. Promotion, Tenure and Performance-Based Salary (Merit) Considerations

All faculty members are expected to actively meet their responsibilities with regard to School and University committee assignments, student advising, and any defined patient-centered care activities. These activities are considered to represent a reasonable contribution in the area of service. In addition, faculty members are strongly encouraged to actively participate in the other types of service activities listed previously. The extent and level of service involvement (e.g., local vs. national) are generally expected to increase with increasing years served as a faculty member.

All faculty members engaged in patient-centered care provision, regardless of whether or not service is an area of significant contribution, should complete the practice portfolio as described in section 2.a. Evaluation of Service – Components, to help document this type of service activity. Faculty members may have service designated as an area of significant contribution. Significant contribution in the area of service must include high quality, valuable service provision that goes beyond those activities required of all faculty members without service as an area of significant contribution. Further definition and differentiation of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory service will be determined by each department and the Dean. It is appreciated that evaluation of the quality of service for promotion, tenure, and merit considerations can be more difficult than the evaluation of other types of efforts. In general, faculty with service as an area of significant contribution must provide more evidence of the scope and quality of their service activities than faculty without this area of significant contribution. Evaluation of these service activities will require external review. The types of materials that can be evaluated by internal and external reviewers include, but are not limited to:

a. descriptions of extramural funding received to carry out service activities.

b. the practice portfolio, which includes evidence of the type and extent of contributions to patient-centered care.

c. letters or surveys that provide evidence of the important benefits that service activities have provided to clients (analogous to student evaluations of teaching).

d. measures of attitudinal change or improved performance of clients as a result of service activities.

e. statements from informed sources in the state who, while not direct recipients of a service activity, are in a position to observe positive outcomes resulting from service activities.

f. data that allow a reasonable inference that improvements in various areas have resulted from service activities.

g. documentation of any service-related honors or awards.

h. formal annual reports of a specific service activity.

i. published manuscripts or abstracts describing service activities, service-related newsletters or monographs, and documentation of any other service contributions that resulted in recognition.

j. description of changes made in service activities that resulted from identified areas of need.
To assist faculty evaluation committees in determining service quality for faculty without service as an area of significant contribution but who still have a relatively large percentage (30% or more) assigned to service activities, some of the types of documentation listed above as applicable should also be included in their Personnel files.

It is difficult to make explicit distinctions between full-time tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution with respect to what constitutes excellence. Tenure-track faculty with service as an area of significant contribution are particularly encouraged to provide evidence of items a. and i. listed above, in addition to the other materials listed as applicable. Evaluation of the service activities of clinical assistant and assistant professors with service as an area of significant contribution must take into account the time since initial appointment and progress made since the last evaluation. For performance-based salary (merit) considerations, these individuals must demonstrate that service activities have been initiated and should document consistent efforts in the area of service. The service activities that are expected of the individual faculty member should be considered. For faculty with service as a defined area of significant contribution, the University guidelines state that “service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the state will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion purposes. While service to the university and professions are worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must have significant service activities, which can include the creation and direction of service-learning projects, directed to the citizens of West Virginia.”

For promotion to the rank of clinical associate or associate professor for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution, a sufficient quality and quantity of service activities should exist to demonstrate to internal and external reviewers that their service activities are sustained and beneficial. For performance-based salary considerations, these individuals must provide evidence of success in service activities consistent with that required for promotion to this rank.

For promotion to the rank of clinical professor or professor for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution, a sustained record of outstanding achievement and success in service activities must be evident. National recognition of the faculty member’s service activities should be apparent. For performance-based salary considerations, these individuals must provide evidence of sustained success in service activities consistent with their letter of appointment.

IV. APPOINTMENT AND CRITERIA FOR CHANGE IN RANK FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY

A. Introduction

WVU School of Pharmacy adjunct faculty assist in meeting the mission and goals of the School. These individuals typically have academic appointments in other units within WVU or are employed outside the University. As indicated in the School Bylaws, adjunct faculty may participate in faculty meetings as non-voting members. They may submit a request for voting privileges to the Dean by July 1 prior to each academic year. Such requests must be approved by a majority of the voting faculty via written ballot.

B. Initial Appointment

Adjunct faculty appointments recognize the expertise of the appointee and denote trust by the School of Pharmacy in their ability to assist with the teaching, research or service mission. Those interested in obtaining an adjunct faculty appointment must submit a curriculum vitae (and other materials if required by a specific department). Appointment requests will be forwarded to the department faculty for their review and action. The recommendation for appointment at a specific rank will be based on an assessment of the qualifications and
experience of the applicant. Written justification must be provided for applications disapproved by the department faculty. The faculty’s recommendation will be forwarded to the chair and Dean. The Dean makes the final decision regarding the appointment and rank of applicants.

The specific responsibilities of adjunct faculty will be defined in writing by the School at the time of initial appointment, with the concurrence of the individual faculty member and his/her primary employer (as appropriate). Changes in these initial responsibilities can be made with the mutual consent of the adjunct faculty member, the chair of the department of the appointment, and the Dean.

C. Criteria for Reappointment

All relevant material reflecting the performance of adjunct faculty as determined by the chair of the adjunct faculty’s department (e.g., student evaluations, annual performance reports, peer review) will be reviewed and evaluated each year by the department chair or appointee. Performance will be documented by the department prior to reappointment.

D. Criteria for Change in Rank

Adjunct faculty members holding their primary faculty appointments at other schools or universities will be granted the commensurate rank if they have been promoted at the other institution. Change in rank for adjunct faculty members who do not hold appointments at other academic institutions is based on an assessment of individual performance in teaching, service, and research/scholarly activity. These are the same areas upon which the promotion of full-time, tenure or non-tenure track faculty is based, although the specific assessment criteria differ for adjunct faculty. Usually, a change in rank is not awarded until the adjunct faculty member has held an academic rank for a period of at least five years. In order for a change in rank to occur for adjunct faculty, excellence is expected in at least one of the three academic areas, generally the area of primary responsibility to the School, with evidence demonstrated of growth/productivity in the other two areas.

Submission of documentation of an individual’s accomplishments in the three academic areas is not required until actual application for change in rank is made. However, adjunct faculty who anticipate seeking a higher academic rank at a future date are encouraged to complete a performance report annually and to provide a copy to the School as a part of their annual renewal. Furthermore, it is recommended that a portfolio be maintained that contains materials analogous to what a full- or part-time faculty member would include in their personnel files. Although these reports and the portfolio will not be formally reviewed until an actual change in rank is requested, it will facilitate the documentation process for the faculty member seeking change in rank as well as the assessment process for the relevant Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee. Adjunct faculty can also request a review of their credentials prior to seeking change in rank to receive feedback and suggestions for improvement. Criteria that may be used for assessment of the three academic areas can be found under the pertinent subsections of part III.

E. Process for Consideration of a Change in Rank

Adjunct faculty who wish to be considered for a change in rank should notify the chair of the department in which they hold their adjunct appointment. The Chair will then notify the appropriate Departmental Evaluation Committee in writing of the intent of the adjunct faculty to do so, indicating their defined area of excellence and the rank for which they are applying. Nomination of a faculty member for a change in rank can also be undertaken by their immediate supervisor at their place of employment or by full-time faculty at the School. Notification of the desire for a change in rank must be made no later than July 1 prior to the year in which the change in rank would become effective. Submission of documentation of individual accomplishments in the three areas of university concern, described above, and a current curriculum vitae must be received by the
chair of the adjunct faculty member's department no later than January 1 of the year during which the proposed change in rank is to be made. The Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee must have access to the most recent description of the individual's defined responsibilities to the School and any previous review of a request for change in rank. A written recommendation for approval or disapproval will be forwarded to the chair of the department, the School-wide Evaluation Committee, and the Dean for their review and action.