

**PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT and the RELIGIOUS STUDIES AND HUMANITIES
PROGRAMS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL**

Approved by Philosophy Department and Religious Studies
and Humanities Programs [03/23/2026]

Approved by the Office of the Provost [05/15/2026]

The Department of Philosophy and the Religious Studies and Humanities Programs Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements 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 basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department policies 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 study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, Department.

The Philosophy Department's faculty evaluation process is intended to: guide faculty toward enhanced 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 absolute criteria for performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual assignment, the digital evaluation file, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure-track, and promotion-eligible Teaching and Research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure-track faculty are subject to a pre-promotion cumulative review two years prior to their critical year to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the identified areas of expected significant contribution, teaching, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program if research is identified as an area of significant contribution; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations in one's letter of appointment by the time of the pre-promotion cumulative review may lead to a recommendation for non-continuation before the critical year.

Reference to “Tenure-track” faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service.

For Tenure-track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service.

For Teaching-track faculty, responsibilities are normally defined as 80% teaching and 20% service.

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.

Annual Assignment

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and Chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure-track and Teaching-track faculty participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The allocation of a faculty member’s teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Appointments in the Eberly College are normally:

| | Teaching | Research | Service |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------------------|---------|
| Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty | 40% | 40% | 20% |
| Teaching-Track Faculty | 80% | ---- ¹ | 20% |
| Adjuncts | 100% | | |

¹ Evaluation in a Teaching-track faculty assignment will normally be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU P&T policy, "faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For Teaching-track faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the digital faculty evaluation file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

The percentages of the appointment allocated to teaching, research, and service that are applied in annual reviews and calculation of performance-based salary increases remain as they are described in the appointment letter unless adjusted by a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Dean.

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.

Teaching-track faculty on a full year's sabbatical leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period, tenure-track faculty would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment. For a single semester's leave, a Tenure track faculty member's annual evaluation would normally be 60%-70% teaching, 20-30% research and 10% service. For a single semester's leave, Teaching-track faculty would normally be 90% teaching and 10% service.

A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics 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 (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the digital faculty evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must annually update their digital faculty evaluation file with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On December 31 the file shall be closed for the review period.

Once an item is entered into the digital faculty evaluation file and reviewed, it may not be removed.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure-track and Teaching-track faculty, must participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Adjuncts will not normally participate in this process.

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 and Teaching categories – the faculty member is evaluated only by the Department Chair, unless 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

Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations on tenure, promotion, and 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 faculty evaluation file.

The department FEC will normally include a minimum of five members, a majority of whom must be tenured faculty. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure must not serve on the committee reviewing her/his personnel file. All categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g., Tenure-track and Teaching-track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases are eligible for service on the committee.

All members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation. ~~even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting.~~

Members of the FEC are appointed by the Chair of the department on a rotating basis. The chair of the FEC is selected by the committee. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC

Members must 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 will serve as acting chair for that single deliberation. Faculty members who serve on the College faculty evaluation committee or the University panel may not serve on the departmental FEC.

It is understood that members of the FEC will keep committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be 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.

The annual review normally covers performance only for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement, and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable to their appointment, or continuing to remain productive.

All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are appropriate.

Ratings affect annual salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement program. Both “excellent” and “good” are meritorious ratings. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to “satisfactory” or lower is appropriate.

Meritorious work must be fully documented; for example, if information is provided for one course when one’s assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating for the entire assignment should be questioned.

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide in the digital faculty evaluation file evidence 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 on evidence in the digital faculty evaluation file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the reviewer’s response should be, “in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I [we] must conclude that the faculty member’s work is unsatisfactory.”

To assist faculty members in assembling their annual productivity reports and to assist the FEC in making informed and consistent evaluations, the Department suggests the following framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes in the areas of teaching, research, or service. One, some, or all of the following criteria may apply:

1. **Significance or Impact:** To what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) *benefit* or affect students, our department, our college, our university, our profession, or other communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect *originality and development* within a body of work?
2. **Engagement:** To what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) *generate, advance, apply, and/or use* knowledge and insights in our field of study? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate *thoroughness, reliability, and availability*?

3. **Context:** To what degree are the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) *consistent with goals* important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on *knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations*? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or *keep current* with changes?

Annual Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member’s overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. Tabulated student evaluations and student comments for all courses taught in Fall and Spring Semesters (excluding tutorials, etc.) must be included in the digital faculty evaluation file. The WVU Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) form is specifically required; self-designed questionnaires may be used in addition to but not in place of the Senate form. In advance of each annual review, faculty members will submit available WVU evaluations for those courses taught in the period under review.

Annual evaluations of teaching for all faculty with a teaching assignment must include– but will not be restricted to – the SPOT evaluation form. (SPOT assessments with unusually low response rates will be looked upon unfavorably by the FEC and may be disqualified for the purposes of the review.) The Faculty evaluation of SPOT reports will focus on student responses to three SPOT prompts, as these have been deemed most relevant to assessing instructor performance: Prompt One, which concerns the manner in which concepts were presented; Prompt Two, which concerns the methods used to present information; and Prompt Four, which concerns the instructor’s responses to questions. (The prompts for online courses vary slightly from in-person courses, but Prompts One, Two, and Four closely track those prompts on the in-person course surveys.) The lowest score in each of the three categories will be dropped. Evaluations will also consider students’ written comments.

Ratings of Excellent, Good, etc. will be determined using the following guidelines:

| Rating | Criteria |
|------------------|---|
| Excellent | Meet the standard for Good and at least two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An average of 75% or higher ratings of Beneficial in the three designated categories • Many positive and enthusiastic written comments |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective teaching narrative that displays evidence of course development and innovation • Independent study or senior thesis supervision to completion or successful graduation • Evidence of quality guest lectures (at least two) • Development of new course materials (including textbooks) • Positive reports from peer-observation of teaching |
| Good | <p>Meet the standard for Satisfactory and also both of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An average of 50% or higher ratings of Beneficial in the three designated categories • At least some positive and/or constructive written comments from students across SPOT evaluations for the calendar year |
| Satisfactory | <p>Satisfy all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher average percentage of combined Beneficial and Neutral ratings than Not Helpful ratings in the three designated categories • Teaching narrative that shows constructive engagement with – and responsiveness to – student feedback • Evidence of a concrete plan to improve teaching, including new teaching strategies, course materials, etc. |
| Unsatisfactory | Do not meet the standard for Satisfactory |

Annual Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member’s overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the department. It is expected that faculty will include in the digital faculty evaluation file copies of all publications to be counted for the review period. The department may accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance by the publication.

Faculty should submit evidence of research or scholarly or creative activity that includes, but goes beyond, publications. This evidence might include, but is not limited to:

1. Published articles, book chapters, monographs, books, etc. Although textbooks normally provide evidence of contributions to teaching, those that offer significant original, scholarly, or critical additions to the presentation of philosophical material may provide evidence of contributions to research.
2. Works in progress or a detailed description of works in progress (what has been done, what has to be done and schedule of completion)
3. Pre-publication or post-publication reviews and the extent cited (i.e., manuscript reviews by external specialist(s) in the field)
4. Presentations of papers at conferences or to professional groups
5. Substantial reviews of books or review essays published in professional journals
6. Serving as a commentator at professional meetings
7. Awards or grants received
8. Additional material which the faculty member may wish to submit

Faculty research productivity will be evaluated annually using the following scoring system:

| Research Activity | Point Value |
|---|--------------------|
| Book (published or accepted) | 30 |
| Book Less than 40k Words (published or accepted) | 20 |
| Peer-reviewed Journal Article or Book Chapter (published or accepted) | 10 |
| Edited Volume (Book or Journal Issue) | 8 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Research-Intensive Public-Facing Paper or Essay | 8 |
| External Research Grant or Award | 6 |
| Conference, Workshop, or Colloquium Presentation | 5 |
| Short Publication (book reviews < 2k words, critical notices, etc.) | 5 |
| Internal Grant or Award | 3 |
| Demonstrated Progress on Article, Book Chapter, or Book Project (including submission for review)** *Not applicable for work reported as accepted/published in same review cycle +Points will be awarded for no more than two review cycles for an article or book chapter and no more than four review cycles for a book | 2 |
| Detailed Research and Grant Proposals and Projects | 1 |

Annual Evaluation:

| Rating | Point Value |
|----------------|--------------|
| Excellent | 10 or higher |
| Good | 6 – 9 |
| Satisfactory | 3-5 |
| Unsatisfactory | Less than 2 |

The above point totals are applicable to faculty with a standard 40% research assignment. Expectations will be calibrated for faculty with lower and higher research assignments. For example, a faculty member with a 10% research assignment will be expected to earn at least three points for a rating of Excellent. Scores will be rounded to the nearest whole number.

While a faculty member can receive a rating of Excellent in a given year without a 10-point or higher value publication, however the faculty member must accrue points via publication in order to qualify for tenure and promotion as described below.

Annual Evaluation of Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the department, college, university, or profession. Service should thus be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the service mission of the department, college, university, or profession. Faculty member narratives should provide details of their service contributions that attest to the quality and impact of their service.

Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Faculty are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

Faculty should submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment. This evidence might include, but is not limited to:

1. Serving on department, Eberly College, or university committees
2. Serving on editorial boards for professional journals
3. Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or academic publishers
4. Serving as a moderator or session chair at a professional meeting
5. Reviewing submissions for presentations at professional organizations
6. Publishing brief book reviews or notes
7. Providing service to the public (e.g., workshops, presentations, consultation)

8. Serving as an advisor for a department or university sponsored organization
9. Serving as an officer or board member of a professional organization

Faculty will be evaluated annually on service using the following metric:

Service to the Department:

| Service Activity | Points |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Departmental Committee | 5 (+1 for Chairing) |
| Other Departmental Service | 1 |

Service to the College and University:

| Service Activity | Points |
|--|------------------------|
| College or University Committee | 5 (+2 for Chairing) |
| Organizing a workshop or intra-WVU conference | 4 |
| Ongoing Advising or Support for a College or University Organization | 3 |
| Other College or University Service | 1 |

Service to the Profession:

| Service Activity | Points |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| Organizing a workshop or conference | 4 |
| Refereeing a journal article | 2 |
| Refereeing a book manuscript | 3 |
| Serving on an editorial board | 3 |
| Serving on a professional committee | 3 |
| Serving as an external evaluator | 3 |

Service to the Public:

| Service Activity | Points |
|---|--------|
| Ongoing advising or support for an outside organization | 4 |
| Public-facing essay | 3 |
| Public lecture | 2 |
| Media Appearance | 2 |
| Short-term advising or consultation | 1 |

Annual Evaluation

| Rating | Score |
|----------------|------------|
| Excellent | 15 or more |
| Good | 8 - 14 |
| Satisfactory | 4 - 7 |
| Unsatisfactory | < 4 |

The above point totals pertain to a standard 20% service assignment. Point totals will be recalibrated for non-standard assignments, e.g. a faculty member with only a 10% service assignment would be expected to earn 5 or more points for rating of Excellent (and so on). Numbers will be rounded to the nearest whole number based on the one-tenth decimal place.

Note: Given their unique administrative duties which are evaluated by the Dean, the FEC will not use the above metrics to evaluate the Chair's administrative service. However, the FEC will use the above metrics to evaluate service unrelated to the duties of the Chair – such as service to the profession – in its annual review.

Rebuttal and Responses to Faculty Evaluations

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 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/>.

Performance-Based Salary Policy

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations.

Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college.

Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

Unless otherwise specified in the department's approved Performance-Based Salary Policy document, the College descriptor values are the default values. The College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating; e.g.

40% teaching = 40×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 100
40% research = 40×4.0 (rating of "Excellent") = 160
20% service = 20×1.0 (rating of "Satisfactory") = 20
Merit Score = 280

80% teaching = 80×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 200
20% service = 20×2.5 (rating of "Good") = 50
Merit Score = 250

If the FEC and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations, unless the unit's approved guidelines provide for a different resolution.

The Philosophy Department uses the College descriptor values.

Promotion for Tenure-Track Faculty

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 below. 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.

Work literally “in press” or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print. For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

In a tenure-track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual’s “critical year,” normally the sixth year on the faculty, as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year of employment. Tenure-track faculty with qualifying experience may in the appointment letter be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years, no more than three, of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, 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 digital faculty 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 15th of the fourth year) request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean’s approval of such 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.

Recommendations for promotion with tenure will be based on the following criteria:

- A preponderance of ratings of Good and Excellent in the areas of their areas of significant contributions as found in their letter of appointment or subsequent memoranda of understanding for all preceding review cycles that count toward the candidate's tenure clock
- At least one peer-review of the candidate's teaching
- A preponderance of ratings of Satisfactory (or higher) in the area of Service in the pre-tenure period
- At least 50 points earned in the pre-tenure period from the acceptance/publication of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or books*
- External review letters testifying to the quality and impact of the candidate's publications

* For a candidate with a lower point total, tenure may nevertheless be recommended if the individual has scholarly accomplishments that offset expectations for publication.

Promotion to Professor

Ordinarily, the interval between discretionary promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion. Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. 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.

For discretionary promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five-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. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. 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.

The standards for promotion to the rank of Professor differ from the standards for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the following three respects: (a) The research on the basis of which a tenure track faculty member is evaluated for tenure and

promotion to Associate Professor may include published research that is straightforwardly based on the faculty member's PhD dissertation; such research would not normally be considered for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. (b) A decision in favor of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may be based upon a record of significant improvement in teaching performance over the probationary period; it is expected that a faculty member who is promoted to the rank of Professor will have demonstrated a consistently high level of teaching competence subsequent to promotion to associate professor. (c) Non-tenured faculty members satisfy the requirement for reasonable service if they play a significant role in the activities of the department; tenured faculty members are expected to participate in additional service, including service to the College, the University, the profession, or the public.

A faculty member will be recommended for promotion to Professor based on the following criteria:

- An overall preponderance of ratings of Good and Excellent in the areas of Teaching and Research in the period following the awarding of tenure and promotion to Associate. Additionally, the three years prior to seeking promotion should consist entirely of Good and Excellent ratings in these areas.
- Satisfactory or higher ratings in the area of Service throughout the post-tenure period
- Earning at least 60 points from the publication of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or books in the period following promotion to Associate, with at least 30 of those points from the publication of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or books earned in the five-year period leading up to the review for promotion to promotion
- External reviews attesting to the quality and impact of the candidate's research and publications

Promotion for Teaching-Track Faculty

Teaching-track faculty typically have little to no research component in their annual workload assignment. Recommendations for promotion are thus based almost entirely on the faculty member's teaching record. Both promotion to Teaching Associate Professor and Teaching Professor are discretionary and failure of promotion in particular case does not result in a terminal contract. However, 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.

Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor

A faculty member will be recommended for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor based on a teaching portfolio that contains the following criteria:

- A preponderance of ratings of Good and Excellent in the years leading up to consideration for promotion with the immediately preceding three years consisting exclusively of ratings of Good and Excellent.
- A statement of teaching philosophy with reflection on the period of teaching leading up to promotion
- Evidence of innovation and creativity with respect to such things as course design, teaching strategy, and curricular development
- At least one peer-review of the candidate's teaching
- The portfolio must include documentation of new course materials, as well as textbooks

Promotion to Teaching Professor

A faculty member will be recommended for promotion to Teaching Professor based on a teaching portfolio that contains the following criteria:

- A preponderance of ratings of Good and Excellent in the area of Teaching in the years following promotion to Teaching Associate Professor with the three years prior to seeking promotion consisting of Goods and Excellents exclusively.
- Evidence of course development and pedagogical innovation, including, but not limited to, the development of new courses, redesigning existing courses, and developing new teaching materials
- The candidate for Teaching Professor must also show 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. The candidate may document this criteria through such means as:

- Nominations for, or receipt of, awards that focus on an aspect of teaching (including advising), external to the university
- A record of pedagogically related presentations or invited lectures at professional conferences, forums, or symposia of national or international stature
- A record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature
- Acknowledgment from professional colleagues external to the university of the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to the teaching discipline
- 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

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 will be adopted.