

**DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE,  
AND PERFORMANCE-BASED RAISES**

<b>1. Professional Expectations.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Faculty Assignment.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. The Faculty Personnel File.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback.....</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 Faculty Evaluation Committee.....	4
4.2 Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee Procedures.....	4
4.3 Role of the Department Chair.....	5
4.4 Performance Descriptors for Annual Review.....	5
4.5 Annual Evaluation in Research/Scholarship.....	5
4.6 Annual Evaluation of Teaching.....	6
4.7 Annual Evaluation of Service.....	7
<b>5. Performance-Based Salary Policy.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6. Pre-promotion Cumulative Review.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7. Tenure and Promotion Review.....</b>	<b>8</b>
7.1 Criteria for Tenure.....	9
7.2 Criteria for Promotion.....	9
7.3 Absolute Standards for Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor <sup>1</sup> .....	10
7.4 Absolute Standards for Promotion to Rank of Professor.....	11
7.5 Promotion and Tenure Administrative Procedures.....	12
<b>8. Responses to Annual Evaluation and Rebuttals of Recommendations.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9. Procedure for Modification of this Document.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex A.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 1.....</b>	<b>20</b>

## **DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Approved by the Provost: 04/02/2026

This document supplements the *West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Performance-Based Raises*. Since the primary review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe the guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to understand the criteria, requirements, and procedures contained in this manual and in the Board, University, and College documents. In the event of conflict among documents, their precedence is: 1) Board, 2) University, 3) College, 4) Department.

The Department of Biology's faculty evaluation process is intended to: enhance faculty success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short- and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for both performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations.

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences has several components including: the letter of appointment, annual assignments, the faculty digital evaluation file, and annual performance reviews. Letters of appointment for tenure-track, and promotion-eligible Service, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include conditions for promotion review. Tenure-track faculty are reviewed by the dean two years prior to their critical year to determine if they are making clear progress toward tenure.

### **1. Professional Expectations**

Faculty responsibilities in the Department of Biology are usually defined in terms of activities undertaken in teaching, research (or equivalent scholarly activity), and service; therefore, faculty evaluation is based primarily upon a review of performance in these areas. Scholarship is an important indication of activity in each of the three areas; it occurs in a variety of forms and need not be restricted to the research area. The extent to which scholarship is recognized depends upon one's area(s) of expected significant contribution. Publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members must keep current in their fields and should be able to demonstrate such currency.

In weighing the faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service, the relationship of the faculty member's expected role at the institution is to be considered. New and continuing activities in all three areas, as defined in the appointment letter and any subsequent Memoranda of Understanding, shall support both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the Department, the College, and the University.

### **2. Faculty assignment**

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to research, teaching, and service. The Department of Biology formally recognizes seven categories of faculty assignments while also recognizing that special cases may exist that necessitate a different percent effort toward research, teaching, and service (see *Department of Biology Workload Guidelines*).

The assignment categories are as follows:

- (1) Tenure-track Research-active (R:T:S 40:40:20)
- (2) Tenure-track Research-reduced (R:T:S 30:60:10)
- (3) Tenure-track Research-intensive (R:T:S 50:30:20)
- (4) Teaching-track Faculty (R:T:S of 0:80:20)
- (5) Service-track Faculty (R:T:S of 0-10:20-30:60-70)
- (6) Adjunct (normally a maximum 0.60 FTE, 100% teaching)
- (7) Research-track Faculty (100% research)

These percentages are used in performance-based salary calculations and as a means to adjust criteria, as appropriate, to the expectations of the assignment. Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between the faculty and chair, however, the chair is responsible for the annual assignment. They provide an opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Service, Research, Teaching, and Tenure-track faculty participate in formal annual assignment planning and feedback. Shifts in assignment may be made as appropriate via a Memorandum of Understanding between the faculty member, chair, and dean of the college. Memoranda of Understanding are to be included in the faculty digital evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation. Tenure and promotion decisions require consideration of conditions set forth and expectations detailed in the appointment letter and subsequent formal agreements.

For faculty assignment categories 1-3 (Tenure-track faculty), faculty are typically hired under Category 1. Subsequent shifts in proportions among categories after the award of tenure may occur via Memoranda of Understanding in order to optimize the faculty member's ongoing contributions to the department and so that they can be appropriately rewarded in performance-based evaluations for continued productivity. In annual evaluations, quantitative and qualitative criteria (e.g., number and quality of scholarly publications, external funding, etc.) for evaluating research, teaching, and service will be adjusted as appropriate to the assignment as described in **Annex A**. Regardless of the proportions among categories, however, promotion and tenure decisions must be consistent with the criterion set forth herein.

For Teaching-track faculty (assignment category 4) and Adjuncts (assignment category 6), the majority of the assignment will be in teaching. Normally, no research productivity will be expected, but there must be systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness as described in **Annex A**. Subsequent shifts in proportions among categories may occur via Memoranda of Understanding in order to optimize the faculty member's ongoing contributions to the department and so that they can be appropriately rewarded in performance-based evaluations for continued productivity.

For Service-track faculty (assignment category 5), the majority of the assignment must be in service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary. Expectations considered in annual evaluations, and possible promotion or performance-based salary increases, will be as defined in the appointment letter and possibly as modified by subsequent Memoranda of Understanding.

The objective of Research-track faculty (assignment category 7) is to perform research activities that facilitate the acquisition of external funding through the collection of preliminary data and submission of extramural grants. The workload expectation is typically 100% research but may include other expectations as defined in the Research-track faculty member's workload. Depending on the circumstances of the Research-track faculty's hire and funding source, there must be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is an expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding. Research-track faculty may teach, but the primary focus of the appointment is to develop an externally funded research program. Classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary, and teaching must be supported separately from internal funding and restricted to the extent defined by funding agencies.

For faculty members approved for sabbatical leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member's assignment for the leave period. The evaluation metrics for any type of leave must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave. Copies of the approved leave application and plan and follow-up report are to be included in the evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

### **3. The Faculty Personnel File**

Faculty must annually update their activity in the WVU digital evaluation file with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. The annual review period for the Department of Biology is from August 16<sup>th</sup> to August 15<sup>th</sup>. All materials must be in the file by September 30<sup>th</sup> following the period under review, at which time the file will be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file for the year under review after the deadline date. Exceptions will be allowed for faculty under consideration for promotion and tenure who will be permitted to add materials to their files until the last day of the calendar year. Faculty may immediately add materials to the file for the next review year.

This digital evaluation file serves as the basis for performance review and must contain all required documentation for each respective area of responsibility (teaching, research, and service), as well as administrative documents such as the letter of appointment and memoranda.

The file must include:

- A current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- The departmental workload form (uploaded by the college and checked for accuracy by the faculty)
- The departmental annual faculty productivity report (AFPR), which summarizes productivity in a format specified by the department
- A narrative that covers each area of assigned contribution and which should contextualize all work for the review period and comment on relevant progress toward long-term goals.
- Point allocation spreadsheet in Excel format (see **Annex A**)
- A university faculty productivity report generated from the digital evaluation file, run for the appropriate date range, which will contain links to all of the above items

### **4. Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback**

The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at West Virginia University. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members<sup>1</sup>, provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, serve as an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and document support of recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. The primary purpose of these annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the role and mission of the university. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary, however, in accordance with the type of appointment, rank, and, where appropriate, tenure status.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance and must be both formative and summative. The review is not limited to events of the one-year period under review, but rather it is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, and, if positive, as a basis for any available

---

<sup>1</sup> Occasional or adjunct faculty receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment.

performance-based salary adjustment (see section 5). The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity for developmental changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the university. For tenured faculty, changes to the areas of significant contribution must be negotiated and determined five years prior to the review year in which promotion will be requested and approved by the dean and provost. See university guidelines for specific applications for varied appointment, rank, and status types. See the details provided in **Annex A** of this document for *Department of Biology Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty*.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Service-, Research-, Teaching-, and Tenure-track faculty participate in formal annual assignment planning and feedback. Adjuncts will normally participate in this process. All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both the Department of Biology Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and by the chair unless they are fully promoted in rank, in which case they are by default only reviewed by the chair, and can opt-in to FEC review.

The process for a response to the annual evaluation letters written by the FEC or by the chair is described in section 8, "Responses to annual evaluation and rebuttals of recommendations."

#### **4.1 Faculty Evaluation Committee**

The FEC serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and 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 faculty member's digital evaluation files.

The Biology FEC will be elected at the last faculty meeting of the academic year. Faculty from all assignment categories are eligible for election. The majority of the FEC committee must be tenured and the composition must adhere to the following rules: (1) seven faculty shall be elected by secret ballot; (2) at least one member, but not more than two, must be from the assistant professor rank; (3) at least one member must be from assignment categories 4-7; (4) at least one member, but not more than two, must be a fully promoted faculty member from assignment categories 1-3; (5) individuals may not be elected for more than two consecutive years unless insufficient faculty are available in a given rank or category; (6) no faculty member under consideration for promotion and/or tenure may serve on the committee; and (7) faculty members who serve on the college evaluation committee may not serve concurrently on the departmental evaluation committee.

All members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the event a member abstains from voting.

#### **4.2 Departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee Procedures**

- The committee shall choose its own chairperson. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC.
- The committee will follow department procedures and criteria.
- No committee member may vote on their own recommendations in the annual review.
- Members will recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for such a deliberation.
- Each year, the committee will familiarize themselves with operating definitions of required qualifiers "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory", "good" and "excellent" in teaching, research, and service as described in **Annex A**. In consideration of promotion and tenure, the committee will review operating definitions of "significant" contributions in each area relevant to the assignment.
- All committee members may vote on recommendations for tenure and promotion in rank.
- The committee will make and report its recommendations on faculty tenure, promotion, and continuation, based on evidence in the WVU digital evaluation file.

- The deliberations of the committee and all information contained in evaluation files shall remain strictly confidential.
- The committee shall review the graduate faculty status of all faculty members every three years and make recommendations to the chair of the department for continuation and change.

#### **4.3 Role of the Department Chair**

The chair reviews and evaluates each faculty member and makes an independent recommendation providing a written rationale for each decision. The chair reports both their and the Faculty Evaluation Committee recommendation to each faculty member and to the dean for continuation of the process at the college level, if appropriate. The chair will recuse themselves when evaluating their partner, spouse, or other member of their immediate family in the annual evaluation or promotion or tenure process. Under such circumstances, the dean of the college, or their designee, executes said evaluation.

#### **4.4 Performance Descriptors for Annual Review**

The annual review of one's performance in each area to which one is assigned shall be assessed as Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or Unsatisfactory as described in **Annex A**. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" ratings, particularly in an area in which a significant contribution is required for promotion and tenure, will not qualify for promotion or tenure. Annual evaluations might lead to the development of a written performance improvement plan, as determined by the chair and dean. A record of unsatisfactory performance and a faculty member's failure to fulfill a performance improvement plan could lead to a recommendation for non-continuation. Recommendations against continuation of a tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track faculty on multiyear contracts not in their final year automatically receive review at all levels, including that of the provost.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide evidence for the file that (1) demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses only on evidence located in the WVU digital evaluation file. To be considered meritorious, work must be well documented.

Research, Teaching, and Service expectations are defined in the faculty member's appointment letter and may be modified via subsequent Memoranda of Understanding. Criteria for attaching performance descriptors (excellent, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) to annual performance evaluations will be adjusted accordingly as described in **Annex A**.

The assessments provided by annual reviews should be the basis for periodic recommendations forwarded to the office of the provost that relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must be supported by (a) a preponderance of meritorious reviews, (b), performance which is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions", and (c) meet defined absolute criteria in **Sections 7.3 and 7.4**. Additionally, all applicable guidelines must be met.

#### **4.5 Annual Evaluation of Research/Scholarship**

Research involves the discovery or synthesis of knowledge, the development of new approaches to understanding and explaining phenomena, the development of new insights, the critical appraisal of the past, and the application of knowledge and expertise to address needs in society and in the profession. Research is a critical component of the mission of the university, college, and department, contributing to the general body of knowledge and thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work may be documented in a variety of ways for evaluation as well as for comparison with peers at WVU and other institutions of higher learning.

Peer-reviewed publications and other products of high quality and successfully funded grant proposals are the most important, but not sole, evidence of scholarly productivity. While writing grant proposals and peer-reviewed publications may be important considerations for performance-based raises, each faculty's letter of appointment, with possible subsequent modifications documented in a Memorandum of Understanding, identifies research expectations for the purposes of tenure and/or promotion.

Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be a single work of considerable importance (such as a book) or a series of studies (articles in peer-reviewed journals) constituting a program of worthwhile research. Success in graduation of students with M.S. or Ph.D. degrees, scientific awards, non-peer-reviewed publications and grant proposal submissions, patents, development of a technique or product which advances the field, invited talks, invited chapters, and presentations are also important evidence of research or scholarly activity. Faculty members are expected to undertake and demonstrate evidence of a continuing program of studies or investigations. Invitations to serve on national panels and editorial boards will be taken as an indication of national/international recognition of the high quality of research performed and reported by the faculty member and be evaluated under 'Research'. The act of serving as a reviewer in these capacities is evaluated under the heading of 'Service'.

#### **4.6 Annual Evaluation of Teaching**

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

Prime requisites of an effective teacher include intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods that promote student learning, the ability to transfer knowledge, acceptance with courtesy of differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest of students.

All faculty, regardless of assignment category, are expected to engage in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the university's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing department-, college-, and university-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives (see **Annex A**). Information used to evaluate teaching effectiveness includes reflective and assessment practices, in addition to student feedback through the current form approved by the faculty senate. Assessments could include: pre/post-test evidence of student learning, advising practices that lead to student success, evidence of graduate student progression through milestones, evidence of undergraduate research student deliverables, annotated syllabi showing changes for course improvement, development of new courses in response to university goals, evidence of incorporation of innovative teaching methods, evidence of inclusive practices, etc. (see **Annex A**). Written peer evaluations could include an analysis of classroom performance, course goals, student population, grade distribution, and effort involved in teaching the course.

Invitations to serve as a peer reviewer for national and international education-related publications or grants will be taken as an indication of national/international recognition of the high quality of teaching-related scholarship performed and reported by the faculty. The act of serving as a reviewer in these capacities is evaluated under the heading of 'Service'.

#### **4.7 Annual Evaluation of Service**

Service activities involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society and the profession. These activities include service to the university, state, region, and at national and international levels. Service to the university includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college.

In keeping with the university's tradition as a land grant institution, the department is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities on the part of its faculty as essential components of its mission. Enlightened perspectives, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable resources in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Service by faculty members to West Virginia is of special importance to the university mission. Paid consulting, while obviously dependent upon a person's professional qualifications, knowledge and experience, will be excluded from consideration of a person's service activities by the department.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession (see **Annex A**). Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients, induces positive change, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with one's university affiliation identified. The nature and extent of acceptable service to society includes, but is not limited to, invited presentations to off-campus groups, tours, field trips, talks to professional and service groups, and professional advice to individuals. Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, service as a committee member or chair at the departmental, college or university level. Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, grant and manuscript reviews, committee and chair service to professional societies and panels.

Faculty in categories 1 – 5 have service as a component of their assignments and must document their service contributions in their files. Service-track faculty in the Department of Biology have service as the area of significant contribution in their assignment. Service-track faculty are expected to demonstrate a high quality of service to receive recognition for significant and meritorious contributions. Evidence for quality of service could include but is not limited to such things as (a) service grant submission and funding, (b) conducting special events for the department, university, or general public, (c) obtaining favorable publicity for departmental facilities, (d) self- and peer-evaluations of service contributions, as well as other documentation of superior contributions to the service mission of the department.

#### **5. Performance-Based Salary Policy**

The chair must consider both the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the chair's annual evaluations when awarding performance-based salary increases. The intent of this policy is to recognize those faculty who are exceeding the normal expectations associated with their position and have been rated good or excellent.

"Excellent" and "Good" characterize performance of merit. "Satisfactory" characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation and to participate in available raise plans, but for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. Performance-based salary increases are intended to reward professional contributions that are truly meritorious.

In determining performance-based raises, the assignment of a faculty member as well as his/her performance in that assignment guides the amount of the award. For example, a faculty member whose primary assignment is in Teaching and whose performance in that area is exemplary should receive a merit increase comparable to that of a faculty member whose primary assignment is in Research or scholarship and whose performance is also exemplary, assuming that the performance in other areas is also comparable. In the Department of Biology, performance-based salary increases will be awarded when available using the following formula, which explicitly weights the score in Research, Teaching and Service (2 for excellent, 1 for good, 0 for satisfactory, -1 for unsatisfactory) by the individual's assignment:

Merit Score = [(Score for research) \* (Proportion of assignment in research)] + [(Score for teaching) \* (Proportion of assignment in teaching)] + [(Score for service) \* (Proportion of assignment in service)]

Individuals will be rated Excellent (2), Good (1), Satisfactory (0), or Unsatisfactory (-1) in each of the three categories by the FEC and separately by the chair. The proportion of one's assignment in Research, Teaching, and Service is the product of negotiations between the faculty member and the chair in accordance with the approved faculty workload model and must be explicitly stated in the *Department of Biology Workload Plan* signed by both parties to be placed in the relevant evaluation file. The merit score will range from 0 to 2 (while a negative score is theoretically possible, any negative total merit score will be assigned a 0). A sample calculation is included here for Professor X, whose assignment is 20% research, 70% teaching and 10% service, and whose performance in those three areas was judged to be Satisfactory, Excellent, and Good, respectively:

Merit Score = [(0) \* (.20)] + [(2) \* (.70)] + [(1) \* (.10)] = 1.50

If the FEC and the second evaluator (usually the chair) present different ratings descriptors, the merit score is an average of the two evaluations.

The receipt of a performance-based salary increase in one or several years does not guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted and/or tenured. If an exemplary record in teaching is not matched by an appropriate record in research or service, such a faculty member would not be promoted or tenured although they may have received performance-based increases in each of several years. This distinction also makes it possible to reward behaviors that may be important to the unit but that, without other equally important behaviors, may not justify promotion and/or tenure. Final performance-based decisions will not be made until 10 working days after the faculty have received their annual evaluations from the Department FEC and from the chair to allow for response to these evaluations as described in section 8, Responses to annual evaluation and rebuttals of recommendations.

## **6. Pre-promotion Cumulative Review**

Tenure-track faculty are carefully reviewed two years prior to their critical year to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, tenure track faculty should be making substantial progress toward a level of teaching and research that would be judged as making significant contributions. "Significant contributions" in research and teaching are those that meet or exceed the absolute standards detailed in **sections 7.3 and 7.4**. Although not required, faculty in any track may request a cumulative pre-promotion review.

Cumulative pre-promotion reviews conducted by the Department FEC and chair follow normal annual review procedures. The dean also reviews the set of annual evaluations to date. Where concerns arise regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the dean will follow up with a request that the entire file be forwarded for assessment by the college committee.

## **7. Tenure and Promotion Review**

In a Tenure-track appointment, tenure must be awarded by the end of the "critical year" (normally the individual's sixth year, as identified in the letter of appointment or MOU). If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for a final year of employment. Tenure-track faculty with qualifying experience at the time of their hire may be offered the option to request a specified number of years credited toward tenure. Upon receipt of such requests, the dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University must be included in the faculty member's digital evaluation file.

Tenure-track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may, during the fourth year of employment (by May 15<sup>th</sup> of the fourth year), request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the dean's approval of such a request, the new critical year will be

confirmed. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

Adjuncts, Service-, Research- and Teaching-track faculty (categories 4-7) are not eligible for tenure. Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in Service-, Research-, or Teaching-track faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College follows the same promotion timeline governing Tenure-track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a Service, Teaching, or promotion-eligible Research faculty member and their chair may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later.

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least two full years after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

### ***7.1 Criteria for Tenure***

To be recommended for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions in two areas of evaluation with reasonable contributions in the other area of assignment. The areas of significant contribution are defined in the faculty member's appointment letter and may be modified in a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding specifying different areas of emphasis or terms.

Significant contributions are those that meet or exceed the absolute standards detailed in **sections 7.3 and 7.4**. Research contributions will be evaluated by several criteria, the most important of which will be the quality of the faculty member's peer-reviewed publications and history of extramural funding. Significant contributions in the area of research require a peer-reviewed publication record. Refereed publications of high quality are the most important, but not sole, evidence of scholarly productivity. There is recognition that different disciplines, and even different research directions within a discipline, entail different publication rates and levels of extramural funding. Publications literally "in press" or unequivocally accepted for publication are appropriate to count for the tenure decision. Other criteria (as outlined in Section 4.5, Evaluation of Research/Scholarship) are also considered. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are encouraged to present periodic departmental seminars on their research, so that the faculty may understand and evaluate their work. External evaluation letters from researchers at peer institutions will be solicited regarding the quality of research contributions.

### ***7.2 Criteria for Promotion***

In order to be recommended for promotion, a promotion-eligible faculty member will be expected, unless there is a Memorandum of Understanding to the contrary, to demonstrate significant contributions in one or more areas of evaluation with reasonable contributions in other areas of assignment. Research-, Service-, and Teaching-track faculty may have a single area of significant contribution. The areas of significant contribution in which each faculty member is expected to perform will be identified in the letter of appointment, or as modified in a subsequent document. Significant contributions are those that meet or exceed the absolute standards detailed in **sections 7.3 and 7.4**

For Tenure-track faculty, research will normally be one of the two areas in which significant contributions are expected for promotion. Though "in press" publications may count toward promotion to rank of Associate Professor, for discretionary promotion to the rank of Professor, all credited publications must be "in print" (including Online First or Publish Ahead of Print digital publications).

For Tenure-track faculty, promotion to the rank of Professor is recognition of the attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation in a recognized field of learning in addition to the achievement of effective teaching skill and a continued record of satisfactory service. For promotion to Professor, consideration should be given to the candidate's cumulative record since his or her last promotion as it is expected that different candidates may attain significant recognition in their field at different times in their tenure. However, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more

recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a “continuous program” of scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record.

For faculty who have Service as an area of significant contribution, service activities that address critical issues that impact society will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion purposes. While service to the university and professions are worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must have significant service activities, which can include the development and implementation of service-learning projects, directed to the citizens of West Virginia. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the university, profession, or on a national or international level. Such exceptions should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

Service-track faculty (category 5) are expected to show evidence of research contributions at a satisfactory level if assigned. If teaching is assigned, Service-track faculty must demonstrate quality teaching contributions, in the same manner as other faculty. Promotion from Service Assistant Professor to Service Associate Professor entails compiling a multi-year record of delivering service of high quality. Promotion from Service Associate Professor to Service Professor is considered when an individual provides evidence of a sustained record of quality service, as well as a continued record of quality teaching and research (when assigned) and publication appropriate to the assignment.

For Teaching-track faculty (category 4), promotion to Teaching Associate Professor or Teaching Professor requires significant contributions in teaching. It requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. While not all Teaching faculty may attain the Teaching Professor rank, annual evaluations should guide Teaching faculty toward that achievement. It is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the university’s teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing department-, college-, and university-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Teaching-track faculty are expected to show evidence of service contributions at a reasonable level. Evidence of contributions in service include advances to education in the Department of Biology, such as participation in orientation, outreach, advising, instructional meetings to discuss the progress and coordination of the courses being taught.

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the one in which the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or tenure, should have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the department in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the dean and by the provost.

### ***7.3 Absolute Standards for Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor***

Faculty who have research as an area of significance must demonstrate significant contributions by satisfying all of the following metrics:

- Faculty are expected to produce at least six scholarly products affiliated with West Virginia University by the time of application for promotion or to accomplish achievements in research that, in the judgment of the Department of Biology Faculty Evaluation Committee and the dean of the Eberly College, are equivalent. Scholarly products are usually peer-reviewed research and review articles in well-regarded journals and peer-reviewed book chapters. At least two of these products must be research articles on which the faculty is first or senior author. If credit toward promotion and/or tenure was offered and accepted, scholarly products during the period of credited time need not be affiliated with West Virginia University.

- Faculty are expected to have secured extramural funding sufficient to support at least part of their research program as principal investigator or major coinvestigator with the grantee West Virginia University or its affiliates, or to accomplish achievements in research that, in the judgment of the Department of Biology Faculty Evaluation Committee and the dean of the Eberly College, are equivalent.
- Faculty are expected to have a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in research in their annual evaluations. However, a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in research does not guarantee promotion/tenure if the other criteria are not met.

Faculty who have teaching as an area of significance must demonstrate significant contributions by satisfying all of the following metrics:

- Faculty are expected to have a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in teaching in their annual evaluations. However, a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in teaching does not guarantee promotion/tenure if the other criteria are not met.
- Faculty are expected to have achieved at least three different items under the section entitled “Assessment/Achievement” outlined in the Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty (see **Annex A, Annual Evaluation of Teaching**).
- Where graduate student involvement is expected, faculty have demonstrated an emerging record of effective graduate student mentorship through evidence of students successfully completing milestones on time.

Faculty who have service as an area of significance must demonstrate significant contributions by satisfying all of the following metrics:

- Faculty are expected to have a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in service in their annual evaluations. However, a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in service does not guarantee promotion/tenure if the other criteria are not met.
- Faculty are expected to have made significant service contributions to society at the individual, group, state, national, and/or international levels. Faculty are expected to have achieved at least four of the items outlined in the Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty in the areas of Outreach and Recruitment, Student Engagement and Retention, Faculty Operations, Staffing Management, Collaborative Work, and/or Publicity and Media (see **Annex A, Appendix 1, Service**).

#### ***7.4 Absolute Standards for Promotion to Rank of Professor***

Faculty who have research as an area of significance must demonstrate significant contributions by satisfying all of the following metrics:

- Faculty are expected to produce at least eight scholarly products affiliated with West Virginia University over the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor or to accomplish achievements in research that, in the judgment of the Department of Biology Faculty Evaluation Committee and the dean of the Eberly College, are equivalent. Scholarly products are usually peer-reviewed research and review articles in well-regarded journals as well as peer-reviewed book chapters. At least five of these products must be research articles on which the faculty member is first or senior author. If credit toward promotion was offered and accepted, scholarly products during the period of credited time need not be affiliated with West Virginia University.
- Faculty are expected to maintain significant extramural funding sufficient to support the majority of their research as principal investigator or major coinvestigator with the grantee West Virginia University or its affiliates over the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor.

- Faculty are expected to have a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in research in their annual evaluations in the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor. However, a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in research does not guarantee promotion/tenure if the other criteria are not met.

Faculty who have teaching as an area of significance must demonstrate significant contributions by satisfying all of the following metrics:

- Faculty are expected to have a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in teaching in their annual evaluations over the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor. However, a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in teaching does not guarantee promotion/tenure if the following other are not met.
- Faculty are expected to have achieved at least four different items under the section entitled "Assessment/Achievement" outlined in the Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty over the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor (see **Annex A, Annual Evaluation of Teaching**).
- Where graduate student involvement is expected, faculty have demonstrated a strong track record of graduate student mentorship through evidence of students successfully completing milestones on time, student-led research articles, and degree completion.

Faculty who have service as an area of significance must demonstrate significant contributions by satisfying all of the following metrics:

- Faculty are expected to have a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in service in their annual evaluations over the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor. However, a preponderance of good and excellent reviews in service does not guarantee promotion/tenure if the other criteria are not met.
- Faculty are expected to have made significant service contributions to society at the level of individuals, groups, state, national, and/or international levels. Faculty are expected to have performed at least six of the items outlined in the Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty in the areas of Outreach and Recruitment, Student Engagement and Retention, Facility Operations, Staffing Management, Collaborative Work, and/or Publicity and Media over the past 5-6 years prior to applying for promotion to the rank of Professor (see **Annex A, Appendix 1, Service**).

### **7.5 Promotion and Tenure Administrative Procedures**

The Department of Biology will adhere to university and college procedures for faculty evaluation. A copy of these procedures is posted to [faculty.wvu.edu](http://faculty.wvu.edu). The department will use the following procedures and deadlines to implement the University Guidelines for External Evaluation of faculty members seeking promotion or tenure.

Faculty members must notify the chair prior to the start of their critical year contract to change their tenure-clock. A faculty member cannot extend their critical year more than three times, nor can a faculty member extend their critical year past their ninth year in the tenure-track.

August 30<sup>th</sup> is the *last* date for a faculty member to notify the chair in writing if they wish to be considered for discretionary promotion.

Per WVU procedures, in years when a faculty member, in any track, who has research as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research from persons external to the University.

The FEC and the faculty member will each prepare a list of at least six possible external evaluators. External evaluators must be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought and are normally faculty members at peer institutions. A short statement describing each evaluator must be submitted by the faculty member and the FEC indicating why each evaluator is qualified to serve as an evaluator. Any personal or

professional relationship between the evaluator and the faculty member must be noted.

These lists of potential evaluators must be forwarded to the department chair by September 6<sup>th</sup>. The chair will then share the faculty evaluation committee list with the faculty member within two working days. The faculty member has the right to review the list and to comment on persons who may not provide an objective evaluation or should be excluded for other reasons. The faculty member's acknowledgement of such review, together with his or her appropriate comments, should be forwarded in writing to the department chair by September 16<sup>th</sup>.

The department chair will select the names of a sufficient number of appropriate external evaluators from each list to ensure receipt of at least four evaluations. This selection process may take into consideration any comments by the faculty member regarding potential evaluators whose names appear on the faculty evaluation committee list. The faculty member is not informed of the names in the final list of external evaluators. The final list, and the evaluation solicitation letter, should be forwarded to the dean for approval by September 18<sup>th</sup>. Both the candidate and the FEC are encouraged to determine an evaluator's willingness to evaluate a candidate prior to submitting names and in advance of sending evaluation materials. October 1 is the *last* day for the department chair to mail letters soliciting external evaluation and supporting materials for *all* faculty under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The dean-approved letter will state that the evaluation must be received by the last working day of the calendar year. The letter should state clearly that returning evaluations to the office of the dean is University procedure and that a copy of the evaluation will be forwarded to the department to be used in its evaluation. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations must be included in the faculty member's evaluation file with identifying information removed.

The office of the dean will provide clerical support and will monitor the receipt of the evaluation letters and facilitate receipt of overdue evaluations. If four evaluations are not received by the last working day of the calendar year, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended through the written consent of the faculty member, chair, dean, and provost. A copy of the written consent letter must be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

The office of the dean will provide a complete set of evaluations for review at the department level.

## **8. Responses to annual evaluation and rebuttals of recommendations**

Faculty members may submit formal reactions to evaluations from the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee or the department chair. The reactions fall into two general classes: "responses" to annual evaluative descriptors and "rebuttals" to recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, or continuation. Responses to annual reviews at the department level may be submitted within 10 working days of receiving the evaluation. When the evaluation includes a recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, or continuation, a rebuttal may be submitted to the dean within five working days of receiving the evaluation. Details can be found in the University's guidelines; see Sections XIII.A.4-7 about reactions to departmental evaluations (reactions to college-level evaluations are described in Section XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6).

If decisions have been made that are construed as capricious or in violation of the Procedures, then a grievance might be appropriate. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at <http://grievanceprocedure.wvu.edu/>.

## **9. Procedure for modification of this document**

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the chair of the department. The committee and the chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the faculty. If the faculty approves the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the dean and the provost. Upon such approval, the change(s) will be adopted.

## **Annex A. Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty**

Updated November 2024 and approved by Biology Faculty on 11/21/24

### **Introduction**

This document has been established to provide guiding principles for annual evaluation of faculty by the Department of Biology Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). The process of evaluation is meant to establish clear criteria for evaluation of performance in Research, Teaching, and Service. Faculty evaluation is a complex process due to the heterogeneity of assignments and the dynamic nature of expectations at the department, college, and university levels. This is therefore intended to be a “living document” that will evolve as the FEC gains experience in application of the criteria, and as guidelines and expectations change at higher levels of the university hierarchy.

The tasks of the FEC are: 1) to provide independent assessment of faculty performance and 2) to assess documentation of performance that represents *unique and exceptional circumstances*. For example, several items in the lists for Research, Teaching, and Service provide a range of values, providing latitude for the FEC to consider the circumstances of a given achievement.

### **Scaling Contributions in Research and Service**

Faculty have different assignments with respect to Teaching, Research and Service. The scoring system is based on a 40:40:20 Research:Teaching:Service assignment. However, scoring will be calibrated for Research and Service on an individual basis to reflect a given faculty’s percent effort.

For the purpose of the annual evaluation, these percentages will be based on letters of appointment and any modifications in assignment approved by the chair. Such modifications must be specified in a letter in the personnel file. For example, new faculty are often given teaching and/or service reassignment during their first year and/or critical years. Such arrangements must be formalized in the annual workload plan and reflected in revised percentages of effort.

In establishing cutoffs for designations of performance in research and service, the following formula will apply:

$$c_i = \frac{a_i}{a_r} c_r$$

where  $c_i$  and  $a_i$  are point cutoffs and assignment percentage for the individual researcher, respectively, and  $c_r$  and  $a_r$  are cutoffs and assignment percentage defined for the reference scale (40:40:20 appointment).

For starting faculty, contributions can be prorated to the proportion of the year spent in the department.

### **Scaling Contributions in Teaching**

Because teaching assignments sometimes include other tasks, such as acquiring external grant funding, teaching is scaled according to the number of course equivalents directly related to instruction as designated in an individual faculty member’s workload. This includes scheduled classroom teaching, undergraduate advising, and the mentorship of graduate students.

In establishing cut-offs for designation of performance in teaching, scaling will involve multiplying the base point cut-offs by the number of assigned course equivalents related to instruction.

### **Faculty Responsibilities in the Evaluation Process**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide the qualifier of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory that corresponds to the criteria established in this document and associated scoring sheet. Productivity must be documented in the digital evaluation file and summarized within the departmental

specified annual faculty productivity report (AFPR). Faculty must submit a faculty productivity report generated from the digital evaluation file, run for the appropriate report range. In accordance with university procedures, evidence of productivity must be placed in the digital evaluation file in support of performance. The FEC is under no obligation to assume that productivity has occurred without this documentation. Therefore, it is incumbent upon each faculty member to supplement their files with the information that they think is important for review.

### **Documentation**

Faculty must submit:

- A current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- The departmental workload form (uploaded by the college and checked for accuracy by the faculty)
- The departmental annual faculty productivity report (AFPR), which summarizes productivity in a format specified by the department
- A narrative that covers each area of assigned contribution and which should contextualize all work for the review period and comment on relevant progress toward long-term goals.
- Point allocation spreadsheet in Excel format (see **Annex A**)
- A university faculty productivity report generated from the digital evaluation file, run for the appropriate date range, which will contain links to all of the above items

**ANNUAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH**

Excellence in Research is defined with an explicit emphasis on achievement measured by scholarly works and grant funding. Because of the nature of the peer review process and the uncertainties of grant funding, points can also be earned for various types of research effort. Up to and including the first 3 tenure clock years, an unlimited number of points can be earned for activities in the “effort” category, but thereafter these points will be capped at 5 effort points.

**Excellent:** >30 points<sup>2</sup>

**Good:** 20-29.99 points

**Satisfactory:** 10-19.99 points

**Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member did not meet the criterion for satisfactory or they did not meet a minimum level of professionalism in fulfilling their research responsibilities.

Points	Achievements
6 pt each <sup>3</sup>	PI or CoPI or CoI on an externally funded grant or contract (may count a single 1-year no cost extension per grant so long as there is a remaining budget).
1 pt/\$100k	Bonus points based on external grant funds received by the faculty member lab annually <sup>4</sup> .
2 pt each	PI or CoPI or CoI on an internal grant.
3 pt each	PI or CoPI or CoI on a pre-proposal that was invited for full submission.
6 pt each	Publishes a research article in a peer-reviewed journal as first/senior author during the past 2 academic years (an academic year is defined as August 16 <sup>th</sup> to the following August 15 <sup>th</sup> . Note that the publication date must correspond to this 2-year window).
3 pt each	Publishes a research article in a peer-reviewed journal as secondary author within the past 2 academic years.
1 pt each	Presents or coauthors an oral presentation or poster at a national/international professional meeting (max 3 pts.).
3 pt each	Presents invited talk at a colloquium or professional conference (max 6 pts).
3 pt	Receives a research award from the college, university or a scientific association (max 3pts).
3 pt	Evidence of stature in the field (e.g., serves on a national panel or editorial board) (max 3pts).
Variable	Other activities deemed as meritorious achievements in research by the FEC (see Appendix 1 for instruction and examples).

  

Points	Effort
5 pt each	Submits, as PI or CoPI, a research grant proposal to an external funding source.
2 pt each	Submits as PI or CoPI an internal grant.
3 pt each	<sup>5</sup> Submits a research article to a peer-reviewed journal as first/senior author.
2 pt each	<sup>4</sup> Submits a research article to a peer-reviewed journal as secondary author.
2 pt	Building and activating a new lab (up to the first two tenure clock years only).
2 pt	Staffing a new lab (New faculty only, one time only).

<sup>2</sup> These values will be scaled according to the formula given in the introduction. For example, for a 60:20:20 assignment, the cutoff for excellent would be  $60/40 \times 30 = 45$  points.

<sup>3</sup> Capped at 24 points.

<sup>4</sup> Funds are based on the total received each year, including F&A. In the case of multiple Biology investigators on the same grant, it will be up to the faculty members to decide how they will divide the grant funds for the purpose of calculating the bonus.

<sup>5</sup> Submission to a pre-print server can be considered as a submission and receive full points. However, if this option is chosen, subsequent submission of the manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal would not be eligible for submission points.

**ANNUAL EVALUATION OF SERVICE**

Excellence in service is defined as contributing in a significant and substantial way to the department, college, university, profession, and the community through volunteer and outreach activities.

**Excellent:** 8+ points

**Good:** 5-7.5 points

**Satisfactory:** 2-4.5 points

**Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member did not meet the criterion for satisfactory or they did not meet a minimum level of professionalism in fulfilling their service responsibilities.

<b>Points</b>	<b>Service to the Profession</b>
3	Serving as an Associate or Senior Editor on a peer reviewed journal
3	Serving on a panel for an external funding agency
2	Holding an administrative office in a scientific society or organization
2	Evidence of exceptional service to the profession (e.g., letter of commendation or award)
0.5 <sup>6</sup>	Reviewer for an external funding agency
0.5 <sup>5</sup>	Reviewer for journals or textbooks
1	Providing professional expertise to scientific groups or organizations
3	Chairs/organizes session at professional national/international conference
<b>Service to the Department</b>	
1 <sup>7</sup>	Chairing a committee
3 <sup>8</sup>	Participation on labor-intensive committees
2	Acquisition of funding for projects that augment the department's service capabilities
2	Evidence of exceptional service (e.g., letter of commendation)
0.5 <sup>5</sup>	Undergraduate advising (e.g., BIOL 486 committee member), if not part of teaching assignment
1	Participation on non-labor-intensive committees
0.5 <sup>5</sup>	Service on graduate advising committees (non-chair)
1	Advising a student organization
1	Participation in faculty meetings when there is no schedule conflict
<b>Service to the College and University</b>	
2	Directing a shared facility
2	Serving on committees
2	Reviewer of internal grant proposals
1	Advising a student organization
1	Providing professional expertise within the college or university
<b>Service to the Community</b>	
1	Performing scientific outreach activities in the community
1	Providing professional expertise to community organizations
1 <sup>8</sup>	Serving on committees
<b>Miscellaneous Service</b>	
Variable	Other meritorious service activities not included on these lists (see Appendix 1) for instruction and examples).

<sup>6</sup> For ranges of reviews and student committees, the faculty earn 0.5 points per unit (e.g., 0.5 points per review or 0.5 points per committee) up to 2 points.

<sup>7</sup> In addition to points earned for participation on committee.

<sup>8</sup> At the departmental level, includes FEC, Graduate, and search committees. Other committees may be considered labor-intensive if sufficient justification is provided in the AFPR.

<sup>8</sup> Related to the faculty appointment and as approved by the chair.

## ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Excellence in Teaching is defined with an emphasis on student learning, evidence-based practice, and iterative growth. While scheduled teaching, student mentorship and advising are recognized as efforts, excellence requires documentation, reflection and assessment of materials provided by instructors themselves, peers, and students. Points can be earned through documented Effort, Reflective Practice, and Achievement.

**Reflective Practice:** Good instructors regularly engage in reflection using multiple forms of evidence (student feedback, self-reflection, alignment with literature, etc.). Faculty may submit evidence of reflective practice (~1 page) for each course or course equivalent. (2 points each submission)

**Assessment and Achievement:** The ultimate aim of teaching is student learning and success. Excellent teaching aligns with the benchmarks below<sup>9</sup>. By its nature, teaching is difficult to capture and measure. The most successful teaching files will present a range of examples that comprehensively convey each teaching activity and its impact. For example, the activity of teaching a course could be represented by the course syllabus, student feedback instrument or other University approved tool, anonymized student work, pre- and post-course test data, instructor-designed course evaluations, screenshots from eCampus, peer observation, etc. Different examples communicate different types of information. Guidelines from the University Promotion and Tenure document suggest that faculty use evidence from different creators (instructor, students, peers), of different types (peer evaluation, syllabi, anonymized student work, student feedback, etc.). One key to a successful teaching file is that it balances a range of example types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized in a teaching narrative.

Evidence and documentation that support these benchmarks may be submitted for each course or course equivalent. Note that it is not expected that faculty members will do all of these each year or each course. Rather, faculty should iteratively improve courses or their teaching practice in the interest of student success or departmental success, which reflect faculty achievement. (4 points each submission)

More than one Assessment & Achievement option can be used for a course. The same option can be used for more than one course. But the *same* option cannot be used more than once for the *same* course in the *same* year. Teaching multiple sections of the same course will count as separate courses if assessed separately. Teaching overloads cannot be used to score points in effort, but can be documented in reflection and achievement.

**Excellent:** 5+ points per course equivalent<sup>10</sup>

**Good:** 4 points per course equivalent

**Satisfactory:** 3 points per course equivalent

**Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member did not meet the criterion for satisfactory or they did not meet a minimum level of professionalism in fulfilling their service responsibilities.

*Examples:*

	2 courses (most Service faculty)	3 courses (most Research faculty)	8 courses (Most teaching faculty)
Excellent <sup>9</sup>	10 (4 effort + 6 pts)	15 (6 effort + 9 pts)	40 (16 effort + 24 pts)
Good	8 (4 effort + 4 pts)	12 (6 effort + 6 pts)	32 (16 effort + 16 pts)
Satisfactory	6 (4 effort + 2 pts)	9 (6 effort + 3 pts)	24 (16 effort + 8 pts)

<sup>9</sup> Adapted from: [Evaluating Teaching | Center for Teaching Excellence \(ku.edu\)](#)

<sup>10</sup> To earn excellent in teaching, at least one achievement must come from scheduled classroom teaching.

<b>Points</b>	<b>Effort</b>
2	Per documented teaching of scheduled courses with review of SPOT scores.
2	Per documented advising of 50 or more undergraduate students per semester
2	Per documented mentoring of 3 or more Masters / PhD / undergraduate research students <sup>11</sup> Documentation = all necessary forms completed, completed reflection on overall IDP for students
2	Miscellaneous (large enrollment (at least 100 students), large number of mentored students, online, inquiry lab set up, other)

<b>Points</b>	<b>Reflective Practice</b>
2 (per course)	You may wish to reflect on: systematic student feedback, grade distributions with a focus on how student differences affect their success, activities that improve accessibility or student success, instructor/student identities that influence the learning process, longitudinal reflection on course changes over time to adapt to changing student or departmental needs, peer feedback from a course audit or class evaluation, considerations that encourage or discourage timely progression of graduate students, Professional development opportunities that improve your own teaching / mentoring / advising. Approximately 1 written page per reflection.

<b>Points</b>	<b>Assessment / Achievement<sup>12</sup></b>
4 (each)	<p>Evidence of student learning through pre/post testing, rubric-based assessment, etc</p> <p>Evidence and assessment of advising practices that contribute to student success</p> <p>Evidence of Graduate students meeting milestones or timely progression</p> <p>Evidence of Undergraduate researcher milestones or deliverables: student awards, WVU presentations, successful thesis defense, etc.</p> <p>Evidence and/or assessment of undergraduate milestones (reflect on graduation rates, etc)</p> <p>Annotated syllabi or course materials that demonstrate course changes that improve alignment with learning goals.</p> <p>Development of a course in response to departmental, college, or university goals with assessment of related outcomes.</p> <p>Incorporation of evidence-based or innovative teaching methods and assessment of related outcomes</p> <p>Evidence of inclusive, multicultural, and/or accessible practices, including universal design for learning and assessment of related outcomes</p> <p>Evidence of changes to coursework based on previous peer feedback or professional development and assessment of related outcomes</p> <p>Evidence and assessment of workshops/trainings/presentations you led that improve teaching for others</p> <p>Undergraduate alumni tracking and reflection</p> <p>Recognition of Teaching or Advising Excellence through internal or external awards</p> <p>Other; must include evidence related to teaching advancement/improvement (see Appendix 1)</p>

<sup>11</sup> Includes students earning credit for research, working in research for pay, or volunteers.

<sup>12</sup> Additional examples and guidelines are given in the Appendices of the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

**Appendix 1** Instructions for “Other activities judged meritorious by the FEC” in Teaching, Research, and Service.

These variable points items represent the value that individual faculty can claim for anything that does not fall into the standard points categories. The points requested are not limited but it is *incumbent on the individual faculty member* to argue the case that the points requested are justified for each item. For example, even if the faculty member publishes in a high impact journal such as *Nature*, faculty must still articulate to the FEC why the article is high impact and worthy of the points requested. The FEC has the discretion to award all, a portion or none of the requested points.

**Research:** Including but not limited to: Publishing in a high impact journal, an unfunded grant with strong favorable reviews, an invitation to present a keynote or similarly high impact talk, etc. New faculty may place “effort related” items in this category during the first tenure clock year only. For example, new faculty having an excessively difficult lab setup process may explain the extra efforts they committed beyond what would be subjectively considered typical.

**Teaching:** Including but not limited to: guest lectures, nominated for teaching award, awards won by mentored students, winning a prestigious teaching award, etc.

**Service:** Including but not limited to: departmental recruitment/promotion, staffing activities, large numbers of letters of recommendation, faculty mentoring, etc. The following framework provides a sample categorization (points should be assigned based on comparable effort to items listed in Service Evaluation table).

Outreach and Recruitment

- Lead tours for interested groups
- Present education programs on campus
- Present education programs at external sites as representative of WVU
- Organize or participate in small sized outreach events (e.g. Christmas Bird Count, Honors Days)
- Organize or participate in large sized outreach events (e.g. Paw Paw Party, Discover WVU)
- Provide information to interested groups and individuals as representative of WVU

Student Engagement and Retention

- Organize events for current students aimed at developing STEM or cohort identity
- Collaborate with on-campus groups that seek to improve student engagement or retention
- Manage peer mentoring programs for undergraduates

Facility Operation

- Site maintenance or curation activities
- Work with donors
- Coordinate reservations for WVU facility
- Serve on local non-profit or public service boards

Staffing Management

- Manage and recruit WVU employees or volunteers
- Lead group volunteer activities
- Engage with WVU service learning courses
- Engage with volunteers from the community

Collaborative Work

- Host and coordinate use of facility by WVU or external groups or individuals
- Interact with users and collaborators on current and planned projects (excluding research activities)
- Interview with students for class projects

Publicity and Media

- Manage WVU facility social media accounts
- Manage WVU facility website or database
- Promote events at facility in local media
- Work featured in media