

August 25, 2014

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Colleagues

From: Joyce E. McConnell
Provost and Vice President for
Academic Affairs



Re: Annual Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Calendar for 2014-15

The document approved by the Faculty Senate last Spring and accepted by President Gee, "Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure," is available at <http://wvufaculty.wvu.edu/policies>. Other useful documents available at that site include "Family Friendly Practices for Faculty Members," a compilation of current policies and practices at WVU that assist faculty members in meeting their responsibilities toward their families while continuing to make appropriate progress in their careers, including West Virginia University Board of Governors Policy 51, "Extension of the Tenure Clock;" the "Parental Work Assignment Procedure," and the "Alternate Work Assignment Procedure."

The "Procedures" document stresses the importance of the annual evaluation. The process for evaluation should do much more than provide the cumulative evidence that supports decisions about promotion and tenure, although those decisions are very important. In addition, the annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. The annual review is the basis for performance-based salary increases, and for the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement for which fully promoted faculty members are eligible (for details see <http://wvufaculty.wvu.edu/policies>).

Faculty success in all dimensions of the mission of this institution, including teaching, research, and service, is essential to the success of West Virginia University.

Creating a positive and respectful environment for academic achievement is an important aspect of teaching effectiveness. I want to encourage you to provide evidence of the effectiveness of all of your teaching, not only through the student evaluation process, but also in a variety of other ways, such as those identified in the "Procedures" document. Such evidence could include peer evaluations, review of syllabi, and other information about course content and student success. Positive evidence of student learning outcomes can be important, as well.

I want to call particular attention to the "Academic Innovations" unit and the "Teaching and Learning Commons," under the leadership of Sue Day-Perroots.

Among other opportunities, these organizations will provide a variety of services to enable faculty members to enhance their effectiveness in teaching.

Research, scholarship and creative activity continue to be important components of the mission of the university, and are critical not only to maintaining our current Carnegie status as a Research University (high research activity) but to help realize our aspiration of reaching the level of Very High Research Activity. These activities infuse instruction and public service with rigor and relevance, and validate the concept of the teacher-scholar. I encourage you to consider activities that are interdisciplinary and collaborative, as appropriate, in addition to those that are discipline-focused and individual. Research that lends itself to technology transfer is particularly valuable. Research of any kind should be consistent with the mission of your unit and your college.

In keeping with its tradition as a land-grant institution, the university is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities by the faculty as essential components of its mission. Service, as represented by faculty engagement with citizens of and communities in West Virginia, is of special importance to that mission. You are encouraged to document the quality of all of your service activities as well as the quantity.

I also want to remind you of several procedural matters identified by previous University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panels that have been of concern to them as a result of their review of promotion and tenure files. Many of these matters have been included in the new "Procedures" document

1. To the extent possible, College- and School-wide committees should be representative of the various departments or programs from which faculty are reviewed, as well as of the diverse makeup of the unit.
2. All members of review committees must sign committee statements, to verify the vote, even in those rare cases in which a member abstains from voting.
3. Particularly in the case of tenure-track (probationary) faculty members, departmental review committees and chairpersons should conduct the annual review in the context of the faculty member's total record since starting in a tenure-track position at WVU, taking into account suggestions for improvement that may have been made in previous years. Such suggestions are typically found in earlier annual evaluation statements, which are considered to be "subsequent documents" for these purposes. The annual reviews should especially comment on the faculty member's cumulative progress toward tenure and/or promotion, as well as on the quality of one's productivity in the immediate previous year..
4. Review committees and chairpersons should not inflate the use of the terms "excellent," "good," and "satisfactory" in the annual review process. The use of the term "satisfactory" in one particular year, or especially when used in the context of an area (typically service) in which "reasonable contributions" are expected, will not by itself prevent promotion

or tenure. "Satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" ratings for several years in an area in which "significant contributions" are expected could be a problem in that context.

5. Regardless of the activities that are assigned to a faculty member and therefore reviewed as "teaching," faculty who teach are expected to provide evidence of effective teaching.
6. Deans should work to ensure that proper procedures are followed by committees at the departmental and college levels, and that the evaluation procedures are consistently applied. One such procedure should confirm that assertions of activity in one's Productivity Report are supported by actual evidence in the evaluation file.
7. Deans and chairs should notify faculty when they have added material to the evaluation file, and should remind faculty of their right to respond to such material within ten working days.
8. Please also be reminded that each faculty evaluation file must have an inventory of contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. [Evaluation files submitted to the office of the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences without inventories will not be reviewed.]
9. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly when suggestions for improvement are appropriate. Such statements are an important part of a comprehensive mentoring program, and should be taken seriously.
10. For promotion or tenure purposes, the comparison of a candidate with others "recently" promoted or tenured should be interpreted as separate comparisons of both one's teaching and one's research, normally within the last two years, if possible.
11. Faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion should work with chairpersons and deans to ensure that all necessary materials are present in the file at the beginning of the review process (that is, by the date on which the file is closed).
12. For promotion to Professor, special weight is normally 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 limited productivity, as long as more recent quantitative and qualitative productivity has been regularly achieved and maintained in an appropriate disciplinary area.
13. The attached calendar for annual review applies to all faculty (including non-tenure track faculty) on all campuses unless an exception has been approved well in advance.

I appreciate the care and diligence exercised in the evaluation procedure in recent years. The current guidelines assist us in moving toward new levels of achievement in the context of a review process that is both rigorous and developmental.

Faculty Colleagues
August 25, 2014
Page 4

For your information, I have attached a list of approved college evaluation guidelines and the dates the criteria were approved or accepted by the Provost's Office. Any guidelines not listed or any guidelines with dates that differ from those on the attached list should not be used during this year's review process. During the coming year, while these documents are being revised to conform to the present "Procedures" document, they will continue to be operable as long as they do not conflict with the university document itself. Included with these materials is Board of Governors Policy 38 regarding Emeritus status.

For those of you who may be interested, Dr. C.B. Wilson and I will offer several faculty development sessions in Morgantown about the annual review, promotion and tenure process. Times and places will be announced in a separate memorandum. Additional material relevant to the annual evaluation process is distributed at these sessions. This includes information about annual review letters, external review letters, evaluation file inventories, and changing one's areas of significant contributions. This material is available to interested faculty upon request.

Please feel free to contact Dr. Wilson, the Office of the Vice President for Health Sciences, or, in Keyser or Montgomery, the Office of the Campus President, as appropriate, with questions you may have about the annual review and/or the promotion and tenure review.

Best wishes for a productive and satisfying new academic year.

db; Attachments

Approved College Faculty Evaluation Criteria
(Dates reflect approval or acceptance by the Provost's Office)

College of Agriculture and Forestry and Consumer Sciences - Approved 9-98

Eberly College of Arts and Sciences - Approved 7-98

Biology – 6/25/10	History – 7/22/09
Chemistry – 6/30/11	Mathematics – 6/30/11
Communication Studies – 6/10/10	Philosophy – 6/30/11
English – Amended 2/12/11	Physics – 4/20/12
Political Science – 7/9/12	Geology/Geography – 7/9/12
Psychology – 6/07/10	Public Administration- 6/10/10
Religious Studies – 1/11/07	Statistics – 2/08/07
Sociology and Anthropology - 6/07/10	Women's Studies Program – 1/23/01
World Languages, Literature - 7/21/09	
School of Applied Social Sciences/Division of Social Work– 6/14/10	

College of Business and Economics – Approved 7/23/12

College of Creative Arts - Approved 6/13
Division of Music – Approved 7/12

College of Engineering and Mineral Resources - Approved 6/99

WVU Extension Service - Approved 11/07

College of Education and Human Services – Approved 11/07

Reed School of Media – Approved/Modified 10/08

College of Law – Approved 5/01

School of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences – Approved 12/18/11

Potomac State College – Approved 8/07/06

Health Sciences Center

School of Dentistry – Accepted 6/13	School of Nursing – Accepted 3/12
School of Medicine - Accepted 8/08	School of Pharmacy –Accepted 4/09
School of Public Health – Accepted 11/12	

WVU Libraries -Approved 12/08

WVU Institute of Technology -- Accepted 5/12

Because of the nature of the discipline, some departments may not have developed specific criteria, and thus will use the appropriate university and college/school documents.

(rev. August 2014)

West Virginia University

Calendar for Annual Review 2014-15

In general, this calendar applies to all faculty, including those with non-tenure-track or part-time status. However, only those evaluations of first and second year tenure-track faculty members that may anticipate difficulties, evaluations that recommend promotion, tenure, discontinuation or termination of an appointment of tenured or tenure-track faculty, Emeritus status, or recommendations for sabbatical leave need to be forwarded to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences.

According to WVU Board of Governors Policy 2, clinical-track, librarian-track, term and other nontenurable faculty appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment. Such faculty appointments are not subject to consideration for tenure, regardless of the number, nature, or time accumulated in such appointments. For such faculty appointments, continuation beyond the period specified in an annual notice of appointment may be stipulated only by receipt of a new notice of appointment, quality of evaluation notwithstanding.

Campus Presidents of the Integrated Divisions in Keyser and Montgomery may appoint designees to execute the assignments described below.

Units with large faculties are encouraged to set earlier interim deadlines in order to meet the University calendar.

When a deadline falls on an official holiday or weekend, materials will be due by the end of the previous business day.

Deadlines for the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences to give written notice refer to deadlines by which letters must be post-marked.

I. EVALUATION OF ALL FIRST YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS

January 1	Deadline for updating evaluation file.
January 15	Deadline for departmental reviews by committee and chairperson to be forwarded to the dean.
February 1	Deadline for college/school reviews by committees and the Dean or Campus President to be forwarded to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences in cases of concern.
March 1	Deadline for the Dean or Campus President to mail written notice of intended reappointment, or for the Provost or the Vice President for Health

Sciences to mail written notice of termination to tenure-track faculty members in their first year of academic service at WVU.

II. EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS WITH MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF SERVICE AT WVU AND TENURED OR NON-TENURABLE FACULTY FOR WHOM ACTION (other than merely continuation) IS RECOMMENDED (excluding Emeritus recommendations)

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| September 10 | Date by which names of possible external reviewers (if appropriate) <u>should</u> be forwarded by the candidate and by the committee to the departmental chair. |
| October 1 | Date by which external reviews (if appropriate) <u>should</u> be solicited. |
| January 1 | Deadline for updating evaluation files. |
| February 1 | Deadline for departmental reviews by committee and chairperson to be forwarded to the Dean and/or Campus President. |
| February 15 | Suggested target for notifying tenure-track faculty of intent to renew by Dean and/ or Campus President. |
| March 15 | Deadline for college/school reviews by committees and the Dean and/or Campus President to be forwarded to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences. |
| May 15 | Deadline for the Dean and/or Campus President to mail to tenure-track faculty written notice of reappointment or for the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences to mail to tenured or tenure-track faculty written notice of promotion or tenure, or written notice of termination to non-tenured faculty members in the tenure-track with <u>nine-month</u> appointments who have completed more than one year of service. |
| June 30 | Deadline for the Dean or Campus President to mail to tenure-track faculty written notice of reappointment or for the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences to mail to tenured or |

tenure-track faculty written notice of promotion or tenure, or written notice of termination to non-tenured faculty members in the tenure-track with twelve-month appointments who have completed more than one year of service.

III. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS FOR ALL OTHER FACULTY
(including Emeritus recommendations)

This calendar is used for faculty members who are tenured and who are being considered for continuation without other action, and for all non-tenurable faculty members who are being considered for continuation without other action. It should also be used for faculty for whom Emeritus status will be recommended.

January 1	Deadline for updating evaluation files.
March 1	Deadline for chairs' and departmental reviews to be forwarded to the Dean or Campus President.
April 1	Deadline for evaluations to be completed by the Dean or Campus President. Full-time non-tenurable faculty <u>should</u> be mailed notification by this date if their contract will not be renewed.
May 1	Deadline for recommendations for Emeritus status to be forwarded to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE

January 15	Deadline for chairpersons to forward sabbatical leave and Professional Development Programs (first round) recommendations to Dean or Campus President.
February 1	Deadline for Dean or Campus President to forward recommendations for sabbatical leaves and Professional Development Programs (first round) to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences.

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL EVALUATION,
PROMOTION, AND TENURE 2014-15**

[Approved by the WVU Faculty Senate, 5/12/14; Accepted with modifications by the President, 8/25/14]

I. INTRODUCTION

The ability of a university to function, progress, develop excellence, and serve society depends on both the individual performance of each faculty member and the collective performance of the faculty as a whole. Thus, the success and reputation of a university are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among its faculty and how effectively those talents are marshaled to accomplish the institutional mission. To achieve and maintain high quality, a comprehensive faculty evaluation system is essential. Properly administered, this system encourages professional growth of individual faculty members, assures retention of those faculty members who demonstrate high-level scholarship and academic performance, and permits appropriate recognition of achievement.

The work of faculty members as independent professionals is not easily categorized or measured. Faculty evaluation must be guided by principles and procedures designed to protect academic freedom and to ensure accuracy, fairness, and equity. This document outlines these broad principles and establishes the rigorous and common procedures necessary to maintain these qualities in the faculty evaluation process.

West Virginia University at Morgantown is the State's comprehensive, doctoral degree granting, land-grant institution. Divisions (Potomac State College, West Virginia University Institute of Technology, and Charleston and Eastern Divisions of the Health Sciences Center) also participate in the university's tripartite mission of teaching, research and service. The integrated divisions in Keyser and Montgomery address the mission areas in ways appropriate to their campuses. Accomplishing this mission in an environment of respect for diversity requires a creative, collective intermingling of individual faculty talents. Annual evaluation, promotion in rank, and the granting of tenure are acts of critical importance both to members of the academic community and for the welfare of the university. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and the university and is both evaluative and developmental. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions reward individual achievement; they also shape the University for decades.

Consistent with this document, colleges, schools and divisions reporting to administrators on the Morgantown campuses and other appropriate units such as the Extension Service and the University Libraries shall supplement these guidelines with more detailed descriptions and interpretations of the criteria and standards that, when approved by the Provost, will apply to faculty members in the particular unit. A subsequent step in this process, if appropriate, subject to Provost approval, could occur at the department level. The unit guidelines may be more specific to expectations of individual disciplines, and they may be more rigorous than the university guidelines but not less so.

II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCESS, CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

A. The Faculty Evaluation Process

The faculty evaluation process at West Virginia University is designed to assist the institution in attracting promising faculty members, helping them reach their potential, rewarding their proficiency, continuing their productivity and professional development throughout their careers, and retaining only those who are outstanding. The process is both evaluative and developmental and has three distinct components:

1. Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives; it forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that will encourage professional growth and provide support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. An important aspect of the annual evaluation is an assessment of one's progress toward tenure and/or the next promotion, as appropriate. Once tenure is awarded, post-tenure review occurs as part of the annual review process. These reviews can support subsequent promotion in rank and the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. They might also lead to a more rigorous review process which could result in a remediation plan, as determined by the unit.

2. Evaluation for Promotion in Rank

Promotion in rank recognizes exemplary performance of a faculty member. The evaluation for promotion in rank provides the opportunity to assess a faculty member's growth and performance since the initial appointment or since the last promotion.

3. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure

For an award of tenure, tenure-track faculty undergo a particularly rigorous evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments and the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained. A more comprehensive assessment of one's progress toward tenure will normally begin no later than mid-way through the tenure-track period.

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the university community. Primary responsibility for evidence of the quality and presentation of an individual's work in the evaluation file rests with the particular faculty member. Faculty colleagues participate in annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure through membership on department, college, and division committees and on the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Independent reviews at the college and institutional levels assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments and colleges. The legal authority and responsibility of Chairpersons, Deans, Campus Presidents, the Vice President for Health Sciences, and the Provost also enter into the determination of academic personnel decisions, as do the needs and circumstances of the department, college, division, and university.¹

B. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of specific departments, colleges or other academic units and their work is to be evaluated in that context. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution. Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles, which may change over time; such changes normally are identified in an annual workload document or memorandum of understanding.

Collectively, members of the faculty teach, advise, mentor, engage in research and creative activity, publish and disseminate their research findings and new knowledge, and provide public, professional, and institutional service and outreach. The extent to which a faculty member's responsibilities emphasize the areas of the university's mission will vary. All faculty members have an obligation to foster the

¹The term "department" refers throughout this document to departments, divisions or other discrete units in colleges or schools. The term "college" refers to colleges, schools and other discrete units reporting to the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences. The term "Chairperson" refers to department or division Chairpersons, Directors, or other unit heads who report to Deans. The term "unit guidelines" applies to guidelines at either the department or college level.

quality, viability, and necessity of their programs. The financial stability of a program and recruitment of an adequate number of students depend in part on the faculty.²

In the faculty member's approved letter of appointment, the university official (usually the Dean or Campus President) responsible for hiring shall define the general terms of the faculty member's major responsibilities, and identify the year by which tenure must be awarded, if applicable. The terms of this appointment are to be reviewed periodically (normally in consultation with the Dean) and may be changed by mutual consent, consistent with this document. Any changes must be reflected in writing by amendment to the letter of appointment. Within the terms of this general apportionment of responsibilities, the details of a faculty member's specific assignments should be subject to joint consultation but are to be determined by the appropriate administrator.

Each department, college, and division shall refine these broad criteria in areas of teaching, research, and service in ways that reflect the unit's discipline and mission. The criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways that equitably reflect the particular responsibilities and assignments of each. How the unit criteria apply to a faculty member's own set of duties should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed in the annual evaluation.

Adjustments in the expectations for faculty members may occur in keeping with changing institutional and unit priorities and personal interests. All tenure-track, clinical-track, or tenured faculty members must do scholarly, creative, or professional work that informs their teaching and service, as defined by the approved unit guidelines.

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Teaching (learning), research³/scholarship/creative activity (discovery), and service (engagement) constitute the heart of the mission of West Virginia University. Faculty responsibilities are defined in terms of activities undertaken in each of the three areas; 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 is not restricted to the research area. The extent to which scholarship is recognized depends upon one's areas of expected significant contribution. Depending upon one's discipline and the unit's guidelines, publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields.

A. Teaching (Learning)

Teaching involves the stimulation of critical thinking, the dissemination of knowledge, and the development of artistic expression. Teaching includes but is not limited to traditional modes of instruction such as the in-person classroom lecture, other classroom activities, and modes such as clinical, laboratory, online, and practicum instruction; distance learning; thesis and dissertation direction; evaluation and critique of student performance; various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction; and advising (mentoring) of undergraduate and graduate students, which is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process. It should be noted that the advising of doctoral students has elements of both teaching and research. The goals of the teaching-learning endeavor are to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits that should culminate in degree completion.

² WVU Board of Governors' Policy 2, Section 2.4.

³ The term "research" is used in this document to include appropriate professional activities such as research, scholarly writing, artistic performance, and creative activities. These activities result in products that may be evaluated and compared with those of peers at other institutions of higher learning.

The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer knowledge, a commitment to deepen student learning, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. Supporting documentation for the evaluation of effective performance in teaching might include evidence drawn from such sources as the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective judgment of students, student advisees and/or mentees, and of peer and Chair evaluations of instructional performance.⁴ It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, the development or use of instructional technology and computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and college. Regardless of the activities defined as “teaching” assigned to a faculty member, faculty who teach are expected to be effective in their explicit teaching assignments. Criteria for the evaluation of teaching should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

B. Research (Discovery)

WVU values academic research activities that increase fundamental knowledge within the discipline, creative activities (including performances and exhibitions) that reach out and serve humankind, and applied research activities that yield tangible benefits to society. Therefore, the impact of an activity is part of the measure of its quality. Historically, the measure of academic research and creative activities has been well-defined by each discipline, often through peer-reviewed publications and performances and exhibitions. The significance of translational or applied research that results in public-private partnerships, patents, licensing, and/or other forms of commercialization and entrepreneurial activity should also be part of the evaluation of research.

Research may be discipline-focused and individual, or it may be interdisciplinary and collaborative. It is a critical component of the mission of the university, contributing to and expanding the general body of knowledge, thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. It validates the concept of the teacher-scholar. Interdisciplinary and collaborative assignments should be identified in the appointment letter when possible, or in annual letters as assignments change. Unit guidelines should address the evaluative process for these activities. It should be noted that the advising of doctoral students has elements of both teaching and research.

In most disciplines, refereed publications (print or electronic) of high quality are expected as evidence of scholarly productivity. In some disciplines, the strongest such evidence may appear in published refereed proceedings rather than archival journals; such cases must be recognized in the college/school guidelines. In the arts and similar disciplines, an original contribution of a creative nature relevant to one or more disciplines may be as valuable as the publication of a scholarly book or article. In certain disciplines, the ability to secure funding may be necessary for the realization of scholarly output. Depending upon the discipline, entrepreneurial and commercialization activities related to intellectual property and patents, which benefit the university, also demonstrate scholarly output. While quantity of effort and output must be sufficient to demonstrate an active and peer-recognized presence in the discipline, quality of research is clearly of great value in determining the level of performance. Important evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance (such as a book or monograph) or a series of smaller, high quality products such as refereed journal articles constituting a program of worthwhile research. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or

⁴ West Virginia University Board of Governors Policy 2 requires student evaluations as part of the faculty evaluation process.

creative works. Criteria for the evaluation of research should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

C. Service (Engagement)

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 its tradition as a land-grant institution, the university 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.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession. 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. One important benefit of service to the university is faculty participation in the governance system. 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 definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of promotion and tenure should be identified in the unit's evaluation guidelines. Criteria for the evaluation of service should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

IV. **CONTEXTS OF APPOINTMENT FOR TENURED OR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

A faculty member is usually appointed without tenure.⁵ Appointments can be made without or with credit toward tenure for previous experience.

A. Without Credit

An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful candidacy for promotion and tenure, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the "critical year," that is, the year in which a tenure decision must be made. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the critical year forward by one year (to year five).

B. With Credit

It is not uncommon for a new appointee to have had full-time experience at another institution of higher learning where he or she was engaged in teaching, research, and service. Depending upon the amount of successful experience in these mission areas at the intended rank or the equivalent, up to three years credit toward tenure may be allowed, unless the candidate does not wish such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative critical year, shall be identified in the letter of appointment. In such a circumstance, by the end of the second academic year the faculty member could

⁵ Occasionally, appointment with tenure is possible. To be appointed with tenure, or to the ranks of associate professor or professor, the individual must have been interviewed by an official in the Office of the Provost, Vice President for Health Sciences, or Campus President during the interview process; the individual's curriculum vitae must be reviewed in that office; and a recommendation for tenure must be submitted by the department and college to that office.

accept the identified critical year, or all or part of the possible allowable credit to be applied in his or her instance, at which point the critical year would be confirmed by the Dean. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit should be added to the evaluation file. If no credit is accepted, during the fourth year the faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the critical year forward by one year (to year five).

If, by the end of the second year, the faculty member does not request modification of the tentative critical year identified in the letter of appointment, that year will become the recognized critical year. Action on tenure earlier than the thus-defined critical year will not be considered except as defined in the previous paragraph.

Exceptions to recognize unique situations are possible, but should be truly exceptional.

V. REQUIRED PERSONNEL ACTIONS/TIMELY NOTICE FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A personnel action is required each year for each faculty member. Such personnel actions include but may not be limited to reappointment, promotion, tenure, or non-renewal.

At West Virginia University, the award of tenure is campus-specific. For this purpose there are four campuses: WVU-Morgantown, (General University, including Extension), WVU-Morgantown (Health Sciences Center, including faculty in the Charleston and Eastern Divisions), Potomac State College, and WVU Institute of Technology.

A tenure-track faculty member in the sixth year, or in the year determined to be the "critical" year, must be reviewed for tenure and must either be awarded tenure or given notice of termination of appointment and a one-year terminal contract. If a faculty member petitions successfully to bring the critical year forward and tenure is not awarded in that year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Such notice of non-retention shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested" and by first class mail. Under certain circumstances the critical year may be extended. See WVU Board of Governors Policy 51.⁶

In the case of a tenure-track full-time faculty member holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, or one of the corresponding Extension ranks, the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences shall give written notice concerning retention or non-retention for the ensuing year by letter post-marked and mailed no later than March 1.

Time spent on a leave of absence or in an assignment less than 1.00 FTE normally shall not count when calculating years of service toward tenure for a tenure-track faculty member. The faculty member may request that such time spent on scholarly activities apply toward years of service. The faculty member's Dean shall determine in advance of the leave whether such time will apply, and will make a recommendation to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences. Written notification of the decision to modify the critical year will be forwarded both to the faculty member and to the Chairperson and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file.

VI. DISCRETIONARY PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Discretionary personnel actions are those which are not required to be taken at specific times, and may include the following (See also Section IV, above):

- Promotion in rank when the critical year does not apply;

⁶ See also: <http://wvufaculty.wvu.edu/policies>, "Work-Life Balance."

- Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
- Nonrenewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
- Termination of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year;
- Termination of the appointment of a tenured faculty member for cause, reduction or discontinuance of an existing program, or financial exigency (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Policy 2).

A tenure-track faculty member will be reviewed automatically in the critical year, unless the faculty member requests no review, in which case a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Otherwise, the faculty member must initiate consideration for a discretionary promotion. A faculty member whose application for promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

Evaluations and recommendations for one's first promotion and/or tenure will be based primarily on one's contributions since appointment at West Virginia University but may be based in part on work elsewhere for which years of potential credit have been identified in the letter of appointment. In the latter case, evidence of one's performance during the established years of credit should be included in the evaluation file.

Ordinarily, the interval between 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. However, for discretionary promotion to professor, special weight will normally be placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term associate professor will not be penalized for an extended period of limited productivity, as long as more recent quantitative and qualitative productivity has been regularly achieved and maintained in an appropriate disciplinary area. Holding the rank of professor designates that the faculty member's academic achievement merits recognition as a distinguished authority in his/her field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for his/her contributions to the discipline. A professor sustains high levels of performance in his/her assignments and responsibilities in all mission areas. The record of a successful candidate for professor must have shown evidence of high-quality productivity over an extended period of time.

While tenure and promotion are separate actions, only in the most extraordinary circumstances may a person be granted tenure without already being at or above the rank of associate professor, or being concurrently promoted to the rank of associate professor. Such extraordinary circumstances may exist for Extension agents and faculty members in the integrated divisions at Keyser and Montgomery who enter the rank and tenure system as Instructors, who may be granted tenure at the rank of assistant professor. It also is university policy that the granting of promotion does not guarantee the award of tenure in a subsequent year. Neither promotion nor tenure shall be granted automatically or merely for years of service.

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Evaluations and recommendations are to be based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The primary evidence to be weighed must be contained in the faculty member's evaluation file. Also included are the professional judgments at each level of review as to the quality and impact of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service, as applicable.

An official faculty evaluation file shall be established and maintained for each faculty member in the office of the Chairperson or, when appropriate, in the office of the Dean. In principle, the record in the evaluation file should be sufficient to document and to support all personnel decisions. Each unit may

utilize an annual reporting form ("Productivity Report") appropriate to the work assignments in that unit for use by all members of the unit, including the Chairperson. The Productivity Report without supporting documentation is not in itself sufficient for evaluation purposes. Evaluation file materials may be in either paper and/or electronic form, provided that the integrity of the information and the date of entry in the file are maintained.

In the case of schools and colleges without departmental/division structure, the faculty evaluation file shall be maintained in the Dean's office under the same provisions as specified above for departmental files. The Dean shall maintain the faculty evaluation file of each Chairperson.

The faculty member's evaluation file should contain, at the minimum, the following items:

1. The letter of appointment and other documents which describe, elaborate upon or modify one's assignment, including position description, work plans, memoranda of understanding, annual reviews, and subsequent letters of agreement.
2. An up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography containing a) critical dates relative to education, employment, change in status, promotion, leave of absence, etc.; b) a list of publications (or the equivalent) with complete citations, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of research, scholarship, and/or creative work; c) a list of service activities.
3. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught and enrollments in each, graduate students supervised, clinical assignments, committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work.
4. For faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of the individual's performance to the home department. In such cases the home department's evaluation should reflect the relative proportion of each dimension of the total assignment.
5. A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses.
6. Other information and records that the Chairperson and/or Dean may wish to add. Faculty members should be notified of such additions, and may respond to the additions within ten working days, which may be after the closing date.
7. All other information that bears upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in all pertinent areas. This information may include, but need not be limited to, teaching evaluations, professional presentations, published materials, grant applications and awards, research in progress and the preparation of unpublished materials, other creative scholarship, and service to the university, the citizens of West Virginia, and the profession. A reflective summary by the faculty member that supports the evidence in the file is strongly recommended.
8. A continuing chronological inventory of entries to assure the integrity of the file.

The faculty member is responsible for assuring completion of Items 2, 3, 4 and 7. The Chairperson shares responsibility for Items 3 and 4 and has responsibility for Items 1, 5, 6, and 8. The Provost's Office may periodically issue more detailed instructions for the development and maintenance of faculty evaluation files. Those requirements may be supplemented or elaborated by college or department procedures.

VIII. COMPLETION OF AND ACCESS TO THE FILE

The faculty evaluation file shall be updated in a timely manner according to the calendar that is circulated annually. On the appropriate deadline date, the file shall be closed for the review period. Only such materials generated as a consequence of the annual faculty evaluation shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Faculty members have the right of access to their evaluation files at any time during regular office hours without giving reasons. All others shall have access to the file only on the basis of a need to know. Members of a faculty evaluation committee or administrative officers responsible for personnel recommendations are assumed to have a need to know. When otherwise necessary, the appropriate administrative officer or the Dean shall determine whether an individual has a need to know and what material is necessary to fulfill the need to know. All persons will treat the material from the file as confidential. The security of all evaluation files is to be assured. The confidentiality of each file is to be respected. Disclosure of file materials to those outside the evaluation process shall occur only under valid legal process or order of a competent court of jurisdiction.

IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

A. General Description

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,⁷ provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and documents that support 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 accord with the type of appointment, rank, and tenure status.

The evaluation procedures may be found in Section XIII, below. Annual evaluation for all faculty, whether tenure-track, tenured, term, clinical -track, librarian-track, or not eligible for tenure (including faculty with prefixes of "research" or "clinical" and lecturers), will be conducted at the departmental level by the Chair and the faculty evaluation committee or at the college level, if appropriate, based on documentation in the evaluation file (see Section VIII). Written evaluations will be placed in the evaluation file and forwarded to each faculty member and to the Dean, who may provide an evaluative statement.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance, and should be both formative and summative. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and are goal-oriented. The review is not limited to events of the immediately-previous one-year period; it is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether 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, paying particular attention to one's cumulative progress toward and expectations for

⁷ Occasional or clinical-track part-time faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment.

tenure and/or the next promotion and, if positive, as a basis for merit salary adjustments and Salary Enhancements for Continued Academic Achievement. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity to develop changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the university.

B. Faculty Categories

Faculty members in all categories have full citizenship in the institution, and have the rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility. This responsibility includes attendance at and participation in faculty meetings and in other dimensions of the concept of shared governance. They are eligible for appointment to any administrative office if they meet the requirements for the position as stated in the position announcement.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members are those who are in a tenure-track appointment but are not yet tenured. For these persons, the annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance should be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion and tenure.

In one's first review, limited evidence of the faculty member's progress will be available. For that review, material in the file such as reports by colleagues on one's teaching and information on one's activities in research and service are useful in order to assess progress.

As one moves through the tenure-track period, annual evaluations will focus increasingly on the successful outcomes of one's activities rather than simply on the activities themselves.

While the absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure, these evaluations should apprise tenure-track faculty members of performance deficiencies and should call attention to expectations for subsequent consideration for promotion and/or tenure and the extent to which they must enhance their productivity. Occasionally, the evaluations will result in termination of the individual's appointment, sometimes prior to the critical year, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts; in these cases, notice shall be given in accord with WVU Board of Governors Policy 2.

2. Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted

The annual evaluation of faculty members who are tenured but not fully promoted will generally emphasize both quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the rank of professor. Evaluation of Extension faculty members in the rank and tenure system will generally emphasize progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all faculty members may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide them toward that achievement.

3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted

Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating faculty members at these ranks is to describe their performance in the context of appropriate expectations, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments and reappointment. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels.

4. Term Faculty

Renewable term appointments of up to three years, in which the principal assignment is teaching, are designated with the prefix “teaching,” accompanying a traditional rank. Term faculty members are hired to respond to program needs. These positions focus on education in all of its manifestations, including but not limited to teaching, advising, or educational program development.

Normally, a term faculty assignment will be at least 80% teaching; the balance might address needs of the unit and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission. As noted elsewhere in this document, "Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For term faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

Term appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. No number of appointments at any term faculty rank/title shall create presumption of any contractual rights, nor the right of continued appointment or transition to another type of position.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a term faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a term faculty member and her/his Chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For term faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the file is expected to show evidence of significant curricular and/or programmatic development and important contributions 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 unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Promotion to the rank of teaching professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in his/her field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for his/her instructional contributions to the discipline. At the Dean's discretion, a panel of term appointees in similar disciplines who have achieved promotion may contribute to the review at the department level.

5. Clinical -Track Faculty at the Health Sciences Center

Clinicians who select this clinical emphasis, non-tenure track must be heavily committed by choice to clinical service as well as teaching. Faculty members in the clinical -track are not subject to the seven-year probationary period of the tenure track; promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability.

Annual evaluation of clinical-track faculty members will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and in subsequent annual documents that identify departmental responsibilities in teaching, service and scholarship. The annual evaluation will focus on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. The annual evaluation of a promotable faculty member will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty members may attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal.

6. Librarian-Track Faculty

Annual evaluation of librarian-track faculty members will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. The annual evaluation of a promotable faculty member

will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty members may attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal. These evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties and occasionally will lead to notices of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. Librarian-track faculty members hold appointments that are not subject to consideration for tenure, regardless of the number, nature, or time accumulated in such appointments. Librarian-track appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment. Librarian-track faculty members have all rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility.

7. Full-Time Faculty Not Eligible for Tenure

Evaluation of faculty members who are not eligible for tenure may emphasize different criteria from those applied to other faculty. This classification includes but is not limited to full-time faculty with prefixes of "research" or "clinical." Annual evaluations will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. If the faculty member is promotable, the annual evaluation will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty members will attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal. These evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties and occasionally will lead to notices of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. Non-renewal of grants or other external funds may result in non-renewal of appointments in spite of positive evaluations. These faculty members hold appointments that are not subject to consideration for tenure, regardless of the number of, nature of, or time accumulated in such appointments. Such appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment.

8. Part-Time Faculty

Evaluation of continuing part-time (less than 1.00 FTE) faculty will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Occasional or clinical part-time faculty members should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignments.

C. Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of one's performance in each of the mission areas to which one is assigned must be assessed as Excellent [characterizing performance of high merit], Good [characterizing performance of merit], Satisfactory [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, when applied to an area in which significant contributions are required, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure], or Unsatisfactory. 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, would not qualify for promotion or tenure.

The assessments provided by annual reviews are the primary basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available, and for the program of Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievements available to faculty at the rank of professor or the equivalent. They should be a basis for those periodic recommendations which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action that are forwarded to the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be supported both (a) by a series of annual reviews above the "satisfactory" level, and (b) beyond those reviews, by performance and output which are

judged to meet expectations identified in the appointment letter and subsequent documents, as well as the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" (see below).

X. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE

The University criteria for the awarding of promotion and the granting of tenure described below are general expectations; they should be elaborated by college or departmental criteria which take account of the distinctive character of the faculty member's discipline. Copies of departmental and/or college criteria shall be available to all participants in the review process.

The faculty of an outstanding university is a community of scholars whose productivity is manifest in a variety of ways. These manifestations are commonly grouped into teaching, research and service.

In order to be recommended for tenure a faculty member reporting to Morgantown normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or other settings and also significant contributions in research. In order to be recommended for tenure an Extension faculty member may be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or other settings and in service. Division faculty reporting to a Campus President may have other expectations, which will be described in the approved documents for that campus.

In the teaching context, "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed those of peers recently (normally within the immediately previous two-year period) achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. In some cases, external reviews of teaching contributions may be appropriate. The term "significant contributions" in research means performance in research which meets or exceeds that of peers who recently (normally within the immediately previous two-year period) achieved similar promotion and/or tenure and who are respected for their contributions in research at peer or aspirational peer research universities and at West Virginia University. The department, subject to approval by the Dean, determines peer or aspirational peer research universities. Candidates for tenure who are expected to make significant contributions in teaching and research are expected to demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in service. Some Extension candidates for tenure and/or promotion may be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions in research. In the unit's guidelines, service activities that would be acceptable when one is expected to make contributions characterized as reasonable should be differentiated from those activities that are viewed as significant.

Successful teaching is an expectation for faculty who are assigned to teach, at any campus. As a criterion for either tenure or promotion, significant contributions will have been made in teaching.

In order to be recommended for discretionary promotion, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in two of the following areas: teaching in the classroom or other settings, research, and service. In the third area of endeavor, the faculty member will be expected to make reasonable contributions. The areas of significant contribution in which each faculty member is expected to perform will be identified in the letter of appointment, or modified in a subsequent document.

In order to be considered for promotion, faculty members who are not eligible for tenure but who are eligible for promotion normally will be expected to make significant contributions in the area(s) of their assignment as outlined in the letter of appointment or as modified in a subsequent document. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "Research," research will normally be the area in which significant contributions are expected. In general, a research faculty member seeking promotion will produce research of equal or better quality and of greater quantity than a tenure track faculty member for whom research is one of two areas in which significant contributions are expected. For faculty who have a title

with the prefix "clinical" (as differentiated from faculty in the "clinical -track"), service will normally be the area in which significant contributions are expected.

For faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution, service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the state 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 creation and direction 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, the profession, or on a national or international level. Such exceptions should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

The decision by the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences to accept a recommendation for or against retention or the awarding of tenure shall rest on both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the department, college, and the university, and on the strengths and limitations of the faculty member as established in the annual evaluation process.

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 or Campus President (or designee) and by the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences. An administrative assignment will be evaluated by the immediate supervisor rather than by the unit committee.

XI. CHANGING AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION

When a faculty member achieves tenure, the criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching and research and reasonable contributions in service may be modified on an individual basis to require significant contributions in a different pair of these categories, with reasonable contributions required in the third. Such a modification should be initiated primarily to assist the department or the college in achieving its mission and goals, as it addresses the three areas of university concern. It is appropriate to establish a certain time period which must elapse after the approval of the request before the individual could be considered for promotion using the new expected areas of significant contribution. Such a modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, Chairperson of the department in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee, and the Dean of the college, and must be stipulated in subsequent letters of agreement. The modification also must be approved by the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences as appropriate.

Typically a request for a change in areas of significant contributions will propose replacing research with service as such an area. A document for this purpose should be developed which identifies both the types and quantity of service expected in the new context and the ways in which the quality of that service will be measured. In most cases, service will be directed toward the needs of the citizens of West Virginia and will go far beyond the kinds of service which are expected in order for one to achieve good university citizenship. "Reasonable contributions in research" must also be defined, in both qualitative and quantitative terms. If such a request is granted, external reviews of service will be expected.

XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

In years when a faculty member who has research or service 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 or service from persons external to the University. The college or

school shall have the option to determine if such external evaluations are required if the faculty member is to make reasonable contributions in the areas of research or service. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered when evaluating the faculty member.

The external reviews will be maintained in a separate section of the evaluation file in the office of the Dean of the college. The various committees and individuals directly involved in the promotion and tenure review process shall be provided with this section of the evaluation file when they have need. The faculty member shall have the right to see the reviews after any identifying information has been removed. All copies shall be returned to the Dean upon the completion of the review. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall be sealed and shall not be used in any subsequent personnel actions.

The names of persons who will be asked to provide external reviews must be selected with participation by the faculty member who is to be evaluated and from the persons in the department who conduct the evaluation. The suggested method for identifying external evaluators is for the departmental evaluation committee (either with or without participation by the Chairperson) and the faculty member each to propose a list of names of appropriate evaluators selected for their professional competence in the discipline. Each list should contain four to six names. A paragraph describing each evaluator should be submitted indicating qualifications to serve in this capacity. Any personal or professional relationship the faculty member has or has had with the evaluator should be identified. The Chairperson or Dean should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from two or more persons on each list. A minimum of four external evaluations ordinarily is required.

Persons who have been closely associated with the person being evaluated, such as co-authors or doctoral research advisors or advisees, may be asked for evaluations but, as with all evaluators, should be requested to identify their professional or personal relationship to the candidate for promotion or tenure. The faculty member has the right to review the list of potential evaluators, to comment upon those who may not provide objective evaluation and to request deletions. The faculty member's written comments and requests should be forwarded to the Chairperson or Dean.

In selecting evaluators, the Chairperson or Dean may consider the faculty member's comments and requests, but the faculty member does not have the right to veto any possible evaluator, nor is the final selection of evaluators to be achieved through obtaining the consent of the faculty member.

If external reviewers from non-university settings are used, there should be an explanation of their qualifications that focuses on their professional competence in the discipline that led to their selection rather than the selection of a reviewer from a university setting. As a general principle, reviewers of research from non-university settings should be used only under very special circumstances, and should be a minority rather than a majority among the reviewers selected. External reviewers of research from universities should be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought. For external reviews of service, individuals in non-university settings may be more appropriate as referees.

The Chair, using letters approved by the Dean, should request the external evaluations, stressing that the standard used as a basis for review should be the quality of the work and the impact or potential impact on the field. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations should be included in the faculty member's file with identifying information removed. The external evaluator may also assess whether the quality of the work of the faculty member being reviewed is comparable to or better than that of persons recently promoted in the evaluator's university. For non-tenurable faculty, the standard should be based on one's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment. The assessment of whether the quantity of scholarly work is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a judgment best left to the local department, college, and the university. The evaluations should be forwarded to the Dean by the external evaluators.

If four evaluations are not received by the time the file is closed, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended through the written consent of the faculty member, Chairperson, and Dean.

XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluations of the achievements of faculty normally will be carried out at three levels of university organization: department or division, college or school, and Provost or Vice President of Health Sciences. Typically, a judgment is made at each of these levels both by the faculty committee and by the administrative officer of the unit. Faculty members should neither initiate nor participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, annual evaluation, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate family or household or other qualified adults, and should not participate in any other promotion and tenure decisions in a year in which a case so described is under consideration.

Each level of review will consider the material in the candidate's evaluation file, which, when combined with reviews from previous years, will form the basis for the evaluation statements and recommendations. All recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their critical year will be forwarded through the complete review process. Recommendations for non-retention or a terminal appointment of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member automatically receive review at all levels, including that of the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences. Participants at each level of review will exercise professional judgment regarding their assessment of the record in the evaluation file in arriving at a recommendation or a decision.

A. Department /Division Level in Colleges and Schools

1. Evaluation committees at the department level are engaged in two specific activities: annual reviews, typically with a recommendation regarding continuation, and reviews for purposes of promotion, tenure, or non-continuation. Each department shall have a faculty evaluation committee, normally consisting of a minimum of five members, a majority of whom must hold tenure. Exceptions must be approved by the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences. Preferably, membership should reflect the diversity of the unit. In the case of smaller colleges, the college-wide committee may substitute for departmental committees. The method of selection of members is left to the discretion of the program unit, but the Chairperson of the department shall not be a member of the committee. If needed, a department may supplement committee membership with faculty members from a related discipline. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure is not eligible to serve on any committee reviewing his/her evaluation file. At the Health Sciences Center, clinical -track faculty who are at or above the rank of associate professor may vote on tenure recommendations at the department level. The departmental committee will review and evaluate material in the faculty member's evaluation file. Based on this evidence, the committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the department Chairperson. The total number of positive and negative votes or abstentions must be recorded. If desired, committee members may include minority statements, which should be included in the body of the evaluation, without separate signatures.

2. The department Chairperson will review the evaluation file as well as the committee's evaluation statement and recommendation regarding each faculty member and will make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty

member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. In a recommendation for tenure, the Chairperson shall take into account the long-range staffing pattern of the department. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Chairperson of the evaluative comments and recommendations of both the department committee and the Chairperson. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.

3. If the faculty member receives a positive recommendation for promotion or tenure from either the department committee or Chairperson, the file is submitted for review at the college level. If both such recommendations are negative, the file is submitted to the Dean for information, except in the critical year, when the file is reviewed by the college committee and the Dean.

4. When a recommendation for tenure, promotion, or termination of appointment has been made, the faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations for review at the college level. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five (5) working days of receipt of the evaluations.

5. A faculty member may petition the Dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations for promotion (i.e., when both the department committee and the department Chairperson render negative recommendations). The petition should reach the Dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. The Dean shall forward the petition to the college evaluation committee as a matter of course for its recommendation. Negative department reviews of tenure cases are automatically reviewed by the college committee and the Dean.

6. Responses to annual reviews may be submitted at any time and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the Chairperson with an additional memo to the file. If the faculty member disagrees or otherwise takes issue with the evaluations or the assignment of descriptors the faculty member may work informally with the Chairperson or ask the Dean to review the evaluations or descriptors. However, any informal efforts to resolve any such issue will not serve to suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances. After considering the faculty member's request, the Dean may direct the Chairperson or committee to reconsider their action, based on a written justification that would be placed in the faculty evaluation file. Any subsequent adjustments would be documented in an additional memo to the file.

B. College/School Level and Integrated Divisions Reporting to Campus Presidents [details may differ in such Divisions]

1. Each college shall have a college faculty evaluation committee. In colleges and schools without departments, the committee functions like a departmental committee. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or the award of tenure should not serve on the college committee reviewing his/her personnel file. Membership should be restricted to tenured faculty; exceptions must be approved by the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences. The method of selection of members is at the discretion of the Dean of the college. No faculty member should serve on both a departmental and college committee and no Chairperson should serve on a college committee.

2. The college faculty committee will review departmental evaluations of the candidates, as well as their evaluation files as forwarded by the Dean. The committee will prepare a written evaluation in each case, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, tenure, and/or promotion, as applicable, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. Normally the committee will review cases in which promotion, tenure or termination are recommended at the department level, although, at the Dean's discretion, annual reviews may also be considered. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the Dean. The total number of positive and negative votes must be recorded.

Committee members may include a minority statement in the body of the evaluation, without separate signatures.

3. The Dean (Campus President/designee) will review evaluations and recommendations from the department and the college faculty committee and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The faculty member shall be informed, in writing, by the Dean (Campus President/designee) of the evaluations and recommendations of both the college committee and the Dean. Copies of all written statements shall be forwarded to the faculty member and also placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.

4. If either the college faculty committee or the Dean supports a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty evaluation file, including both department and college recommendations together with external evaluations, is forwarded to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences. If a request for discretionary promotion receives negative recommendations by both the college committee and the Dean, the faculty evaluation file normally would not be forwarded to the next level.

5. A faculty member may include a rebuttal to the college-level recommendations for review at the next level. A rebuttal must be forwarded to the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of the recommendations.

6. A faculty member may petition the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences for a review of negative recommendations for discretionary promotion from the college level, i.e., when both the college committee and the Dean (Campus President/designee) render negative decisions. The petition should reach the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of notification by the Dean (Campus President/designee) of negative recommendations at the college/school level.

7. Deans (Campus Presidents/designees) have the responsibility for determining whether all committee evaluations have been conducted fairly within the college and for assuring that comparable norms are appropriately applied in like units.

8. Recommendations by the Dean (Campus President/designee) for tenure must be accompanied by a statement indicating how the proposed awarding of tenure of a probationary faculty member will affect the long-range staffing pattern of the department and/or college, taking into account expected attrition, accreditation, budgetary limitations, and the need for flexibility.

C. University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel

1. The Provost and the Vice President for Health Sciences will each consult with the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel, consisting of at least five faculty members selected by the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee. No person who has reviewed faculty at the department or college level during the current cycle, or who is being considered for promotion or tenure, may serve on the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel.

2. The recommendations and faculty appeals will be reviewed by the Advisory Panel. Primary attention will be given to four questions:

(a) Has each recommendation been supported by objective evidence in the evaluation file to ensure that no faculty member is being treated capriciously or arbitrarily?

- (b) Have the review procedures at all levels been followed?
- (c) Is each recommendation consistent with university and unit policies and objectives?
 - (d) Are the recommendations consistent with the department, college, division, and university criteria for promotion and tenure?

3. The Advisory Panel will advise the Provost or Vice President for Health Sciences regarding the cases considered and will prepare written statements addressing these issues. The statement must be signed by all members of the panel, dated, and added to the faculty member's file. Panel members may include minority statements with the general statement.

D. Provost and Vice President for Health Sciences Level

- 1. For the purposes described in these guidelines, the decision-making authority of the President has been delegated to the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences, as appropriate.
- 2. Decisions on promotion and tenure recommendations will be made by the Provost or the Vice President for Health Sciences, as appropriate, after review of the recommendations by departments, colleges, and their administrators and the findings of the Advisory Panel.
- 3. The President or designee will report the decisions to the Board of Governors. Such report will indicate the number of decisions as well as the individuals receiving positive action, and will verify that the appropriate standards and guidelines have been met.
- 4. The faculty member and the appropriate Dean will be notified in writing of the decision rendered.

E. Negative Decisions

1. Tenure Denied; Nonretention or Termination During Tenure-Track Period

A faculty member may request from the President or designee, within ten (10) working days of receipt of the notice from the President's designee of nonretention or termination during the tenure-track period, the reasons for the decision (Section 10.10 of West Virginia University Board of Governors Policy 2). Within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons, the faculty member may appeal the decision by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 15 of Board of Governors Policy 2.

2. Promotion Denied; Other Personnel Decisions

A faculty member desiring to appeal a decision on promotion or other personnel decisions not included above may appeal by using W.Va. Code §6C-2, as described in Board of Governors Policy 2. The appeal should reach the office of the President's designee within fifteen (15) working days after receipt of the written decision.

WVU Board of Governors Policy 2 and W.Va. Code §6C-2 are available in the offices of the Dean and department/division Chairperson, and may be obtained from the offices of the Provost, the Vice President for Health Sciences, the Campus Presidents, and the Wise, Evansdale, and Health Sciences Center Libraries. They are accessible online at <http://bog.wvu.edu/r/download/7515>, and <http://pegb.wv.gov/>. Faculty may wish to check with the Division of Human Resources (Morgantown) to assure that they have access to the most recent copy of the procedures.