

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES  
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE,  
AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES**

**Approved 7.15.2020**

**Table of Contents**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. APPOINTMENT LETTERS AND ASSIGNMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A. Tenure-Track Faculty.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Teaching Faculty .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C. Service Faculty .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>D. Research Faculty .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>E. Other Faculty .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Visiting Faculty .....	5
2. Lecturers .....	6
3. Senior Lecturers .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. Adjunct Faculty .....	6
<b>III. ANNUAL WORKLOAD PLAN .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>A. Annual Review and Planning Process.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>B. Departures from the Appointment Letter .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>C. Workloads During Sabbatical Leaves and Professional Development Programs.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>D. Parental and Alternative Work Assignments .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV. FACULTY EVALUATION DOCUMENTS &amp; DIGITAL MEASURES.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>A. General Information .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>B. Teaching .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>C. Scholarship/Research.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>D. Service.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>E. Archived Reports and Documents.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>F. Administrative Procedures and Security .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>V. THE DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>A. Composition .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>B. Recusal.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>C. Verification of Committee Votes and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>D. Electronic versus In-Person Participation .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VI. COLLEGE-LEVEL EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>A. Composition of the College Committee.....</b>	<b>16</b>

B.	Committee Procedures.....	16
C.	Recusal.....	16
D.	Electronic versus In-Person Participation .....	17
E.	Role of the Dean .....	17
<b>VII.</b>	<b>THE EVALUATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
A.	General Standards .....	18
B.	Annual Evaluation.....	19
1.	Annual Evaluation of Faculty at the Rank of Professor.....	19
2.	Faculty with Externally-funded Research Expectations.....	20
C.	Cumulative Pre-Promotion Evaluation.....	20
D.	Career Evaluation and Standards for Promotion or Tenure.....	20
1.	Tenure-Track Faculty.....	21
2.	Teaching Faculty.....	21
3.	Service Faculty .....	22
E.	Evaluation for Emeritus Status .....	23
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>REBUTTALS AND RESPONSES TO FACULTY EVALUATIONS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
A.	Rebuttals.....	24
B.	Responses .....	24
<b>IX.</b>	<b>EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
A.	Evaluator Qualifications .....	25
B.	Faculty Member’s Feedback.....	26
C.	Chair’s Proposed List of Evaluators and Letter of Invitation .....	26
D.	Dean’s Review and Approval .....	26
E.	Final Departmental Procedures .....	26
<b>X.</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT .....</b>	<b>29</b>

## I. INTRODUCTION

These *Guidelines* complement the [West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure](#). The *Guidelines* are designed to direct departmental procedures, establish college-wide standards and conventions, and codify the procedures to be followed in conducting college-level evaluations. College- and department-level evaluations must conform to the policies and procedures promulgated by West Virginia University (WVU) and its Board of Governors.

Therefore, faculty members, department- and college-level Faculty Evaluation Committees, Department Chairs, and the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services must familiarize themselves with the contents of these *Guidelines*, the *WVU Procedures* document, relevant policies of the Board of Governors, and departmental guidelines approved by the Dean and the Provost.

In putting the general standards of the university- and college-level documents into practice, departments may impose standards that are more stringent than those required at either the university or college level.

The evaluation process is intended to promote faculty development and achievement, clarify faculty goals, inform annual assignments that reflect the short- and long-term vision of the department, and provide consistent and clear criteria for performance-based salary increases and for promotion and/or tenure recommendations, as applicable. The process is both evaluative and developmental.

Annual evaluations are conducted at the department level and, when action is recommended (promotion, tenure, cumulative pre-promotion review, termination of appointment, or non-renewal of appointment), at the College and University levels. Several components are considered in the faculty evaluation process. Included among them are:

- the appointment letter and subsequent memoranda of understanding;
- annual workload plans and percentages;
- the Faculty Evaluation File, including the faculty member's productivity reports and relevant documentation;
- performance evaluations made at lower levels in the faculty evaluation process;
- performance evaluations from previous years, including documentation of previous promotion and/or tenure decisions, as applicable; and
- responses and rebuttals to previous evaluations.

## II. APPOINTMENT LETTERS AND ASSIGNMENTS

This section specifies the types of faculty roles in the College and how the expectations for an individual faculty member are to be documented. These procedures do not nullify or negate existing, documented agreements specifying a faculty member's expectations that were in place prior to the approval of these *Guidelines*.

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment normally allocated to teaching, research, and service. The expectations and percentages differ depending on the category of the faculty appointment. Each percentage expresses the value placed on the activity and not necessarily the time or effort devoted to it.

Each faculty member's appointment letter defines the specific expectations for their position in research, teaching, and service, as appropriate given the faculty member's areas of contribution. These expectations can be modified by an officially approved amendment to the appointment letter or a memorandum of understanding. Such modifications should be issued in the event of a significant and relatively permanent change to a faculty member's expectations, including changes in programs or departments. This amending document is also expected when a faculty member, upon achieving tenure, opts to change their areas of significant contribution, through the process outlined in Section XI of the WVU *Procedures* document. In general, the appointment letter or memorandum of understanding should be periodically reviewed, including upon promotion and/or tenure, to determine if modifications are warranted. The most recent appointment letter and/or memorandum of understanding supersedes all prior letters and should be used for making decisions on promotion and/or tenure.

Tenure-Track<sup>1</sup>, Teaching, Service, and Research faculty positions are promotable. In such cases, the appointment letter identifies the areas of significant contribution in which meritorious performance is required as well as the timeline for promotion. In some cases, the letter may give an individual with previous relevant experience (normally in a similar position) the option to count achievements at their previous institution toward promotion at WVU.

### A. Tenure-Track Faculty

For Tenure-Track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40 percent teaching, 40 percent research, and 20 percent service. Regardless of percentages, Tenure-Track faculty members normally are expected to make significant contributions in teaching and research and at least reasonable contributions in service.

The College authorizes Tenure-Track faculty positions when an ongoing need for instruction and scholarship is anticipated. Under normal circumstances, the initial appointment is probationary—that is, without an award of tenure. The letter of appointment (offer letter) identifies the Critical Year (normally the sixth year at WVU) and any options to advance the Critical Year. In some cases, the letter may allow an individual with previous relevant experience (normally in a similar position) the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure (up to three years credit). This option must be exercised by the faculty member in a timely manner, according to the terms of the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded at the end of the Critical Year, a terminal contract is offered for the next year.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, the term "tenure-track" includes tenured faculty members as well as probationary faculty members in a tenurable position.

Initial Tenure-Track appointments normally are made at the rank of Assistant Professor and normally require a terminal degree in a relevant field. The newly hired individual is required to submit proof of the terminal degree before the start date. If the individual has not completed all requirements for the terminal degree by the start date, the position may revert to that of a Visiting Assistant Professor, with no credit toward tenure, for one year. If all requirements for conferral of the doctoral degree are not met within the next several months (with the exact date specified in the letter, normally December 31 for an appointment that begins at the start of the academic year), the Department and College will have the option of not renewing the appointment after the initial academic year. In such a case, the tenure-track Assistant Professor position will have to be re-advertised. The previously hired individual may re-apply for the tenure-track position but cannot be guaranteed that they will be re-selected.

Probationary faculty members are required to have a cumulative pre-promotion review, normally conducted two or three years before the Critical Year, to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. This review normally is conducted by the departmental evaluation committee and the department chair for advisory purposes. However, cumulative pre-promotion reviews will proceed through all college levels (including college committee) for individuals who have received prior annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory in any category. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the areas of significant contribution or in fulfilling specific expectations in the letter of appointment may lead to the non-renewal of the contract prior to the Critical Year. If a recommendation for the issuance of a terminal contract is made at the department level, the file would be sent to the college evaluation committee and the Dean of CEHS for further review and/or action.

Occasionally an appointment with tenure is possible. This is most likely when an individual is recruited for a senior administrative position or for a named professorship. An appointment with tenure must be supported by the Dean and approved by the Provost's Office.

## **B. Teaching Faculty**

The *WVU Procedures* document describes faculty appointments with the prefix “teaching” as renewable term appointments (also see [BOG Faculty Rule 4.2. – Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Dismissal for Cause](#)) in which the principal assignment is instructional (normally at least 80%) and the balance of the assignment depends on the needs of the department and the interests of the faculty member. In the College of Education and Human Services, the assignment normally is defined as at least 80 percent teaching and at least 5 percent service. (Historically, most Teaching faculty members in CEHS have been assigned 80 percent teaching and 20 percent service.) At 1.0 FTE, an 80 percent teaching load is eight courses (or equivalent in consultation with departmental policy) per nine-month academic year.

The College authorizes Teaching faculty positions when an ongoing need for instruction is anticipated. The initial term of a Teaching appointment is normally one year. Upon satisfactory completion of the initial term, reappointment may be for one, two, or three years. There is no limit on the number of terms.

A Teaching faculty member with a master's degree is eligible for the rank of Instructor (formally, “Teaching Instructor”). A terminal degree in the relevant discipline—normally a doctoral degree, but sometimes a master's degree—is required for professorial rank (e.g., Teaching Assistant Professor). The Dean may grant an exception to this, where significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal

degree. An individual appointed initially as a Teaching Instructor may be promoted to Teaching Assistant Professor if the individual holds a relevant terminal degree (or approved substitute) at the time of promotion (and meets the other criteria for promotion).

Although Teaching positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion (i.e., Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor). Requests for promotion review are at the discretion of the faculty member and ordinarily are made after at least five years at the current rank. To be promoted, significant contributions are required in the area of teaching and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other areas of assignment.

Because promotion of Teaching faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory, although suggested. As noted in Section IV.E of these *Guidelines*, however, departments provide such reviews upon request, so that Teaching faculty members can obtain the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

### **C. Service Faculty**

The prefix "Service" is applied to faculty who have a primary assignment in service with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. In the College of Education and Human Services, Service normally constitutes at least 50 percent of the assignment and the remainder is in teaching and, in some cases, research. The College authorizes Service faculty positions when an ongoing need for service and instruction is anticipated. The initial term of a Service appointment is normally one year. Upon satisfactory completion of the initial term, reappointment may be for one, two, or three years. There is no limit on the number of terms.

A Service faculty member with a master's degree is eligible for the rank of Instructor (formally, "Service Instructor"). A terminal degree in the relevant discipline—normally a doctoral degree, but sometimes a master's degree—is required for professorial rank (e.g., Service Assistant Professor). The Dean may grant an exception to this, where significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree. An individual appointed initially as a Service Instructor may be promoted to Service Assistant Professor if the individual holds a relevant terminal degree (or approved substitute) at the time of promotion (and meets the other criteria for promotion).

Although Service positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion (i.e., Service Assistant Professor, Service Associate Professor, and Service Professor). Requests for promotion review are at the discretion of the faculty member and ordinarily are made after at least five years at the current rank.

Because promotion of Service faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory, although suggested. As noted in Section IV.E of these *Guidelines*, however, departments provide such reviews upon request, so that Service faculty members can obtain the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

### **D. Research Faculty**

The primary focus of a Research faculty appointment is engagement as the principal investigator in externally funded research. A Research faculty assignment may be 100 percent research. Alternatively, a portion of the assignment may be allocated to teaching and/or service. In accordance with [BOG Faculty Rule 4.2.](#), classroom instruction and/or other assignments

must be secondary. If teaching is part of the assignment, it must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. Except for the salary associated with teaching, the salary of Research faculty appointments may be fully or partially supported by institutional funds at the outset and include a timeline for becoming self-supporting through external funds (normally after two or three years). Because the salaries of Research faculty members are contingent on external funding, they are not considered “permanent” faculty members for the purposes of these *Guidelines*.

Individuals with a terminal degree are eligible for a professorial rank (e.g., “Research Assistant Professor”). It is unlikely that an individual without a terminal degree would be appointed to a Research faculty position.

Although Research positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion (i.e., Research Associate Professor and Research Professor). Requests for promotion review are at the discretion of the faculty member and ordinarily are made after at least five years at the current rank. In addition to a terminal degree, significant contributions are required in the area of research and at least reasonable contributions in other assigned areas (if applicable).

Because promotion of Research faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory. As noted in Section IV.E of these *Guidelines*, however, departments provide such reviews upon request, so that Research faculty members can obtain the department’s detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

## **E. Other Faculty<sup>2</sup>**

The College of Education and Human Services has several additional categories of faculty. Some are appointed to meet short-term instructional needs without anticipating a long-term commitment; these include Visiting faculty, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers. None of these temporary, non-Tenure-Track positions are eligible for promotion. The last category consists of Adjunct faculty who hold courtesy appointment without salary.

### **1. Visiting Faculty**

Visiting faculty appointments normally are limited to a total of three years. At 1.0 FTE, a Visiting appointment normally carries a teaching load of six courses (or equivalent) per nine-month academic year. This assignment is intended to allow time for scholarship so that the Visiting faculty member may be competitive for a permanent academic position at the end of the appointment. A Visiting faculty member may, at any time during or after the appointment, apply for a permanent faculty position at WVU (or elsewhere) if one is posted, but a Visiting appointment per se is not a prelude to a permanent position and entails no promise of such a position.

A Visiting faculty member with a master’s degree is eligible for the rank of Instructor (formally, “Visiting Instructor”). A terminal degree in a relevant discipline – normally a doctoral degree, but sometimes a master’s degree – is required for professorial rank (e.g., Visiting Assistant Professor).

---

<sup>2</sup> Employees categorized as “FEAPs” – Faculty Equivalent/Academic Professionals – their appointments, evaluation, promotion, etc., are not covered by the present document.

## 2. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer positions are renewable part-time teaching appointments. Lecturers are hired to address teaching needs in a particular semester or year. Compensation is defined on a per course basis, normally not to exceed .80 FTE – four courses or the equivalent per semester.

The appointment requires a minimum of a master's degree. Lecturers without a proven record of teaching ability at WVU are normally offered only single-semester appointments. Lecturers for whom there is confirmed expectation of employment across the year at six courses or greater (3:3 or 4:2), should be offered benefits-eligible appointments.

Appointment letters for benefits-eligible Lecturers come from the Dean. Letters for one-semester assignments come from the Chair, following approval in the Office of the Dean.

Departments may periodically post requirements for potential Lecturer needs. Applications are accepted at any time.

## 3. Adjunct Faculty

According to [BOG Faculty Rule 4.6 – Adjunct Faculty](#), the term “Adjunct” may be applied to paid, part-time faculty members or unpaid volunteers with a courtesy title. Adjunct faculty appointments are made by the Dean at the request of the Department Chair.

The Chair

- attests that the candidate for an Adjunct appointment has the support of the department's faculty,
- summarizes the candidate's qualifications and anticipated contributions to the department,
- provides a copy of the candidate's vita, and
- proposes a rank for the candidate (e.g., “Adjunct Assistant Professor”).

If the request is granted, the Dean appoints the candidate to a three-year term that can be renewed at the request of the Department Chair. There is no limit on the number of terms.



### **III. ANNUAL WORKLOAD PLAN**

#### **A. Annual Review and Planning Process**

Annual faculty assignments are documented in the annual Workload Plan and recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual Workload Plans reflect collaborative discussion between the faculty member and the Department Chair in which they review progress and set goals and expectations for the period covered in the next annual evaluation. Faculty members in the Tenure-Track, Teaching, Service, and Research categories must participate in this formal process of review and planning, with the result being a Workload Plan signed by the faculty member and the Department Chair and submitted to the Office of the Dean for final approval.

#### **B. Departures from the Appointment Letter**

The percentage allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter as described in Section II above. Annual percentages may be adjusted in accord with local circumstances and documented in the annual Workload Plan.

If a temporary (i.e., per year) reallocation of effort is warranted, the Dean typically affords the Department Chair the discretion to make a change of 10 percentage points (e.g., from 40 in teaching, 40 in research, 20 in service to 30 in teaching, 50 in research, 20 in service). Reallocation of more than 10 percentage points requires the written approval of the Dean.

A common reason for reallocating effort from service or teaching to research, although not the only one, is receipt of significant external research funding. If the Department Chair believes that the reallocation should exceed 10 percentage points, the Dean normally will require a buyout using external funds, with the cost calculated according to college policy.

Another common reason for reallocating effort is the granting of a sabbatical leave or a professional development program, as described below.

The WVU Faculty Constitution (Section IV.6) obligates the Dean to reallocate effort from teaching and research to service when a faculty member is Chair or Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate.

If a change in percentage is to be maintained on a more-or-less permanent basis, the change should be recorded in a memorandum of understanding. Normally the memorandum is prepared in the Office of the Dean based on input from the Department Chair and faculty member and is signed by the Dean and the faculty member.

Regardless of percentages, expectations for promotion and tenure remain as described in the appointment letter or memorandum of understanding unless formal approval is granted for a change in areas of significant contribution. The process for changing areas of significant contribution is described in Section XI of the WVU *Procedures* document and requires approval by both the Dean and the Provost. In the case of Tenure-Track faculty members, a change in areas of significant contribution can be considered only after tenure is awarded.

#### **C. Workloads During Sabbatical Leaves**

For faculty members approved for a sabbatical leave or other faculty development programs supported by the University's Office of the Provost, the approved application and plan together

constitute an agreement temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the period of the leave or program.

Sabbatical leave assignments are negotiated between the faculty member and the department chair. Commonly, a sabbatical leave would be considered a 100-percent research assignment for the duration of the leave. However, assignments may vary depending on the specific goals of the sabbatical leave application.

The percentages reported in the annual Workload Plan depend on the duration of the leave or program. The percentages are simple in full-year cases: for example, 100 percent research in the case of a sabbatical leave. The arithmetic is slightly more complex in 1-semester cases. For example, a Tenure-Track faculty member's percentages might be 0 in teaching, 100 in research, and 0 in service during a one-semester sabbatical leave, and 40 in teaching, 40 in research, and 20 in service in the non-leave semester. Averaging the 2 semesters would yield annual percentages of 20 in teaching, 70 in research, and 10 in service. Similar calculations apply in other cases. In general, the annual percentages should add up to 100 and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on a leave or program. In the case of a professional development program in which the assignment does not fall into research, teaching, or service, the percentages would be based on the portion of the review period not on the program.

#### **D. Parental and Alternative Work Assignments**

The University offers work-life policies and procedures that promote flexibility for certain full-time Tenure-Track and non-Tenure-Track faculty members who are dealing with certain personal, parental, or professional responsibilities; see [BOG Faculty Rule 4.5 - Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty: Extension of the Tenure Clock](#).<sup>3</sup>

The Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty normally results in a release from, or modification of, traditional teaching duties to accommodate the birth, adoption, or guardianship of a child without salary reduction.

The Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty is also available to accommodate serious circumstances – for example, illness of the faculty member or a member of the immediate family, care of an elderly parent, or some other serious but unforeseen circumstance – without salary reduction.

With a Modification of Duties, the approved assignment temporarily replaces the effort normally assigned to traditional teaching duties during the semester in which the event occurs so that the percentages reported in the annual Workload Plan remain at 100 percent.

In terms of annual evaluations, the faculty member is not penalized because the quantity of teaching decreased during the year. The evaluation focuses on the quality of the assigned teaching for the year under review. A similar approach is taken with regard to research and service: The evaluations focus on the quality, not the quantity, of the faculty member's research or service for the year under review.

---

<sup>3</sup> BOG Faculty Rule 4.5 is the rewriting of former BOG Policy 51 as of 2018.

Probationary tenure-track faculty members who use the Modification of Duties qualify for an extension of their Critical Year per procedures from the Office of the Provost (see also Section VII.D.1.a of these *Guidelines*).

#### **IV. FACULTY EVALUATION DOCUMENTS & DIGITAL MEASURES**

Faculty members are responsible for reporting and documenting their achievements in teaching, research, and service electronically in the Digital Measures platform. A general overview of Digital Measures, including access, entry and reporting, can be accessed [here](#). It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide evidence in Digital Measures that (a) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (b) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work.

Digital Measures is open and available for additions throughout the calendar year and faculty members are encouraged to enter evidence of work accomplishments on an on-going basis. For purposes of annual evaluation, additions to Digital Measures are closed for the review period on the department-specified deadline date. For purposes of evaluations for promotion or tenure, additions to Digital Measures closes on the last business day of the calendar year. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process may be added to Digital Measures after it is closed.

If work at a previous institution is credited towards tenure or promotion at WVU, the faculty member includes evidence in Digital Measures of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at WVU. Such evidence might not be taken into consideration in the initial annual evaluations, but it is likely to be important in the cumulative pre-promotion evaluation and certain to be important in the career evaluation in which tenure and/or promotion is being considered.

Faculty content in Digital Measures is structured in five activity groups (1) General Information, (2) Teaching, (3) Scholarship/Research, (4) Service, and (5) Archived Reports and Documents. The teaching, research, and service activity groups include documentation for each respective area of contribution. In most cases, the faculty member is responsible for providing the documentation for each category with the exception of Student Evaluations of Instruction which are centrally loaded into Digital Measures. Administrative Data, including documents such as initial appointment letters, critical year letters, and intent to renew appointment letters, are generally uploaded by administrative staff.

##### **A. General Information**

Faculty document and keep current the General Information components, including (though not limited to): contact information, administrative assignments, awards and honors, education and certifications. CEHS annual workload information and other documents describing a faculty member's assignment (e.g., appointment letter) are also stored in this area, though are generally uploaded by administrative staff.

Private consulting apart from the University normally is not submitted in Digital Measures. Prior to engaging in any consulting arrangement for/during an academic year, whether pre-existing or new, the faculty member must inform their Department Chair and obtain permission. The agreement should be uploaded to Digital Measures. Faculty members must review consulting agreements with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and develop a contract with the University when appropriate, so that consulting is no longer private and can be considered as faculty activity. Exceptions must be clearly defined in the annual Workload Plan; see also [BOG Governance Rule 1.4 – Ethics, Conflicts of Interest, and Outside Consulting Arrangements](#).

## **B. Teaching**

Teaching is documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. Documentation of each course must include, at minimum, a narrative, syllabus, and student evaluations of instruction (see Departmental guidelines for specific documentation and formatting requirements). Evidence of the content and quality of the course is to be included to avoid excessive reliance on student evaluations. Supporting documentation might include evidence from the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective judgment of students, student advisees and/or mentees, and of peer and Chair evaluations of instructional performance. It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, the development or use of instructional technology and computer assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and college.

## **C. Scholarship/Research**

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work are documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research mission of the department. Some information, such as proposals and awards managed through WVU+kc will be automatically imported, though faculty members should confirm the accuracy of the information.

For the purposes of College-level reviews, credit for publications will be given at the point of unequivocal final acceptance for publication. It is noted for faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of full professor that the Provost's Office credits published manuscripts only, including online publication. In some cases, the Provost's Office may designate that an "in press" publication from the tenure file was counted in the tenure decision and thus may not be counted towards the promotion to full professor.

Departmental guidelines for publication credit may differ from the College guidelines in specifying when an article, chapter, book or other scholarly publications may be reported and credit given. Typically for Departmental annual review of all tenure-track faculty members, credit for publications is given at the point of unequivocal final acceptance for publication. An individual faculty member may, however, elect to include a publication at the point of publication instead, as long as the work is not counted more than once. It should also be noted that large-scale, long-term projects, such as books and scholarly works of similar scope, may be reported, and credit given, over more than one reporting period. Departmental guidelines must clearly state the rules for deciding how much credit is assigned for such works. For promotion and/or tenure decisions, departments typically follow the College guidelines of giving credit for unequivocally accepted and published manuscripts for tenure/promotion to associate professor and published manuscripts only (including online publication) for promotion to full professor.

Each article and book must be documented with proof of publication, which must be included by the faculty member in the Digital Measures file. For an article, the proof can be a reprint of the article or, if the department guidelines allow a publication to be claimed when it is "in press," a letter from the publishing journal that states unequivocally that the article has received final acceptance for publication. For a book, proof can consist of the title page and table of contents.

The “in press” status of a book requires a letter from the publisher stating that the book has received final acceptance for publication.

External grants, and the amounts allocated to the faculty member’s activities, along with the duration for the grant must be documented by official communications from the granting agency and/or the relevant office within WVU. For purposes of annual and promotion reviews, descriptions of external funding must clearly delineate whether the funding was awarded to support research, teaching, or service and is credited in the appropriate category. Individuals also must clearly note their role and contribution to the funded project.

#### **D. Service**

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member’s professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, College, University, or profession. Such activities may, include, for example, service on departmental training committees, College or University P&T committees, and editorial boards of professional journals. As per the University’s land-grant mission, service to the community and state that draws on a faculty member’s expertise may also be submitted. Faculty members submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment, and that is consistent with current University and Departmental expectations for documenting service. See Departmental guidelines for specific criteria for the evaluation of service in each unit.

#### **E. Archived Reports and Documents**

Faculty members should update and submit their curriculum vitae at least annually. Other supporting documentation, including items of an administrative nature that the Department Chair or Dean may wish to include, will be included in this section as well.

Report Narratives are included in this section. The faculty member must submit an Annual Review Narrative as part of an annual report every year to facilitate annual performance evaluations. This report covers the most recently completed year of work. Although WVU’s timelines for faculty evaluation in the context of promotion and tenure are based on a calendar-year reporting period (January 1 through December 31), some departments within the College have adopted alternative reporting periods (most commonly the fiscal year July 1 through June 30).

There are other types of Report Narratives that may be applicable to a faculty member in a given year:

- Promotion and/or Tenure Narratives (Teaching, Research, and Service Narratives) summarize accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion or tenure. In departments that use a calendar-year reporting period for annual reviews, the narratives’ end date coincides with the annual report’s end date. In departments with other reporting periods (e.g., the fiscal year), the narratives’ end date is on the last working day in December, regardless of end date for the annual evaluation. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, the credited work is also included in the narratives.
- A Cumulative Pre-Promotion Narrative summarizing work since the initial appointment at WVU is required of probationary tenure-track faculty members two years before the

Critical Year. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure for work done before starting at WVU, the credited work also should be included in the narrative.

- A Cumulative Pre-Promotion Narrative is also encouraged, to be submitted by non-tenure-track Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured associate professors, to solicit the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards discretionary promotion. In these cases, the report should be based on either work since the initial appointment at WVU or work since the last promotion at WVU, whichever is appropriate. If the appointment letter allows credit towards promotion for work done before starting at WVU, and the work was done during the period covered by the Narrative, then the credited work should also be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.

The Faculty Productivity Report is to be run, reviewed and submitted annually by all faculty members. The Faculty Productivity Report is generated automatically by Digital Measures and includes active links to the information elsewhere submitted in Digital Measures, including in the Teaching, Scholarship/Research, and Service sections.

Review, Promotion, and Tenure Documents—Department Chair reviews, department committee reviews, College committee and Dean's reviews (if applicable), and any written responses from the faculty member—are archived in Digital Measures. Such documents are generally uploaded by administrative staff.

#### **F. Administrative Procedures and Security**

Administrative procedures related to the use of Digital Measures by designated committees, Department Chairs, and the Offices of the Dean and Provost can be found in the University document Digital Measures: College Administrator Guide to Managing Faculty Data.

Individual faculty have password access to their online Digital Measures account and must take appropriate precautions to protect their password and not share it with others per WVU ITS Policy 2.2 Identity and Access Management. Committee members and others involved in the evaluation process will be given viewing access to specified faculty members' Digital Measures account by the Office of the Dean. A designated member of each committee will also be given rights to upload required documents to the specified faculty members' account.

## V. THE DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereafter, the “Department Committee”) serves as an evaluating body for annual, cumulative pre-promotion, and career evaluations, and makes recommendations regarding continuation, tenure, promotion, Emeritus status, and termination of appointments. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and ethical and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the Faculty Evaluation File.

The members of the Department Committee keep their deliberations and the information contained in Faculty Evaluation Files strictly confidential. An exception to this rule is allowed if the Committee or a member of the Committee needs to report an apparent violation of WVU, College, or departmental procedures. In such a case, the Committee or member may disclose to institutional officials (e.g., the Department Chair, Dean, Provost, as appropriate) with a need to know the information necessary to describe the violation.

### A. Composition

The Department Committee normally consists of a minimum of five members, a majority of whom must hold tenure. The Department Committee should have at least one member that is Teaching or Service faculty if the department has faculty members with those assignments. Departments are permitted to draw on faculty members from other departments in the College to serve on the Department Committee in order to satisfy these requirements.

The College suggests that the members of the Committee be elected by the full-time (1.0 FTE) permanent faculty members who are subject to evaluation by the Committee. The individuals eligible for potential membership on the Committee include the full-time permanent faculty in the unit who qualify for performance-based salary increases (i.e., Tenure-Track, Service, and Teaching faculty). Note that because the salaries of Research faculty members are contingent on external funding, they are not considered “permanent” faculty members for the purposes of these *Guidelines*.

The following individuals, however, are not eligible: (a) the Department Chair and, in the event of their involvement in department chair-level reviews, Associate Chairs<sup>4</sup>, (b) anyone under consideration for promotion and/or tenure, (c) anyone serving on any other faculty evaluation committee within the College or University, (d) anyone who is in the immediate family or household of an individual under consideration for promotion or tenure.

Once the membership of the Committee is established, each member, regardless of rank or appointment, participates as a full voting member in all of the Committee’s business, except as noted in Section V.B (“Recusal”) of these *Guidelines*. Exceptions to these rules about eligibility for, and participation in, the Department Committee must be approved by the Provost.

Departments include within their guidelines the following details about the Committee: (a) the number of members, (b) who is eligible to serve, (c) how members are selected, (d) the duration of terms of office, (e) whether the terms are staggered, (f) any limit on consecutive terms, and (g) how the chair of the Committee is selected. The College encourages departments to arrange

---

<sup>4</sup> The practice of Associate Chairs being involved in department chair-level evaluations should not be employed if it unduly restricts the number of eligible faculty from a given department available to serve on the department or college evaluation committee.



staggered terms to maintain a degree of continuity in the Committee's membership, and yet to limit the length of any individual's service to allow the regular influx of fresh perspectives and to prevent the development of undue influence over the faculty evaluation process. Departments are allowed to have differential procedures as long as those procedures do not violate university or college level documents.

The College suggests that the chair be selected by the committee. The Committee Chair is normally a tenured faculty member and normally has at least one year of recent prior experience on the Committee.

The College requires that the membership of the Committee be established by May 1 and reported to the Office of the Dean by the Department Chair.

#### **B. Recusal**

Committee members recuse themselves when their own annual evaluation case is under consideration by the Committee. Committee members must recuse themselves when the annual evaluation case of anyone who in their immediate family or household (current or former) is under consideration by the Committee, or in any other case in which the Committee member would have reasons to be unable (or seen to be unable) to be impartial and fair in their evaluation. When this proviso affects the chair of the Committee, another member serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. When an individual recuses themselves from the Committee, they cease to be a member of the Committee during the recusal.

#### **C. Verification of Committee Votes and Recommendations**

Each evaluation is signed by all members of the Committee to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting. However, if a member has recused themselves during a vote, they do not sign because they ceased to function as a member of the Committee during the recusal. In place of a signature, the term "Recused" should be written.

#### **D. Electronic versus In-Person Participation**

Because of its importance in promoting faculty development and achievement, the deliberations of the Department Committee are expected to involve the full participation of every member of the Committee. Although the physical presence of each member is ideal, at the joint discretion of the Department Chair and the Committee Chair, a minority of the members may participate remotely by electronic means. Remote members must be able to participate fully – that is, they must be able to see and hear what the physically present members see and hear, and they in turn must be seen and heard by the physically present members. In instances of University campus closure, the Committee can fully conduct its charge remotely.

## VI. COLLEGE-LEVEL EVALUATION

### A. Composition of the College Committee

The CEHS Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereafter, the “College Committee”) normally consists of five members. The College Committee normally includes one tenured representative from each department, and at least one Teaching or Service faculty member. The following individuals, however, are not eligible: (a) Department Chairs and, in the event of their involvement in department chair-level reviews, Associate Chairs, (b) anyone serving on any other faculty evaluation committee within the College or University, (c) anyone under consideration for promotion or tenure, and (d) anyone who is in the immediate family or household of an individual who is evaluated by the College committee (see Section XIII of the *WVU Procedures* document).

In line with the *WVU Procedures* document, the particular method of selection of members of the College Committee is at the discretion of the Dean of CEHS, though will follow some standard guidelines. The tenured representative from each department is determined by departmental guidelines, and the Teaching or Service faculty member(s) is selected through departmental rotation. Members of the College Committee normally serve two-year terms, with half of the members being appointed or elected to new terms each year to maintain institutional memory and consistency. Each member, regardless of rank or appointment, participates as a full voting member in all of the Committee business, except as noted in Section VI.C (“Recusal”) of these *Guidelines*.

### B. Committee Procedures

The College Committee chooses a chair in its initial meeting.

The College Committee considers the faculty member’s departmental procedures and criteria, letter of appointment, memoranda of understanding, annual workloads and evaluations, external reviews (if applicable), all recommendations forwarded from the department, and any rebuttals or other responses made by the faculty member.

The College Committee employs the standards described in the *WVU Procedures* document, these *Guidelines*, and the relevant departmental guidelines. Before beginning their work, the College Committee meets collectively with the Dean to receive their charges and any guidance the Dean may offer.

The College Committee makes its recommendations for promotion, tenure, continuation or termination of appointment to the Dean based on the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File as forwarded, plus materials generated as a consequence of the faculty evaluation process. The College Committee keeps its deliberations and the information contained in Faculty Evaluation Files strictly confidential. An exception to this rule is allowed if the College Committee or a member of the College Committee needs to report an apparent violation of WVU, CEHS, or departmental procedures. In such a case, the College Committee or member may disclose to institutional officials with a need to know (e.g., the Department Chair, Dean, Provost, as appropriate) the information necessary to describe the violation.

### C. Recusal

In the rare event that a committee member has a conflict of interest regarding the evaluation of another faculty file being considered by the College Committee, the committee member must

recuse themselves. When this proviso affects the chair of the Committee, another member serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. When an individual recuses themselves from the committee, they cease to be a member of the committee during the recusal.

#### **D. Electronic versus In-Person Participation**

Because of its importance in promoting faculty development and achievement, the deliberations of the College Committee are expected to involve the full participation of every member. Although the physical presence of each member is ideal, at the joint discretion of the Dean and the committee chair, a minority of the members may participate remotely by electronic means. Remote members must be able to participate fully – that is, they must be able to see and hear what the physically present members see and hear, and they in turn must be seen and heard by the physically present members. In instances of University campus closure, the Committee can fully conduct its charge remotely.

#### **E. Role of the Dean**

The Dean reviews and evaluates each recommendation (as well as rebuttals and responses) of faculty members under consideration for promotion, tenure, continuation or termination of appointment and makes an independent recommendation that includes a rationale for each decision. The Dean reports the recommendations of the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Department Chair, the College Committee, and the Dean to the Provost for continuation of the process at the University level.

## VII. THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Faculty members are evaluated at the department level each year, normally by the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair. The evaluations by the Committee and the Chair are independent in the sense that the Chair's evaluation is not controlled by the Committee's evaluation. However, in reviewing the faculty member's record, the Chair should review the Committee's report and recommendations and comment on them.

In the event a faculty member has an assignment in more than one department or Center, the faculty member's home unit, identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent memoranda of understanding detailing percentage of effort, is responsible for evaluating the faculty member's performance and, when appropriate, making recommendations for tenure, promotion, continuation or termination of appointment. As such, the home unit's evaluation guidelines must be followed. However, the other unit(s) served by the faculty member will provide input into the home unit's evaluation by providing a written assessment of the faculty member's contributions as these contributions relate to teaching, research or service as relevant to the faculty member's role in the additional unit. The chair of the home department faculty evaluation committee should make this request of the other unit's chairperson or equivalent.

The evaluations provide ratings of performance in the areas of assignment (research, teaching, service, as appropriate) as well as statements that are developmental and goal oriented. In annual evaluations, the review is not limited to events of the immediately previous one-year period; it is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether recommendations for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment should guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, paying particular attention to cumulative progress toward, and expectations for, tenure and/or the next promotion.

The Department Chair should avoid excessive duplication of the narratives in the Committee's evaluation. However, the evidentiary basis of an evaluation needs to be clearly articulated. For example, a faculty member's research for the year might be rated as "excellent," based on the Faculty Evaluation Committee's and Chair's interpretations of the departmental guidelines for that faculty member's specific workload and memorandum of understanding because she published two papers in top journals and won a federal grant. Evidence for the "excellent" rating should be clearly stated. (If the Committee's statement is clear and the Chair agrees, the Chair's statement needs only to acknowledge agreement.)

When department-level evaluations include a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment, the faculty member is also evaluated at the College level, by both the College Committee and the Dean.

### A. General Standards

Each department establishes written standards of evaluation that are informed and guided by the WVU *Procedures* document, with particular attention to Section II ("Professional Expectations of Faculty Members"), Section IX ("Annual Evaluations"), and Section X ("Criteria for Promotion or Tenure").

Committee members are expected to act in good faith and in a spirit of collegiality in their evaluation of a faculty member's file. When a member is not acting in good faith, other committee members should make this situation known to the Dean.

Evaluation of performance in each area of assignment is assessed as “Excellent” (characterizing performance of high merit), “Good” (characterizing performance of merit), “Satisfactory” (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or “Unsatisfactory.”

Evaluations and recommendations are based on the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File as described in Section IV of these *Guidelines*, considered in the context of Departmental guidelines. If there is not enough information in the File to warrant a meritorious rating (“excellent” or “good”), a rating of “satisfactory” or lower is appropriate. If there is no evidence in the File to document a particular activity, a rating of “unsatisfactory” is appropriate with an explanation of why that rating is given.

For Service faculty members and Teaching faculty members for whom instances of scholarly activity, such as peer-reviewed articles, are welcome but not required, such contributions should be noted in the evaluations but should not contribute to the evaluation of areas of contribution.

## **B. Annual Evaluation**

The annual evaluation serves as a tool for faculty development at all faculty ranks, regardless of tenure or non-tenure status. All faculty members receive annual evaluations. Those who hold benefits-eligible appointments normally receive annual evaluations at the department level by the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair. The benefits-eligible faculty members normally include those in the Tenure-Track, Teaching, Research, Service, Visiting, and Senior Lecturer categories. Departments may develop alternative procedures for evaluating faculty members who teach on a per-course basis.

In addition to rating performance in the areas of assignment, the annual evaluations by the Committee and the Chair each normally include a recommendation to continue the faculty member at their current rank (termination of appointment is recommended by voting against continuation). This recommendation is omitted in a year when a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation or a career evaluation is conducted. In those cases, a recommendation on continuation (or some suitable substitute, such as a recommendation for promotion) is made as part of the cumulative pre-promotion or career evaluation (see Sections VII.C and VII.D of these *Guidelines*).

### **1. Annual Evaluation of Faculty at the Rank of Professor**

Every faculty member is evaluated at the department level, normally by both the Department Committee and the Department Chair. In the case of fully promoted faculty members – that is, those at the rank of Professor in the Tenure-Track, Teaching, Research, or Service categories – the faculty member is evaluated only by the Department Chair, unless one of the following exceptions applies:

- The faculty member submits to the Department Chair a written request to be evaluated by the Department Committee (as well as by the Chair). Departments set their own deadlines for receipt of these requests. A new request is required each year.

- The Department Chair holds the rank of Professor. Because Chairs cannot evaluate themselves, the department-level evaluation of their research, teaching, and service (as applicable) comes from the Department Committee.

## 2. Faculty with Externally-funded Research Expectations

College of Education and Human Services faculty members may have grant-related expectations. Some faculty members are expected to demonstrate concerted and systematic efforts to obtain external funding through the submission of competitive research proposals, with their progress and success in pursuing and/or obtaining external research funding and their ability to sustain their research program to be important components of their annual evaluations. The Department Committee and Department Chair must consider the faculty member's progress in meeting grant expectations as part of annual, pre-promotion, and career evaluations of research, responsive to the specific requirements stated in the faculty member's appointment letter and memoranda of understanding.

### **C. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Evaluation for Tenure-Track Faculty**

Two or three years (non-inclusive of leave) prior to the Critical Year, probationary Tenure-Track faculty members are subject to a more rigorous review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected of Tenure-Track faculty members, there will be a particular focus on the expectation to have developed an active and sustainable research program as defined in the letter of appointment.

A cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is conducted by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair in addition to the annual evaluation. Cumulative pre-promotion reviews will proceed through all college levels for individuals who have received prior annual review ratings of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory in any category. The evaluation is based on the cumulative pre-promotion report described above in Section IV.C.1.b of these *Guidelines* as well as the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File. Besides ratings of teaching, research, and service (as appropriate to the faculty member's assignment), the evaluation includes a judgment about whether the faculty member is on-track for promotion and tenure and what steps, if any, are needed for improvement.

The cumulative pre-promotion evaluation also includes a judgment about the likelihood of success by the Critical Year, and a recommendation to continue the faculty member at their current rank (termination of appointment is recommended by voting against continuation). In a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation, a recommendation in favor of continuation suggests that the faculty member is likely to attain tenure in the Critical Year. A recommendation against continuation suggests that the faculty member is unlikely to attain tenure in the Critical Year.

### **D. Career Evaluation and Standards for Promotion or Tenure**

A career evaluation normally is conducted when a faculty member seeks promotion or tenure. It is based on the career-report as described above in Section IV.C.1.b of these *Guidelines* as well as the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File. A career evaluation is conducted by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair in addition to the annual evaluation. In addition to rating performance in the areas of assignment, the evaluation includes a

recommendation regarding promotion and, in the case of probationary Tenure-Track faculty members, a recommendation regarding tenure.

Within the general standards established by the WVU *Procedures* document and these College of Education and Human Services *Guidelines*, departments establish specific standards for promotion and, where applicable, tenure, with separately stated standards for the various faculty categories and the various ranks. For example, for Tenure-Track faculty, departments specify the criteria for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor.

## 1. Tenure-Track Faculty

For Tenure-Track faculty members, a recommendation in favor of tenure and/or promotion normally requires significant contributions in teaching and research and at least reasonable contributions in service as defined in Section X (“Criteria for Promotion and Tenure”) of the WVU *Procedures* document.

In a year when a faculty member who has research as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member’s research from persons external to the University, as described in Section XII (“External Evaluations”) of the WVU *Procedures* document and Section IX of these *Guidelines*.

If a candidate for tenure has specific grant expectations in the appointment letter and falls short of them, the department evaluators—the Department Committee and the Department Chair—may consider the possibility that the candidate’s overall achievements in research compensate for this shortcoming. In such a case, the evaluators should include in their letters a description of the relevant accomplishments and the reasons why they should be considered as the equivalent of meeting the grant requirement. After reviewing the departmental letters, the Dean will decide whether the accomplishments meet the equivalency standard and provide a basis for a positive recommendation regarding tenure.

*BOG Faculty Rule 4.5 “Extension of the Tenure Clock”* establishes the circumstances under which the Critical Year may be extended. Included among these circumstances are those that lead a faculty member to use the Modifications of Duties for Certain Full-time Faculty including, exceptional professional circumstances not of the faculty member’s own making (e.g., a delay in essential laboratory renovations). [BOG Faculty Rule 4.5](#) limits the timing of requests for extensions to within one year of the qualifying event in most cases.

For faculty members whose Critical Year has been extended through BOG Faculty Rule 4.5, the standards for promotion and tenure are the same regardless of the time frame under which the faculty member is reviewed. Evaluations at both the department and college levels must take this into consideration. In addition, Department Chairs should normally call this matter to the attention of external evaluators as noted in Section IX.C of these *Guidelines*.

## 2. Teaching Faculty

A Teaching faculty member and the Department Chair may normally choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

For a Teaching faculty member, the sole area of significant contribution is teaching, with specific expectations articulated in the faculty member's appointment letter or memorandum of understanding as well as departmental evaluation guidelines. At least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion to a professorial rank—that is, from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor—normally requires a terminal degree. As described in Section II.B of these *Guidelines*, the Dean may grant an exception to this, in which case significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree.

For promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to the rank of Teaching Associate Professor, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain a narrative and evidence of the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective judgment of students, student advisees and/or mentees, and of peer and Chair evaluations of instructional performance. The File may also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, the development or use of instructional technology and computer assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and college. Note that external evaluations are *not* needed as part of the Faculty Evaluation File for faculty members seeking promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor.

For promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to the rank of Teaching Professor, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evidence showing that professional colleagues, both within the university and/or nationally or internationally, acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline. Departmental evaluations can document the judgment of colleagues within the university. To document the judgments of colleagues nationally or internationally, the candidate for Teaching Professor has two options: (a) The file must include evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's programmatic contributions in teaching from persons external to WVU, as described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the WVU *Procedures* document and Section IX of these *Guidelines*, and/or (b) the file must include a record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature, and/or a record of pedagogically related presentations at professional conferences of national or international stature, and/or (c) evidence of student mentorship, professional development, consultations.

### 3. Service Faculty

A Service faculty member and the Department Chair may normally choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

For a Service faculty member, promotion depends on significant contributions in service and teaching, with specific expectations articulated in the faculty member's appointment letter or memorandum of understanding as well as departmental evaluation guidelines. At least reasonable contributions are required in research, if research effort is part of the faculty's appointment and/or workload.



Promotion to a professorial rank—that is, from Service Instructor to Service Assistant Professor—normally requires a terminal degree. As described in Section II.C of these *Guidelines*, the Dean may grant an exception to this, in which case significant relevant professional experience and an advanced graduate degree might be treated as a substitute for a terminal degree.

In a year when a faculty member who has service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's service from persons external to the University, as described in Section XII ("External Evaluations") of the WVU *Procedures* document and Section IX of these *Guidelines*. This external evaluation expectation includes when a faculty member seeks promotion from Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor and a promotion from Service Associate Professor to Service Professor.

#### **E. Evaluation for Emeritus Status**

A faculty member is considered for Emeritus status when his or her retirement is announced and, normally, after at least ten consecutive years of full-time service to WVU. A faculty member who meets these criteria is evaluated by the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair. If the faculty member's overall contributions to WVU are judged as meritorious, the Committee and Chair submit to the Dean their recommendations in favor of Emeritus status along with a brief description of the contributions that warrant the recommendation. The departmental evaluations can be based upon a review of the faculty member's *vita* or other suitable summary of his or her contributions; a career report is not required. Other University procedures in place at the time of the Emeritus recommendation will be followed.

Faculty members who are awarded Emeritus status retain their professional titles. In every case, the term "Emeritus" follows the rank and title (e.g., "Associate Professor Emeritus," "Teaching Professor Emeritus").

## **VIII. REBUTTALS AND RESPONSES TO FACULTY EVALUATIONS**

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to their evaluations from the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, College Faculty Evaluation Committee, or Dean. The reactions fall into two general classes: “responses” in the general case and “rebuttals” in specific situations. These are described in more detail in the *WVU Procedures* document: For reactions to departmental evaluations see Sections XIII.A.6, XIII.A.4, and XIII.A.5; for reactions to college-level evaluations, see Section XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6.

Each evaluation letter must advise the faculty member of the appropriate type of reaction that is available to them, as follows:

### **A. Rebuttals**

When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment, the evaluation should include a statement advising the faculty member of their right of rebuttal at the next level. In a department-level evaluation, the statement should say, “If you wish to challenge this evaluation, you may submit a rebuttal to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services within five working days of your receipt of this evaluation.” In a college-level evaluation, the statement should replace “Dean of the College of Education and Human Services” with “Provost.”

### **B. Responses**

Responses to annual reviews at the department level may be submitted at any time. Evaluations without a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment should say, “You may, at any time, submit a response to this evaluation to [Department Chair] or Dean of the College of Education and Human Services, in accordance with Section XIII.A.6 of the *WVU Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.”

## IX. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

External evaluations of some aspects of faculty achievement are considered when:

- a Tenure-Track faculty member seeks tenure and/or promotion, or a Research faculty member seeks promotion (external evaluations of research are required),
- a Teaching faculty member seeks promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor and exercises the option for documenting national or international recognition of their achievements through external evaluations, or
- a Service faculty member seeks promotion (external evaluations of service are required).

In other words, all faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure must have external letters with the exceptions of Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor or Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor.

The general procedures for identifying suitable external evaluators are described in Section XII (“External Evaluations”) of the *WVU Procedures* document. In the College of Education and Human Services, this task is shared by the department committee tasked with faculty evaluation, promotion and/or tenure recommendations and the Department Chair utilizing the process that follows. Additional details, such as the timeline for completing the steps, are subject to change and distributed annually.

### A. Evaluator Qualifications

The faculty candidate and the Department Committee, acting independently, each give the Department Chair a list of at least six evaluators from peer institutions.

A “peer institution” is one with a Carnegie Classification that matches that of WVU, namely “R1: Doctoral Universities – Highest research activity.” To propose an evaluator who is at a college or university that is not a Carnegie R1 institution, justification is required. Such justifications include but are not limited to: (1) an individual who, by virtue of their scholarly specialization or standing in the discipline, is uniquely qualified to judge the faculty member’s research, or (2) a senior scholar who spent the bulk of their career at a peer institution and thus is capable of making appropriate judgments from the standpoint of a colleague at a peer institution.

When research or programmatic contributions in teaching is to be evaluated, all or nearly all evaluators should be from academic departments at peer institutions. When service is to be evaluated, individuals in non-academic settings may be appropriate as evaluators.

Each proposed evaluator in an academic department must be at or above the rank to which the faculty candidate aspires. If the candidate is applying for promotion to Associate Professor, the evaluators could be Associate Professors or Professors. If the candidate is applying for promotion to Professor, the evaluators must be Professors.

In the case of a Teaching Associate Professor seeking promotion to Teaching Professor, the external evaluators should be faculty members at peer institutions who hold the rank of Teaching Professor or the equivalent.

In the case of a Service Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Service Associate Professor, the external evaluators should be faculty members at peer institutions who hold the rank of Service Associate Professor or the equivalent.

## **B. Faculty Member's Feedback**

According to timelines specified by the University, upon receiving the committee's list, the Department Chair shares it with the faculty member and solicits the candidate's written comments.

In a written, signed, and dated statement, the faculty member gives the Department Chair comments regarding the committee's suggested evaluators, in particular the appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of the suggested evaluators in terms of the faculty member's area of research, as well as any conflicts of interest. If the candidate has no comments, this should be indicated in writing as well.

## **C. Chair's Proposed List of Evaluators and Letter of Invitation**

The Department Chair should consider any comments provided by the faculty candidate but is not obligated to eliminate a potential evaluator simply because the candidate has objected.

The Department Chair prepares: (a) a final list of proposed evaluators, and (b) a sample copy of the letter to be sent to the evaluators, based on a template provided by the Dean. The Chair's list should have individuals from both the faculty candidate's list and the committee's list. The final list should include six potential reviewers and up to six substitutes in event a potential reviewer declines the invitation. Unless a proposed evaluator is unacceptable, the Chair's list should exhaust the names from the candidate and committee's lists. The Chair's list is confidential.

Following Dean's approval, the Chair invites six of the potential evaluators on the list to prepare an evaluation letter. If someone declines, the Chair should invite another prospective evaluator from the list until agreements are secured from at least four evaluators (ideally six). In addition, the Chair should send reminders to the evaluators 30 days before the deadline for receipt of the evaluations. To preserve the anonymity of the evaluators, the list of agreed evaluators must not be shared with the faculty candidate.

If the faculty candidate has been granted an extension of the tenure clock under BOG Faculty Rule 4.5, the letter inviting the external evaluations includes a special passage, "Please note that Dr. X received an extension to his/her tenure clock by virtue of university policy. Under these circumstances, the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than for faculty whose tenure clock has not been interrupted. Therefore, we would appreciate that in evaluating this candidate, you consider the merits of quality and impact, not the time taken to achieve those accomplishments."

## **D. Dean's Review and Approval**

The Dean reviews the proposed evaluators and the sample letter. The Dean may seek additional information from the Chair, strike one or more individuals from the list of potential evaluators, or require revisions to the letter. When the materials are approved, the Dean will notify the Department Chair in a timely fashion.

## **E. Final Departmental Procedures**

The Department Chair uploads a copy of the approved sample letter in the candidate's Faculty Evaluation File in Digital Measures. Because the identity of the evaluators is confidential, the

approved list of evaluators is placed in the Confidential Documents section of the Digital Measures File.

The candidate provides the Department Chair with a digital package of materials to be sent to the external evaluators. The package should include a curriculum vitae; a research narrative (in the case of promotions for tenure-track faculty; for Teaching faculty this would be a teaching narrative and for Service faculty a service narrative), and up to five documents/work products (e.g., PDF of published articles) that document the candidate's achievements in research, service, or programmatic contributions to teaching. External reviewers for tenure track faculty that must demonstrate significant contributions in research are asked to comment only on the quality and standing of the candidate's scholarly (research) work and do not evaluate teaching or service. The digital package of materials and a table of contents must be included in the candidate's Faculty Evaluation File in Digital Measures.

Upon the Dean's approval of the Department Chair's final list, and before sending the evaluation materials to the evaluators, the Chair should make preliminary contact with the approved evaluators by email or telephone to verify their willingness to participate in the process.

Faculty may request (through the Dean's administrative assistant) to view redacted versions of the external letters once the Department committee and Chair reviews have been forwarded to the Dean.

## **X. PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES**

The *WVU Procedures* document (Section IX.C, “Descriptors for Annual Review”) indicates that the assessments provided by annual reviews are the primary basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available, and for the program of Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievements available to faculty at the rank of professor or the equivalent.

In years in which performance-based salary increases are approved, the Dean will follow directives from the Provost for allocating increases. Normally these are designed to assign modest raises for “Satisfactory” performance and more substantial raises for “Good” or “Excellent” performance. Faculty members who receive an “Unsatisfactory” rating in each of their areas of contribution are not eligible for a salary increase in that evaluation year. Relevant information for merit raise decisions will be pulled from Digital Measures (ratings of performance in teaching, research, and service; workload percentages in teaching, research, and service).

Though departmental ratings can be numerical (on a scale in the department’s approved salary policy), per University policy a corresponding categorical descriptor also must be included using the terms “Unsatisfactory,” “Satisfactory,” “Good,” or “Excellent”.

When ratings from the Committee and Chair differ, the Office of the Dean will average them unless the department’s approved guidelines provide for a different resolution.

## **XI. PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT**

Eligible faculty members (i.e., full time [1.0 FTE] permanent employees of the College of Education and Human Services in the Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Service categories) can propose a change or an addition to these *Guidelines* by making a recommendation to the Dean. After consulting with appropriate parties – for example, Department Chairs, Program Directors, the Office of the Provost, and the Faculty Executive Committee – the Dean will make a recommendation to the faculty. If a ballot of eligible faculty members yields a simple majority in favor of the proposal, the change or addition will be incorporated into a revised draft of these *Guidelines* and submitted for the Provost's approval. Upon such approval, the revised *Guidelines* will be adopted for the subsequent review year.