

**EBERLY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**  
**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE,**  
**AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES**

Approved by the Faculty of the Eberly College, November 10, 2025

Approved by the Office of the Provost, December 10, 2025

**OUTLINE**

- I. INTRODUCTION – Page 2**
- II. APPOINTMENT LETTER AND ASSIGNMENTS – Page 2**
  - A. Tenure-Track Faculty
    - 1. College-Wide Research Standards
    - 2. Pursuit of External Funding
    - 3. Sponsored Research Expectations
    - 4. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Review
  - B. Teaching Faculty
  - C. Research Faculty
  - D. Service Faculty
  - E. Other Faculty
    - 1. Visiting Faculty
    - 2. Lecturers
    - 3. Adjunct Faculty
- III. ANNUAL WORKLOAD PLAN – Page 7**
  - A. Annual Review and Planning Process
  - B. Departures from the Appointment Letter
  - C. Workloads during Sabbatical Leaves and Professional Development Programs
  - D. Parental and Alternative Work Assignments
- IV. THE FACULTY EVALUATION FILE – Page 9**
  - A. Administrative Category
  - B. Areas of Contribution Categories
    - 1. Teaching
    - 2. Research
    - 3. Service
  - C. Productivity Reports
    - 1. Types of Report
      - a. Annual Report
      - b. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report
      - c. Promotion/Tenure Report
    - 2. When to Report a Publication
  - D. Security of Files
- V. THE DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE – Page 12**
  - A. Composition
  - B. Recusal
  - C. Verification of Committee Votes and Recommendations
  - D. Electronic versus In-Person Participation
- VI. COLLEGE-LEVEL EVALUATION – Page 14**
  - A. Composition of the College Committee
    - 1. Tenured Members
    - 2. Untenured Members
  - B. Committee Procedures
  - C. Recusal
  - D. Electronic versus In-Person Participation
  - E. Role of the Dean
- VII. THE EVALUATION PROCESS – Page 16**
  - A. General Standards
    - 1. Evidentiary Basis of Evaluation
  - B. Annual Evaluation
    - 1. Annual Evaluation of Faculty at the Rank of Professor
    - 2. Faculty with Grant Expectations
  - C. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Evaluation
  - D. Career Evaluation and Standards for Promotion or Tenure
    - 1. Tenure-Track Faculty
      - a. Rule 4.5 Extensions of the Tenure Clock
    - 2. Teaching Faculty
    - 3. Research Faculty
    - 4. Service Faculty
  - E. Evaluation for Emeritus Status
- VIII. REBUTTALS AND RESPONSES TO FACULTY EVALUATIONS – Page 23**
  - A. Rebuttals
  - B. Responses
- IX. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS – Page 23**
  - A. Evaluator Qualifications
  - B. Faculty Member's Feedback
  - C. Chair's Proposed List of Evaluators and Letter of Invitation
  - D. Dean's Review and Approval
  - E. Final Departmental Procedures
- X. PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY INCREASES – Page 25**
- XI. PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT – Page 26**

## 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 Eberly College must familiarize themselves with the contents of these *Guidelines*, the *WVU Procedures* document, relevant rules 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 tenure recommendations, as applicable. The process is both evaluative and developmental.

Annual evaluations are conducted at the department level. When an action such as promotion, tenure, emeritus status, or non-continuation is recommended, evaluations also occur at the College and University levels. Pre-promotion cumulative reviews include reviews at the department level and Dean .

Several components are considered in the faculty evaluation process. Included among them are:

- the letter of appointment and subsequent memoranda of understanding;
- annual workload plans and percentages;
- the digital 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; and
- responses and rebuttals to previous evaluations.

## II. APPOINTMENT LETTER AND ASSIGNMENTS

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 may 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.

Tenure-Track<sup>1</sup>, Teaching, Research, and Service 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 towards 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 – and the appointment is anticipated to continue through, and at least one year beyond, the “Critical Year” in which a tenure decision must be made. The 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 offer an individual with previous relevant experience (normally in a similar position) the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. If tenure is not awarded at the end of the Critical Year, a terminal contract is offered for the next year.

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. 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.

Occasionally appointment with tenure is possible. This is most likely when an individual is recruited for an advanced faculty position and when that individual has already obtained tenure at a peer institution.

### 1. College-Wide Research Standards

The appointment letter for Tenure-Track faculty members includes information about College-wide standards in research. Except perhaps in cases of administrative appointments, all Tenure-Track faculty members are expected to develop and maintain an active, independent research program that yields high-quality, peer-reviewed publications and provides research training and experience for the department's students including, where appropriate, opportunities for students to conduct thesis and dissertation research.

### 2. Pursuit of External Funding

For those Tenure-Track faculty members who are expected to support their research programs through external funding (normally faculty members in the natural sciences and social sciences), the appointment letter requires them to:

- demonstrate concerted and systematic efforts to obtain external funding through the submission of competitive research proposals, with their progress and success in obtaining external research funding and their ability to sustain their research program to be important components of their annual evaluations; and

- develop a specific plan for the pursuit of research funding that is maintained in the digital evaluation file for consideration in annual evaluations.

### 3. Sponsored Research Expectations

Faculty are encouraged to seek funding for their research and scholarly pursuits. In disciplines where significant investments are required to conduct research, successful acquisition of awards is expected.

Specific criteria for the pursuit of sponsored research will be developed at the unit level and updated every five years. Faculty appointments should contain specific expectations for research funding.

If awards are expected but are not successfully acquired, promotion and/or tenure may nevertheless be recommended if the individual has obtained scholarly accomplishments that offset sponsored research expectations.

### 4. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Review

Probationary faculty members are required to have a cumulative pre-promotion review, normally conducted two years before the Critical Year, to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. 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 issuance of a terminal contract before the Critical Year.

## **B. Teaching Faculty**

The WVU *Procedures* document describes faculty appointments with the prefix “teaching” as renewable term appointments 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 Eberly College, the assignment normally is defined as at least 80 percent teaching and at least 5 percent service. Historically, most Teaching faculty members in Eberly have been assigned 80 percent teaching and 20 percent service. At 1.0 FTE, an 80 percent teaching load is eight courses (or equivalent) per nine-month academic year.

The College authorizes Teaching faculty positions when an ongoing need for instruction is anticipated. Temporary teaching appointments generally are “Visiting” faculty members and at-will teaching appointments are “Adjunct Instructors” as described below. The initial term of a Teaching appointment is normally one year. Upon satisfactory completion of the initial term, reappointment may be for additional one-year terms or multiple year terms by rank as permitted by Board of Governors Rule 4.2. There is no limit on the number of terms.

To be appointed at a Teaching professorial rank (e.g., “Teaching Assistant Professor”), an individual must hold either 1) a terminal degree in a relevant discipline or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant. An individual with an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline but without professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant is eligible for appointment at the rank of Instructor (formally, “Teaching Instructor”).

An individual appointed initially as a Teaching Instructor may be promoted to Teaching Assistant Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in a relevant discipline or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant. To be promoted, significant contributions are required in the area of teaching and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment.

Because promotion of Teaching faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory. As noted in Section IV.C.1.b 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. 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. 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 2 or 3 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. In such a case, the rank would be Instructor (formally, "Research Instructor").

Although Research positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion. 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.C.1.b 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.

### **D. Service Faculty**

Service faculty have a primary assignment in service with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. Service is at least 60 percent of the assignment, research is 5 to 10 percent, and the rest is in teaching. Normally, teaching by Service faculty members is limited to 2 courses or equivalent per semester.

The College authorizes Service faculty positions when an ongoing need for service and instruction is anticipated. Although Service positions are not eligible for tenure, they are eligible for promotion.

To be appointed at a Service professorial rank (e.g., “Service Assistant Professor”), an individual must hold either 1) a terminal degree in a relevant discipline or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant. An individual with an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline but without professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant is eligible for appointment at the rank of Instructor (formally, “Service Instructor”).

An individual appointed initially as a Service Instructor may be promoted to Service Assistant Professor if, at the time promotion is sought, the individual holds either 1) a terminal degree in a relevant discipline or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant. To be promoted, significant contributions are required in the area of service and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment.

Because promotion of Service faculty members is discretionary, a cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is not mandatory. As noted in Section IV.C.1.b 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.

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

The Eberly College 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 and Adjunct Faculty. Neither of these temporary, non-Tenure-Track positions are eligible for promotion. The last category consists of Adjunct (Courtesy) faculty who hold a courtesy appointment without salary.

### 1. Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty appointments normally are limited to a total of 3 years. At 1.0 FTE, a Visiting appointment normally carries a teaching load of 6 courses (or equivalent) per 9-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 upon leaving WVU 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).

### 2. Adjuncts

Adjunct positions are renewable part-time teaching appointments. Adjuncts are hired to address teaching needs in a particular semester or year. Compensation is defined on a per course basis, normally not to exceed .60 FTE – three courses or the equivalent per semester.

The appointment requires a minimum of a master's degree. Adjuncts without a proven record of teaching ability at WVU are normally offered only single-semester appointments. Adjunct Instructor positions are posted on the WVU Careers site.

### 3. Adjunct (Courtesy) Faculty

According to Board of Governors Rule 4.6, the term "Adjunct" may be applied to paid, part-time faculty members or unpaid volunteers with a courtesy title. In the Eberly College, Adjunct (Courtesy) faculty members are of the second type.

Adjunct (Courtesy) faculty appointments are made by the Dean at the request of the Department Chair. The Chair (a) attests that the candidate for an Adjunct (Courtesy) appointment has the support of the department's faculty, (b) summarizes the candidate's qualifications and anticipated contributions to the department, (c) provides a copy of the candidate's vita, and (d) proposes a rank for the candidate (e.g., "Adjunct Assistant Professor"). If the request is granted, the Dean appoints the candidate to a 3-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, Research, and Service 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. All Workload Plans must follow applicable workload policies that have been approved by the Provost's office.

### **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 reallocation of effort from service or teaching to research is warranted, the Department Chair has the discretion, in consultation with the Dean, to make a temporary 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 some of the external funds, with the cost calculated according to the Eberly College's *Externally Sponsored Course Buyout Policy*.

Another common reason for reallocating effort is the granting of a sabbatical leave, as described in Section III.C 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 signed by the Dean and the faculty member.

Regardless of percentages, expectations for promotions and tenure remain as described in the appointment letter unless formal approval is granted for a change in areas of significant contribution. The process 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, the approved application and plan together constitute a memorandum of understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the period of the leave.

A sabbatical leave would normally be considered a 100-percent research assignment for the duration of the leave.

The percentages reported in the annual Workload Plan depend on the duration of the leave. 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 1-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.

### **D. Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty; Extension of the Tenure Clock**

The University offers work-life policies and procedures that promote flexibility for Tenure-Track and non-Tenure-Track faculty members who are dealing with certain personal, parental, or professional responsibilities.

- 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 or for the 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 a salary reduction.

With an approved 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. Probationary tenure-track faculty members who use the Modification of Duties for Certain Full-Time Faculty normally qualify for a modification of their Critical Year under the provisions of Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5, "Extension of the Tenure Clock" (see also Section VII.D.1.a of these Guidelines).

#### **IV. THE FACULTY EVALUATION FILE**

Faculty members are responsible for reporting and documenting their achievements in teaching, research, and service in the digital evaluation file. It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide for the File evidence that (a) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (b) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work.

For purposes of annual evaluation, the digital evaluation file is closed for the review period on the department-specified deadline date. For purposes of evaluations for promotion or tenure, the File closes on the last day of the calendar year. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process for the period under review may be added to the File after it is closed. Faculty may immediately begin adding materials for the next period under review.

If work at a previous institution is credited towards tenure or promotion at WVU, the faculty member includes in the digital evaluation file evidence 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 or promotion (or both) is at stake.

The contents of each digital evaluation file are organized in four separate categories as described below.

##### **A. Administrative Category**

The administrative category includes: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) Workload Plans and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; (d) annual curriculum vitae and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records of an administrative nature that the Department Chair or Dean may wish to include.

The Department Chair is responsible for Items a, b, c, and e. The faculty member is responsible for Item d. Of particular importance are the productivity reports (see Section IV.C below).

## **B. Areas of Contribution Categories**

The teaching, research, and service categories include documentation for each respective area of contribution. The specific contents of these categories are described in the departmental guidelines. In most cases, the faculty member is responsible for providing the documentation for each category. A narrative is required for each area of significant contribution.

### 1. 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, the syllabus and faculty senate approved form of student evaluations. Additionally, the College encourages faculty with a teaching assignment to participate in a peer-evaluation. At least one peer evaluation of teaching must occur and be documented prior to a pre-promotion review. Departments are strongly encouraged, however, to require more detailed evidence of the content and quality of the course and to avoid excessive reliance on student evaluations. In particular, departments are encouraged to require assessment of learning outcomes and response to student feedback.

### 2. 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.

Each article and book must be documented with proof of publication. 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, must be documented by official communications from the granting agency and/or the relevant office within WVU.

### 3. Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, Eberly College, University, or profession. Faculty members submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment.

Private consulting apart from the University normally is not submitted to the digital evaluation file. Faculty members are encouraged to review consulting agreements with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to 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.

As of this writing, detailed documentation of service within WVU is not required if the Department Chair is able to certify the validity of the faculty member's report of service in the productivity report as described below.

## C. Productivity Reports

Faculty members must submit a faculty productivity report that summarizes the individual's assignment and their contributions in teaching, research, and service, as appropriate. In addition to the particular details required by the department, the report must include, for each area of contribution in the faculty member's assignment, a narrative summary that places the reported activities and associated documentation in context.

As of this writing, at the discretion of the Department Chair, documentation of service activities within WVU can be omitted from the service category if the Department Chair is willing and able to certify that the descriptions of institutional service in the productivity report are valid.

### 1. Types of Report

There are 3 kinds of faculty productivity reports covering different time periods. The start and end dates should be indicated in each report.

a. *Annual Report*: This report covers the most recently completed year of work. Although WVU's timelines for faculty evaluation are based on a calendar-year reporting period (January 1 through December 31), some departments within the Eberly College have adopted alternative reporting periods (most commonly the fiscal year, July 1 through June 30).

The faculty member must submit a report every year to facilitate annual performance evaluations. In some years, the faculty member also must submit an additional report to facilitate a more integrative evaluation of the faculty member's progress towards tenure or promotion (cumulative pre-promotion report) or the faculty member's success in meeting the standards for tenure or promotion (career report).

b. *Cumulative Pre-Promotion Report*: This report is required of probationary Tenure-Track faculty members two years before the Critical Year in which case the report summarizes work since the initial appointment at WVU. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for work done before starting at WVU, the credited work also must be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.

Although the cumulative pre-promotion report is intended to support an evaluation of a Tenure-Track faculty member's progress towards tenure, it may be useful to gauge any type of faculty member's progress towards promotion. Therefore, departments must allow Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured associate professors, to submit cumulative pre-promotion reports and thereby solicit the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion. In these cases, the report should be based on either work since the initial appointment at WVU or work since January 1 in the year of their last promotion at WVU, whichever is later. 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 report, then the credited work also must be included in the cumulative pre-promotion report.

c. *Promotion/Tenure Report*: This report summarizes accomplishments to be considered in an application for promotion or tenure. In departments that use a calendar-year reporting period for annual reviews, the career report's end date coincides with the annual report's end date. In

departments with other reporting periods (e.g., the fiscal year), the career report's end date is on the last day in December, regardless of end date for the annual evaluation. If the appointment letter allows credit towards tenure or promotion for research, teaching, or service done before starting at WVU, the credited work also is included in the career report.

## 2. When to Report a Publication

Departmental guidelines specify when an article or book may be reported and credit given for it. In the case of many articles, there normally are three possibilities: (a) counting the article during the reporting period in which it was unequivocally given final acceptance for publication, (b) counting it during reporting period in which it was actually published, or (c) allowing the faculty member to choose between these alternatives. Departmental guidelines may describe alternative procedures that allow additional flexibility or accommodate forms of publication such as online journals.

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.

Because the purpose of annual, cumulative pre-promotion, and career reviews is to evaluate productivity over a particular time period, a faculty member cannot be given an unlimited amount of time to defer reporting a publication.

## **D. Security of Files**

Once an item is entered into the digital evaluation file, it must not be removed. Records of faculty productivity at WVU, whether physical or electronic, must be maintained in a way that preserves their integrity.

## **V. THE DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee serves as an evaluating body for annual, cumulative pre-promotion, and career evaluations, and makes recommendations regarding continuation, tenure, promotion, Emeritus status, and (rarely) non-continuation. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the digital evaluation file.

The members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep their deliberations and the information contained in digital 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, Eberly College, or departmental procedures. In such a case, the 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.

## **A. Composition**

The department Faculty Evaluation Committee normally consists of a minimum of 5 members, a majority of whom must hold tenure. 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. Regardless of whether Committee members are elected by the faculty or appointed by the Department Chair, the individuals eligible for potential membership on the Committee must be inclusive of categories and ranks of full-time permanent faculty in the unit (Tenure-Track, Teaching, & Service; instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor) who qualify for performance-based salary increases. The following individuals, however, are not eligible: (a) the Department Chair, (b) anyone under consideration for promotion or tenure, (c) anyone who is in the immediate family or household of an individual who is evaluated by the Committee (see Section XIII of the WVU *Procedures* document), and (d) anyone who is serving on the College Committee (see Section VI of these *Guidelines*). Note, too, 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*.

Once the membership of the Committee is established, each member 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 departmental Faculty Evaluation 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 (the College encourages a selection process that ensures equal opportunity for participation, for example, selection by faculty vote), (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 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.

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 1 year of recent prior experience on the Committee.

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

## **B. Recusal**

Committee members recuse themselves when their own case is under consideration by the Committee. 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 departmental Faculty Evaluation 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.

## **VI. COLLEGE-LEVEL EVALUATION**

### **A. Composition of the College Committee**

The Eberly College Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereafter, the “College Committee”), consists of 3 subcommittees representing the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. The members of the subcommittees are appointed by the Dean. To provide continuity from year to year, the members normally are appointed to 2-year terms with half of the membership of each subcommittee changing each year. To be eligible to serve, an individual must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the Eberly College. The following individuals, however, are not eligible: (a) Department Chairs, (b) anyone serving on any other faculty evaluation committee within the Eberly College, (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 subcommittee (see Section XIII of the WVU *Procedures* document).

Once the membership of each subcommittee is established, each member participates as a full voting member in all of the subcommittee’s business, except as noted in Section VI.C (“Recusal”) of these *Guidelines*.

#### **1. Tenured Members**

The majority of each subcommittee consists of tenured faculty members holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Each tenured member represents a unit within the Eberly College and is appointed to the subcommittee by the Dean at the recommendation of the Department Chair. The departmental representatives are assigned to the subcommittees as follows:

- **Humanities Subcommittee**: The four tenured members represent English; History; Philosophy; and World Languages Programs.
- **Natural Sciences Subcommittee**: The six tenured members represent Biology, Chemistry, Forensic and Investigative Science, the Geology faculty of the Department of Geology and Geography, School of Mathematical and Data Sciences, and Physics and Astronomy.

- Social Sciences Subcommittee: The six tenured members represent Communication Studies, the Geography faculty of the Department of Geology and Geography, Political Science, Psychology, Social Work, and Sociology and Anthropology.

## 2. Untenured Members

Each subcommittee also has one untenured faculty member, chosen from among the College's Teaching and Service faculty members holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. These subcommittee members do not represent any particular department; they are selected at-large by the Dean in consultation with Department Chairs and other appropriate members of the Eberly College.

### **B. Committee Procedures**

Each subcommittee chooses its own chair.

Each subcommittee evaluates faculty members from the departments it represents (e.g., the Humanities Subcommittee evaluates the faculty of English, History, Philosophy, and World Languages Programs). Faculty members from programs or departments that are not represented on any of the subcommittees – as of this writing, Leadership Studies, Multidisciplinary Studies, Native American Studies, Religious Studies, and Women's and Gender Studies – may decide for themselves which subcommittee will consider their case, and should notify the Dean of their decision by September 1 of the year in which they apply for promotion or tenure.

Each subcommittee considers the faculty member's departmental procedures and criteria, all recommendations forwarded from the department, and any rebuttals or other responses made by the faculty member.

The subcommittees employ the standards described in the WVU *Procedures* document, these *Guidelines*, and the relevant departmental guidelines. The subcommittees may not modify the standards or establish their own.

Before beginning their work, the members of the three subcommittees meet collectively with the Dean to receive their charges and any guidance the Dean may offer.

Each subcommittee will consider the cases assigned to it and prepare recommendations to the Dean based on the evidence in the digital evaluation file as forwarded, plus materials generated as a consequence of the faculty evaluation process. The respective chairs of the subcommittees will meet with the membership of the committee as a whole and share a summary of the faculty recommendations.

Each subcommittee keeps its deliberations and the information contained in digital evaluation files strictly confidential. An exception to this rule is allowed if the committee, subcommittee or a member of either needs to report an apparent violation of WVU, Eberly College, or departmental procedures. In such a case, the committee, subcommittee, 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**

When the individual under evaluation is from a subcommittee member's department, that member is recused. The recused member must not be present during the subcommittee's deliberations regarding the departmental colleague, nor participate in the evaluation in any way. The recused member may, however, provide information (e.g., about departmental standards) upon written request from other members of the subcommittee. When this proviso affects the chair of the subcommittee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. When an individual recuses themselves from the subcommittee, they cease to be a member of the subcommittee during the recusal.

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

Because of its importance in promoting faculty development and achievement, the deliberations of each College subcommittee are expected to involve the full participation of every member of the subcommittee. Although the physical presence of each member is required, certain circumstances may arise where a member may need to participate remotely by electronic means. A request to do so may be granted at the discretion of the Dean or the subcommittee chair.

### **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, Emeritus status, or non-continuation 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 appropriate subcommittee of 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. However, in reviewing the faculty member's record, the Chair should review the Committee's report and recommendations and comment on them.

Some faculty members in the Eberly College have assignments in multiple departments. The faculty member's home department, identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent memoranda of understanding, is responsible for evaluating the faculty member's performance and, when appropriate, making recommendations for tenure, promotion, or non-continuation. As such the home department's evaluation guidelines must be followed. However, the other department(s) served by the faculty member will provide input into the home department's evaluation by providing a written assessment of the faculty member's contributions.

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 1-year period; it is also to be a review of

annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions 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. If, for example, a faculty member's research for the year is rated as "excellent" because she published two papers in top journals and won a federal grant, that should be made clear. (If the Committee says this clearly and the Chair agrees, the Chair's statement will be clear enough if the Chair asserts the agreement.)

When the department-level evaluations include a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, Emeritus status, or (in rare cases) non-continuation, the faculty member also is evaluated at the College-level, by 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 III ("Professional Expectations of Faculty Members"), Section IX ("Annual Evaluations"), and Section X ("Criteria for Promotion or Tenure"). These standards must specify absolute criteria by which ratings of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory are assigned, for annual reviews of assigned areas of contributions. These standards must also specify absolute standards for promotion and/or tenure.

For successful promotion, meritorious evaluations are necessary but not necessarily sufficient if absolute criteria, as established by units, are not satisfied and documented in the digital evaluation file.

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."

For those faculty members who are required to make only at least a reasonable contribution in research (normally Service faculty members and some Teaching faculty members), the expectation is that the digital evaluation file will document one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference each year. Other instances of scholarly activity such as peer-reviewed articles are welcome, but not required, to meet the criterion of at least a reasonable contribution in research.

#### **1. Evidentiary Basis of Evaluation**

Evaluations and recommendations are based on the evidence in the digital evaluation file as described in Section IV of these *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.

## **B. Annual Evaluation**

The annual evaluation serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of 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, and Visiting 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 (non-continuation 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 Faculty Evaluation 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 Faculty Evaluation Committee (as well as by the Chair). Any such requests must be provided, in writing, at least ninety (90) days in advance of the applicable file closing date. 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 and teaching comes from the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Administrative service is evaluated solely by the Dean or Dean's designee.

### 2. Faculty with Grant Expectations

As described above in Sections II.A.2 and II.A.3 of these *Guidelines*, in disciplines where significant investments are required to conduct research, successful acquisition of awards is expected.

Specific criteria for the pursuit of sponsored research will be developed at the unit level and updated every five years. Faculty appointments should contain specific expectations for research funding.

The departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair must consider the faculty member's progress in meeting these expectations as part of annual, pre-promotion, and career evaluations of research. Appointment letters for faculty members with grant expectations require the faculty member to develop a plan for the pursuit of external research grants that is kept in the digital evaluation file. For such faculty members, the quality of the plan and the faculty member's progress in fulfilling it must be considered in evaluations of research.

### **C. Cumulative Pre-Promotion Evaluation**

Two years before 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 particular focus on the expectation to have developed an active, independent, and sustainable research program as defined in the letter of appointment.

As noted above in Section IV.C.1.b of these *Guidelines*, even though the cumulative pre-promotion report is required to support an evaluation of a Tenure-Track faculty member's progress towards tenure, it may be used to gauge any faculty member's progress towards promotion. Therefore, departments allow Teaching, Research, or Service faculty members, as well as tenured associate professors, to submit cumulative pre-promotion reports to solicit the department's detailed feedback on their progress towards promotion.

A cumulative pre-promotion evaluation is conducted by both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair in addition to the annual evaluation. 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 digital 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 the next career step (promotion, tenure) and what steps, if any, are needed for improvement.

In the case of probationary Tenure-Track faculty members, 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 (non-continuation 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 digital 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 Eberly College *Guidelines*, departments establish specific absolute 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 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 tenure-track faculty member is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the digital evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's contributions in the faculty member's area of significant or outstanding contribution(s) as identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent memoranda of understanding, 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 Faculty Evaluation 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.

a. *Rule 4.5 Extensions of the Tenure Clock.* Board of Governors Rule 4.5 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 Modification of Duties for Certain Full-time Faculty and, rarely, exceptional professional circumstances not of the faculty member's own making (e.g. a delay in essential laboratory renovations). Rule 4.5 limits the timing of requests for extensions to within one year of the qualifying event in most cases. The Rule also prohibits requests for extension during the Critical Year established in the letter of appointment, memoranda of understanding, or subsequent letters of agreement.

For faculty members whose Critical Year has been extended through 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. As set forth in the University Procedures document, section IV(B)(1), a teaching faculty may, during their fourth year in rank, petition the Dean to bring their promotion forward one year, in which case they would initiate consideration for their first promotion during the fifth year (with promotion effective beginning year six).

For a Teaching faculty member, the sole area of significant contribution is teaching. At least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion to a Teaching professorial rank (i.e.: “Teaching Instructor” to “Teaching Assistant Professor”) requires either 1) a terminal degree in a relevant discipline or 2) an advanced graduate degree in a relevant discipline in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant.

For promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor, in addition to documentation of significant curricular and/or programmatic contributions, the digital evaluation file must contain evidence showing that professional colleagues, both within the university and 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 may consider documenting their case through a number of ways such as: 1) nominations for, or receipt of, awards that focus on an aspect of teaching (including advising), external to the university, 2) a record of pedagogically related presentations or invited lectures at professional conferences, forums, or symposia of national or international stature, 3) a record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature, 4) professional colleagues external to the university acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member’s programmatic contributions to the teaching discipline or 5) other relevant information that demonstrates national or international acknowledgement of the quality and impact of the faculty member’s programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline.

Note that while external evaluations of teaching are an option to demonstrate this criterion, they are not required.

### 3. Research Faculty

A Research 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 7), or later. As set forth in the University Procedures document, section IV(B)(1), a research faculty may, during their fourth year in rank, petition the Dean to bring their promotion forward one year, in which case they would initiate consideration for their first promotion during the fifth year (with promotion effective beginning year six).

For a Research faculty member, the sole area of significant contribution is research. At least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment, if there are any.

In a year when a faculty member who has research as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the digital 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*.

### 4. 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 7), or later. As set forth in the University Procedures document, section IV(B)(1), a service faculty may, during their fourth year in rank, petition the Dean to bring their promotion forward one year, in which case they would initiate consideration for their first promotion during the fifth year (with promotion effective beginning year 6).

For a Service faculty member in the Eberly College, promotion depends on significant contributions in service and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment.

Promotion to a Service professorial rank (i.e.: “Service Instructor” to “Service Assistant Professor”) requires either 1) a terminal degree or 2) an advanced graduate degree in combination with professional or academic experience that is both significant and relevant.

### **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 10 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.

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 evaluations from the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, College Faculty Evaluation Committee, or Dean. The reactions fall into 2 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 non-continuation, 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 that “If you wish to challenge this evaluation, you may submit a rebuttal to the Dean of the Eberly College within 5 working days of your receipt of this evaluation.” In a college-level evaluation, the statement should replace “Dean of the Eberly College” with “Provost.”

## **B. Responses**

Responses to annual reviews at the department level may be submitted within 10 working days of receipt of the evaluation. Evaluations without a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or non-continuation should say, “You may, within 10 working days of receipt of this evaluation, submit a response to this evaluation to [Department Chair] or the Dean of the Eberly College, 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 faculty achievement are required when a Tenure-Track faculty member seeks tenure or promotion, or a Research faculty member seeks promotion (external evaluations of research are required).

The purpose of external evaluation is to have candidates for promotion and/or tenure evaluated by experts in their field with regard to the impact and quality of their work. Assessments as to whether the candidate would receive promotion and/or tenure at the external evaluator’s institution are not required.

The task of identifying suitable external evaluators is shared by the faculty candidate for promotion or tenure, the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee (or some other appropriate committee), and the Department Chair. The general procedures are described in Section XII (“External Evaluations”) of the *WVU Procedures* document. The basic steps as the process is implemented in the Eberly College are outlined below. 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 departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee (or other appropriate faculty committee), acting independently, each give the Department Chair a list of at least four, and preferably six or more, potential evaluators from peer institutions.

Normally, 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. Perhaps the individual, by virtue of their scholarly specialization or standing in the discipline, is uniquely qualified to judge the faculty member’s research. Or perhaps the individual is 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. These examples are not exhaustive.

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, however, individuals in non-academic settings might 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 Professor and have been promoted, at least in part, because of significant contributions in teaching.

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

In a timely fashion after receiving the committee's list, the Department Chair shares it with the faculty candidate and solicits the candidate's written comments.

In a written, signed, and dated statement, the faculty candidate gives the Department Chair comments regarding the committee's suggested evaluators. 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 must 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, normally 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 list should have at least six names, and preferably more. Indeed, unless a proposed evaluator is unacceptable, the Chair's list should exhaust the names from the candidate and committee's lists. The goal is to have a sufficient number of potential evaluators so that agreements to write letters can be secured from six individuals (see Section IX.E below), in case some individuals decline the invitation to write a letter. The Chair's list is confidential. To preserve the anonymity of the evaluators, the list must not be shared with the faculty candidate.

The letter inviting the external evaluations includes a special passage if the faculty candidate has been granted a Rule 4.5 extension of the tenure clock. Unless otherwise specified by the candidate, the letter says "Please note that Dr. X received an extension to his/her tenure clock by virtue of university rule. 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 Dean's office places a copy of the approved sample letter in the candidate's digital evaluation file. Because the identity of the evaluators is confidential, the approved list of evaluators is not placed into a section of the digital evaluation file that is accessible to the candidate.

The candidate provides the Department Chair with a package of materials to be sent to the external evaluators. The package should include a vita; materials that document the candidate's achievements in research, service, or programmatic contributions to teaching; a narrative that puts the documented achievements into context; and any other review materials the candidate wishes to share with the external evaluators. These materials must be included in the candidate's digital evaluation file. If the materials are already in the file, a list of the materials sent to the evaluators should be filed. If the materials are not in the digital evaluation file, a list of the materials and the materials themselves should be added.

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.

To increase the likelihood of receiving at least four evaluations, the Department Chair should secure agreements from at least six evaluators. In addition, the Chair should send reminders to the evaluators about a month before the deadline for receipt of the evaluations.

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

The WVU *Procedures* document (Section IX.D, "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.

Every department is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that is incorporated into its faculty evaluation guidelines and approved by the Dean. The performance-based salary policy must be designed to assign modest raises for "Satisfactory" performance and more substantial raises for "Good" or "Excellent" performance.

In years in which performance-based raises are approved, the Department Chair submits to the Office of the Dean the following information for each faculty member who is eligible for a raise: ratings of performance in teaching, research, and service, and the workload percentages in teaching, research, and service.

The department's ratings can be numerical (on a scale in the department's approved salary policy) or categorical ("Unsatisfactory," "Satisfactory," "Good," or "Excellent"). If the department submits categorical ratings, they will be converted to numbers as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0, "Unsatisfactory" = 0.

The department can submit one set of ratings combining those of the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair, or separate sets of ratings from the Committee and Chair. If the

Committee and the Chair's ratings are different, 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 Eberly College 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 – the Dean will make a recommendation to the faculty. If a ballot of eligible faculty members yields a majority of votes 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.

## FOOTNOTES

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

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