

**Faculty Review Guidelines**  
**College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences**  
**Revised 12/18/14, Approved by CPASS Faculty 1/9/15**  
**Approved by the Provost's Office 06/24/15**

Note: These guidelines are effective immediately and will be used starting with the 2015-16 review cycle. All sections within the CPASS guidelines in quotations "" have been copied verbatim from the WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure 2014-15.

1. The Purpose of Faculty Evaluation
  - a. The primary purpose of faculty evaluation in the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences is to determine the degree to which individual faculty members contribute to the College's mission areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The second purpose of the evaluation process is "to help faculty members achieve a higher level of quality productivity." The College's evaluation process functions within the University's evaluation process and shall contribute to decisions concerning salary increases, retention, promotion, and tenure which ultimately affect the fulfillment of the College's mission.
  - b. The College's faculty evaluation process is designed to assess each faculty member's performance according to the stated expectations in each mission area according to an individual's letter of appointment or subsequent documents.
  - c. According to the West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, "The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and the university and is both evaluative and developmental." Further, the annual evaluation is "both formative and summative... not limited to events of the immediately-previous one-year period," but also is "a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed."
  - d. Once tenure has been awarded, "post-tenure review occurs as part of the annual review process. These reviews can support subsequent promotion in rank and the salary enhancement for continued academic achievement. They might also lead to a more rigorous review process which could result in a remediation plan, as determined by the unit."
2. Evaluation Calendar
  - a. The faculty evaluation calendar and deadlines published by the Provost's Office are observed by the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences.
3. Faculty Review Committee
  - a. The College-wide Faculty Review Committee is vested with the responsibility of peer review and functions in lieu of departmental evaluation committees. The committee consists of five tenured faculty members at the rank of associate professor or above who are not active candidates for promotion who function as voting members, an ex-officio non-voting affirmative action officer, and other ex-officio non-voting members appointed by the Dean. The Assistant/Associate Dean shall serve as the affirmative action liaison to the committee who will have the responsibility of monitoring the evaluation process to assure that women and minorities are fairly reviewed, and that evaluations are not arbitrary and/or capricious.

- b. The election process for voting members of the Faculty Review Committee is as follows:
    - i. The Dean shall hold a yearly “at-large” election of eligible faculty. All non-administrative full-time faculty in the College will vote for up to the number of open seats. The highest vote recipients corresponding to the number of open seats shall be declared elected, though no more than three faculty members shall serve in any year from any one department, and no more than two from any one discipline. If any continuing member is unable to complete the second year of a term, the next highest vote recipient shall fill the unexpired term and will not be eligible for reelection the following year. Since peer review is a collegial responsibility in an academic community only extraordinary circumstances (e.g., sabbatical, leave of absence) shall exempt eligible faculty from standing for election or for serving a complete term.
    - ii. The following conditions also apply:
      - (1) Elected committee members shall serve a term of two years, elected for staggered terms (two seats elected one year, three seats elected the following year).
      - (2) The elected faculty members may not succeed themselves through reelection for one year.
      - (3) The chair of the committee shall be selected by committee members at the first committee meeting. The chair must be a voting member of the committee and hold the rank of associate or full professor.
4. Faculty Workload Plan (FWoP)
- a. The Department Chair meets annually with each faculty member to discuss a faculty workload plan. This yearly agreement identifies each faculty member’s activities and outcomes across teaching, service, and/or research. Areas of significant contribution for promotion and/or tenure are governed by the appointment letter, unless modified in a subsequent document authorized by the Provost’s Office.
  - b. The faculty member’s activities in the mission areas of research/creative activity, teaching, and service are evaluated annually by a representative of the Dean’s Office and by the Faculty Review Committee according to the FWoP. Specifically, the files of untenured and/or unpromoted faculty are reviewed at four levels (FRC, Chair, Assistant/Associate Dean, and Dean). All other faculty files are reviewed at three levels (FRC, Chair, and Assistant/Associate Dean). The Dean provides a composite review for any faculty during a critical year. The results of those yearly evaluations are used in promotion/tenure decisions and in merit-based salary enhancement recommendations.
  - c. FWOps for each subsequent year must be submitted in draft form to the Department Chair by November 1<sup>st</sup> and agreed upon by the Dean’s Office by November 15<sup>th</sup>. Current year workload plans may be revised and re-discussed by December 1<sup>st</sup> and approved by December 15<sup>th</sup>. If revised and re-discussed FWOps are not approved by the Chair by December 15<sup>th</sup>, 4:45 PM, the previously approved FWoP applies.

- d. Failure to have an approved FWoP by November 15 will result in the Dean or his/her designee assigning a workload plan on December 1. This plan shall then be signed by the Dean, the Assistant/Associate Dean, and the Department Chair and it shall become the official Memorandum of Understanding defining the faculty member's effort for CPASS for the following calendar year.

#### 5. Evaluation File

- a. For purposes of annual review, a file of materials relevant only to activities in the calendar year being reviewed should be prepared (January 1 - December 31). This calendar year file will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file, which includes materials covering preceding years. In addition to the current year's materials, a representative of the Dean's Office shall include copies of all previous evaluations from the time of appointment or from the date of the last promotion, whichever is more recent.
- b. Faculty in their critical year or faculty being considered for promotion shall include materials for the last five calendar years or from the last promotion, whichever is more recent.
- c. Materials other than those relevant to the current year's evaluation should *not* be discarded. These cumulative files will be maintained by the Dean's Office so they will be available during evaluations which cover more than one year.
- d. It is essential that the evaluation file format be diligently followed.
- e. The Faculty Evaluation File must include items listed in Section VII in the University document. To facilitate this, the following format for the evaluation file will be **required**:
  - i. Folder to include vitae and signed faculty workload plan (FWoP).
  - ii. Folder for evidence in research/creative activity.
  - iii. Folder for evidence in teaching, including a record of classes taught for fall and spring only.
  - iv. Folder for evidence in service.
  - v. A narrative that briefly addresses research, teaching, and service. This narrative should offer explanatory notes that clarify the value and nature of the evidence.
  - vi. External evaluations, when appropriate.
  - vii. A numbered inventory for each folder submitted.
- f. A numbered inventory must be included in each folder listing the items of evidence contained therein. The first elements of the numbered inventory in each folder shall be pasted in from the FWoP, and the first pieces of evidence contained in the folder shall correspond to the FWoP items. These inventories will be used by the Dean's Office to verify the contents and integrity of the evaluation file as required by the Provost's Office. They will also be used by the Faculty Review Committee as a summary of productivity in evaluating faculty.
- g. The Faculty Review Committee and the Dean's Office will conduct evaluations on the basis of evidence in the evaluation file. If there is no evidence in the file the Committee and the Dean's Office will assume there was no productivity in a given area, and a rating of unsatisfactory will be assigned to that area.
- h. A chronological inventory shall be maintained for each faculty member's evaluation file by the Dean or by the Dean's designee. The purpose of this

inventory is to maintain the integrity of the evaluation file. This requirement will be met in the following ways:

- i. Faculty members have the right to access their files at any time during regular work hours without giving reasons.
- ii. The Dean's Office will maintain a log which will monitor access to confidential evaluation files. Files can only be removed or reviewed on a "need-to-know" basis (e.g., the Dean, Assistant/Associate Dean, Department Chairs, members of the Faculty Review Committee, etc.). Anyone removing a file must sign out on a log provided according to format which includes:
  - (1) Name
  - (2) Date Out
  - (3) Date In
- iii. The Dean's Office will audit file contents on or about January 1 of each year to verify its contents and to assure its integrity. At this time the files will be closed until the completion of the reviews. The Dean's Office will use the numbered inventory of each evidence folder to conduct the audit.
- iv. Responses by faculty members to previous annual reviews may be added to the file within two weeks of receiving written documentation of the annual review. Errors of fact found in evaluations should normally be corrected by the Department Chair with an additional memo to the file. The faculty member has the right to ask the Dean to review the descriptors ("Unsatisfactory", "Satisfactory", "Good" or "Excellent") used in the evaluations by the Committee, Assistant/Associate Dean or Department Chair. The Dean may choose whether or not to ask the Committee, Assistant/Associate Dean or Department Chair to reconsider their evaluation. Any subsequent adjustments to evaluations would be documented in an additional memo to the file.

6. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

- a. The College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences uses the criteria for promotion and tenure adopted by the University found in Section X of the University Guidelines.
- b. These guidelines define significant contributions in teaching as "those that meet or exceed those of peers recently (normally within the last two year-year period) achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at WVU".
- c. These guidelines define significant contributions in research as "performance which meets or exceeds that of peers who recently (normally within the immediate previous two year-year period) achieved similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at peer or aspirational peer research universities and at WVU".
- d. For promotion to the rank of professor, according to Section VI of the WVU Guidelines, "special weight will normally be placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period." Additionally, these guidelines suggest that those promoted to the rank of professor will be a "distinguished authority" in his/her field and hold a national and/or international reputation for their work.

Finally, according to WVU Guidelines, a professor “sustains high levels of performance in his/her assignments and responsibilities in all mission areas” and also must have shown “evidence of high-quality productivity over an extended period of time”.

7. External Reviews
  - a. The College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences uses the process outlined by the University Guidelines, Section X.
  - b. Names and materials from the Faculty Review Committee and from the faculty member must be in the Dean’s Office by **September 10** in order to solicit and receive external reviews by the time the file is closed on **January 1**.
8. Classifications of Faculty
  - a. The University Guidelines define classifications for faculty positions in Section IX, B. The College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences follows those guidelines.
9. Criteria for Evaluation
  - a. The following criteria are adopted by the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences as an elaboration of the criteria found in Section X of the University’s Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.
  - b. Research/Creative Activity
    - i. Faculty who have research/creative activity as an area of significant contribution will normally be required to produce outcomes in one or more of the following categories: publications in national or international peer reviewed research journals, adjudicated research presentations at national and international meetings, and books, computer software, book chapters primarily intended for a research audience, or securing external funding to support research/creative activities. **Of these categories, the greatest weight will be placed on evidence supporting a critical mass of quality peer reviewed publications.** Evidence in these categories will be necessary to demonstrate an ongoing program of research within the faculty member’s area of expertise throughout the evaluation period. When the number of publications is low it will be incumbent upon the faculty to demonstrate a singular and substantial impact of that research on the field. Additionally, according to WVU guidelines “entrepreneurial and commercialization activities related to intellectual property and patents, which benefit the university, also demonstrate scholarly output.” These contributions could result from activities either as a principal investigator in a research project or as a member of a research team.
    - ii. Interdisciplinary work is encouraged. Within collaborative projects where faculty are not the first author or principal investigator, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to clarify their contribution on those projects in their annual narrative. When not first author, faculty are encouraged to indicate when they are Senior Author with colleagues or students. Additionally, faculty are encouraged to indicate when they are the lead author (or investigator) from WVU on a multi-institution manuscript or grant.
    - iii. **Faculty are also encouraged to document or discuss journal quality (e.g., impact factor, acceptance rates) in their narratives.**

- iv. Faculty who have research/creative activity as an area of reasonable contribution will normally be required to produce outcomes in one or more of the following categories: publications in regional or national peer reviewed journals whose readership may be researchers or practitioners, peer reviewed presentations at regional or national conferences whose audience is either researchers or practitioners, and books, computer software, or book chapters intended for an audience of researchers or practitioners.
- c. Teaching
- i. All faculty in the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences will have teaching as an area of significant contribution. Teaching will be evaluated on the basis of both quantity and quality. Quantity of instruction may be measured by the following: number of credit hours taught in lecture or laboratory courses involving in-class instruction, number of student credit hours produced in such courses, and/or actual assigned student contact time invested in instruction in laboratory, classroom, seminar, internship, or thesis and dissertation direction. However, a faculty member whose assignment requires less teaching will not be penalized.
  - ii. The quality of instruction shall be evaluated through multiple methods. Each faculty shall have students evaluate the majority of courses taught using the Faculty Senate Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). In addition, other forms of evidence may be examined: reports of observations of instruction by colleagues, other forms of student evaluations of instruction, evidence of student outcomes such as fulfillment of course objectives, and instructional materials including texts, laboratory manuals, audio-visual aids, research to support teaching effectiveness, and computer-based instructional software. Successful innovation in instruction shall be considered as evidence of quality. Promotion and tenure will require demonstrations of both quantity of instruction as well as quality; multiple forms of evidence will be necessary to establish quality of instruction. Faculty are highly encouraged to have all classes evaluated.
  - iii. Academic program advising is a part of the teaching load and shall also be evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantity may be assessed by numbers of undergraduate advisees, and the number of graduate advisees in which the faculty member serves as committee chair. Quality may be assessed using a college-approved advising assessment instrument, or by other documents which demonstrate advising effectiveness.
  - iv. Each year, the recipient of the “outstanding teacher of the year award” in CPASS will be supported by Dean’s Office to apply for the WVU Foundation Outstanding Teacher of the Year at the university level the subsequent year. The Faculty Review Committee will rank order the top two candidates for the WVU Foundation Outstanding Teacher Award and forward to the Dean’s Office. The Dean’s Office will support the top candidate who meets the qualifications for the award and decides to apply.

- d. Service
    - i. According to University Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, all service activities must be clearly identified as within the individual's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with one's university affiliation identified. When such qualifications are not obvious from the nature of evidence included in the service portion of the file, accompanying evidence must be attached to clarify the faculty's role in the service activity.
    - ii. For faculty for whom service is an area of significant contribution, outreach activities and work products which benefit the citizens of West Virginia and which are clearly beyond the scope of normal committee work expected of all faculty members will be required. Service at regional and/or national levels or to professional organizations may also be valuable for these faculty provided such contributions are clearly exceptional in quantity and quality. Both the quantity and quality of all such service activities will be required for promotion and tenure consideration.
    - iii. For faculty for whom service is an area of at least reasonable contribution, service to the University, state, region, nation and/or professional associations will be expected. Evidence of consistent and meaningful engagement in such activities will be required throughout the course of the evaluation period.
10. Review Process
- a. A two-phase evaluation process is utilized. Phase I involves an assessment of faculty against each individual's faculty workload plan (FWoP). Thus, Phase I focuses on a specific calendar year evaluation. All faculty, including those not tenured or fully promoted, as well as non-tenure track clinical faculty, and tenured, fully promoted faculty, are evaluated in Phase I.
  - b. Phase II involves the promotion and tenure evaluation process which is based on criteria established by the Board of Governors, the Provost's office, and these guidelines. Phase II is conducted for all faculty, regardless of rank.
  - c. Phase I
    - i. In Phase I, the approved FWoP itself serves as the criteria for evaluation and must reflect a faculty member's areas of significant contribution in a given calendar year.
    - ii. Evaluations will be based on evidence of activities and outcomes within the FWoP in all areas of contribution. These evaluations will be based on both the quality and quantity of activities and outcomes documented in the file that occurred in the specific year noted on the FWoP.
    - iii. The committee will write a recommendation supporting one of the following categories **for each area**: 1) Unsatisfactory: did not meet the workload plan in quantity and/or quality; 2) Satisfactory: met workload plan with acceptable quality; 3) Good: exceeded workload plan in quantity and/or quality; and 4) Excellent: substantially exceeded workload plan in quantity and/or quality.

- d. Phase II
  - i. For those involved in the Phase II evaluations who are not being considered for promotion or tenure in the current calendar year, the recommendation of the Committee concerns the answer to one or both of the following questions:
    - (1) Did this faculty member make adequate progress toward tenure during the current review period? and/or
    - (2) Did this faculty member make adequate progress toward promotion or the next appropriate action during the current review period?
  - ii. For those faculty involved in the Phase II evaluation who are in their critical year or who are being considered for a discretionary promotion, the recommendation of the Committee concerns one or both of the following questions:
    - (1) Is this faculty member promotable? and/or
    - (2) Is this faculty member tenurable? Positive answers to these questions shall be based on a preponderance of ratings above satisfactory in the areas of significant contribution and ratings of at least satisfactory in the area of at least reasonable contribution during the period of evaluation, as well as on expectations as stated in the various guidelines. Phase II evaluations “pay particular attention to one’s cumulative progress toward and expectations for tenure or the next promotion.”