

# **Executive Summary**

## **of Proposed Changes to West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure 2014-15**

**Expansion** – These changes in the draft document expand the definition of what counts in teaching, research, and service, and clarify the type of documentation faculty should provide in their annual evaluation and promotion and/or tenure files to receive credit for their work.

Significant changes/additions include:

- Increasing the required teaching documentation to include narrative and peer evaluations in addition to syllabi and student feedback
- Adding definitions, examples and metrics to be considered when evaluating teaching, research, and service
- Incorporating language to recognize and credit public and community-engaged work; multi/trans/inter-disciplinary work; and diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice work

**Alignment and Consistency** – These changes in the draft document ensure that key components of the faculty evaluation processes are standardized and applied consistently across colleges, school, and campuses and types of faculty positions.

Significant changes/additions include:

- Requiring external reviews for promotion from assistant to associate professor (or equivalent) and associate professor to professor (or equivalent) for both tenure-track and non-tenured faculty and removing external review requirement for instructor to assistant promotion\*
- Awarding tenure to faculty only at the associate professor rank or higher
- Making librarian-track faculty eligible for 3/6/9-year contracts like teaching and service professors
- Allowing up to three (3) years of credit towards promotion for non-tenure track faculty with previous experience
- Adding clear statements regarding non-discrimination
- Incorporating text explaining how to evaluate of Modification of Duties and/or Extension of the Tenure Clock utilization
- Providing a common date for uploading redacted external reviews
- Clarifying who can serve and vote on department, college/school and University faculty evaluation committees
- Stating that higher expectations are required for promotion from associate to professor

*\*Clinical-track faculty seeking promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with a United Health Associates (UHA) or a Dental Corporation contract are excluded.*

**Accountability and Transparency** – These changes in the draft document clarify the responsibilities and steps in the faculty evaluation process and make transparent the procedures for non-retention of tenure-track and non-continuation of tenured faculty.

Significant changes/additions include:

- Providing greater clarity of what constitutes a “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” annual rating
- Clarifying the language and processes for non-renewal of tenure-track faculty
- Clarifying the language and processes for non-continuation of tenured faculty
- Requiring that a faculty member denied promotion wait two years before resubmitting their file
- Replacing the requirement that a faculty member’s cumulative body of work “meets or exceeds previously promoted peers” with “meets or exceeds absolutes” outlined in the offer letter, memorandum of understanding, and/or guidelines

## FINAL PROPOSED UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES -11/15/22

PROPOSED – 10/3/22, EDITED AND UPDATED 10/25/22, and 11/4/22, and 11/15/22

### 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;  
Modifications to represent BOG Rule 4.2, 5/22/20]

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The ability of a university to achieve, sustain, and increase its excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service to society depends on both the individual and collective performance of the faculty. Thus, the success and reputation of a university depend on the ~~talents~~individual strengths of the faculty and their effectiveness in accomplishing the institutional mission. A comprehensive, equitable, and transparent faculty evaluation system is essential to assure high-quality faculty work and to recognize and reward faculty accomplishment. Properly administered, such a system encourages professional growth of individual faculty members, permits appropriate recognition of their achievements, and assures retention of faculty members who make significant contributions to the University's mission through influential research, creative scholarship, and/or impactful teaching and service.

The work of faculty members as interdependent professionals can be categorized or measured in multiple ways. 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 consistent procedures necessary to maintain these qualities in the faculty evaluation process.

West Virginia University ("University") at Morgantown is the state's comprehensive, doctoral degree granting, land-grant institution. Other members of the WVU system—including Potomac State College, West Virginia University Institute of Technology, and Charleston and Eastern Divisions of the Health Sciences Center—help achieve the University's tripartite mission of teaching, research and service. The integrated divisional campuses in Keyser and Beckley address the mission areas in ways appropriate to their campuses. In every part of the WVU system, the University's mission is best achieved by creating an atmosphere of respect for diversity. 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.

West Virginia University is committed to building and maintaining a community that reflects human diversity and improves opportunities for citizens of the University, the state and the broader region. WVU also seeks to achieve national and international impact and is committed to equal opportunity, affirmative action, social justice and the elimination of discrimination and harassment. These commitments are moral imperatives for an intellectual community that celebrates individual differences and diversity.

West Virginia University does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity or expression, genetic information, HIV/AIDS status, military status, national origin, pregnancy, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or protected veteran status, or any other bases under the law, in its education program or activity, which includes employment.

Consistent with this document, colleges, schools and divisions (Units) reporting to administrators on the Morgantown campuses, and other appropriate units such as the Extension Service and the University

**Commented [A1]:** A number of edits were made in the first three paragraphs to set the tone for the equity minded reforms that are now proposed in the document. The edits were also made to make the document more transparent, consistent, and in a more accessible style continued throughout the document.

**Commented [A2]:** Consistency  
Non-discrimination statements were added to the document to align with affirmative action, equal employment, BOG Rule 1.6 and DDEI.

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. The unit guidelines may be more specific to expectations of individual disciplines, and they may be more ~~but not less~~ rigorous than the University guidelines, ~~but not exclusionary~~.

Commented [A3]: Edited and updated based on comments.

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

### A. The Faculty Evaluation Process

The faculty evaluation process at WVU is designed to attract promising faculty members, foster their productivity and professional development, help them reach their potential, and reward their accomplishments. 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. The faculty evaluation process promotes high standards and provides recognition for meritorious work. The process has four 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 record of performance that encourages professional growth and provides support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. An important aspect of the annual evaluation is an assessment of one's progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. Once tenure has been awarded, ordinary post-tenure review occurs as part of the annual evaluation process. Negative annual evaluations might lead to the development of a written performance improvement plan, as determined by the relevant chairperson and dean. A faculty member's failure to fulfill a performance improvement plan could lead to a recommendation for non-continuation. Such a recommendation can be made at any time and must include a review at all levels with the decision made by the Provost.

Commented [A4]: Edited and updated based on comments.

#### 2. Evaluation for Promotion in Rank

Promotion in rank recognizes exemplary performance by 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 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 an assessment of the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained. A cumulative assessment of one's progress toward tenure will normally begin no later than mid-way through the tenure-track period or two years prior to the faculty member's critical year. During this mid-tenure review, a faculty member will be reviewed by the department, the chair and the dean.

#### 4. Evaluation of Post-Promotion and/or Tenure for all Faculty (Tenured, Teaching-track, Service-track, Research-track, Librarian-track, Extension-track, and Clinical-track)

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the University community. The individual faculty member is responsible for providing evidence of the quality and impact of their work in their digital evaluation file. 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 each level 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.<sup>1</sup>

For ordinary annual reviews, fully promoted faculty members are evaluated by their Chair and may also choose to be evaluated by their department committee. The faculty member must inform the department chair or equivalent, in writing, 90 days in advance of the faculty member's file closing.

**Commented [A5]:** Consistency  
This addition makes the 2015-2016 pilot project "Streamlining the Annual Review Process" standard practice for fully promoted faculty.

In post-promotion and/or post-tenure cases that do not follow the standard time intervals between promotions, a faculty member, unit leader, or dean may request a cumulative review. The cumulative review will assess the faculty member's achievements since their last promotion or salary enhancement (normally five years since last action) to determine the appropriate workload moving forward. When a faculty member achieves promotion and/or tenure, the criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching, research, and/or service may be modified on an individual basis to require significant contributions in a different pair of these mission areas, with reasonable contributions required in the third. Changes such as these will be based on the needs of the unit, the appropriate balance of assignments within the unit, consultation with the unit, and with the approval of the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost. An Associate/Full Professor could be considered for promotion and/or salary enhancements if a memorandum of understanding was developed and was subsequently in place for at least five full academic years prior to consideration.

**Commented [A6]:** Consistency  
This paragraph ensures that we continue to provide feedback to support the careers of Associate and Full professors as well as clearly stating the process for changing significant areas of contribution.

As noted in section II.B., each academic unit must specify the criteria by which ratings of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory are assigned. Ratings of Unsatisfactory are reserved for cases in which the faculty member is not meeting the academic unit's minimal standards for job performance. Ratings of Unsatisfactory follow (a) a period of performance decline for which the faculty member had received specific feedback in prior annual evaluations yet has not demonstrated improvement or (b) gross misconduct (e.g., job abandonment).

If any faculty member receives an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s) in any area at any level, the unit leader must notify the dean and develop a written performance improvement plan with the faculty member. The performance improvement plan must be developed within 30 days of the notification. The unit leader must work with the faculty member on their performance improvement plan and monitors their progress, although the faculty member is ultimately responsible for meeting the requirements of the performance improvement plan. If any faculty member in the following annual review receives a second "Unsatisfactory" rating(s) in the same area at any level, that level of review ~~must~~ may recommend non-continuation. Non-continuation ~~must~~ may also be recommended if the faculty member receives an "Unsatisfactory" in two out of three consecutive annual reviews in the same area at any level. In addition, if a faculty member receives "Unsatisfactory" across two of the three mission areas in an annual review, at any level, that level of review must recommend non-continuation. A review at all levels, including one by the Provost, must occur if the performance improvement plan is not adhered to and/or if there is a recommendation for non-continuation.

**Commented [A7]:** Consistency  
Must and shall are consistently inserted throughout the document to create consistency and accountability for faculty evaluation committees, chairpersons, and deans.

**Commented [A8R7]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

**Commented [A9]:** Consistency  
This text is codifying the process in place for "Unsatisfactory" faculty performance. The text also clarifies when to recommend non-continuation as well as the process that is followed when non-continuation is recommended.

## 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 the context of the faculty member's particular roles at

<sup>1</sup>The 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.

the institution. Faculty accomplishments should be judged in the context of faculty roles, which may change over time; such changes normally are identified in an annual workload document or memorandum of understanding. Regardless of form, changes to workload must be formally documented in writing.

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 work furthers the different areas of the University's mission will vary.

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 these University Procedures. 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/creative work, and service in ways that reflect the unit's discipline and mission (see appendices 1-3 for a detailed description of these mission areas). 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 must 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 individual professional interests.

All faculty members have an obligation to foster the 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.<sup>2</sup> All faculty members (Tenured, Teaching-track, Service-track, Research-track, Librarian-track, Extension-track, and Clinical-track) are expected to keep up with new developments in their disciplines and to engage in professional development activities related to their mission areas. Examples of professional development activities include, but are not limited to, attending conferences and Teaching and Learning Commons (TLC) workshops.

### III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Teaching, research<sup>3</sup> and service constitute the heart of the mission of West Virginia University and are equally valuable to the institution. 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. Each of these areas can be an area of significant contribution. Therefore, all faculty are externally reviewed in one area for any level of promotion or for tenure as outlined in the offer letter, except for staff librarians seeking promotion to assistant librarian and instructors seeking promotion to assistant professor<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> WVU Board of Governors' Rule 4.1, Section 3.2.

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

<sup>4</sup> Clinical-track Assistant Professors with contracts with University Health Associates (UHA) or the Dental Corporation do not require external reviews for promotion to Associate Professor. However, all clinical-track faculty require external reviews for promotion to Full Professor.

**Commented [A10]:** Expansion  
There are now appendices for research, teaching and service activities that outline different activities that could be categorized as RTS as well as evidence that could be used to illustrate quality and impact.

**Commented [A11]:** Alignment  
This requirement was added to align the external review process across the different types and tracks of faculty members, regardless of the track or campus. We also removed the external review requirement for promotion from instructor to assistant professor.

Depending upon one's discipline and the unit's guidelines, publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Additionally, professional development and/or scholarly activities should reflect active and on-going substantive engagement with research and scholarly works. Professional engagement may include but is not limited to participating in relevant professional development opportunities (TLC workshops, certifications); moderating, facilitating, or leading workshops and/or trainings; and presenting or publishing scholarly work. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields.

Academic leaders annually approve the research, teaching, and/or service assignments of their faculty and only work approved by the academic leader ~~are~~ is considered in the evaluation. Faculty members are required to document their performance in their digital evaluation files that demonstrate the quality, quantity, and impact of their work, and they must meet the review deadlines set by the University.

**Commented [A12]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

#### A. Teaching

Teaching stimulates critical thinking and curiosity, disseminates knowledge, and develops communication skills and/or artistic expression. Teaching includes traditional modes of instruction such as the in-person classroom lecture, class discussion, seminars, and other classroom activities. It can occur in different modes such as clinical, laboratory, online, and practicum instruction, and it can be done via distance learning as well as face-to-face. Teaching also includes activities outside scheduled classes, including but not limited to 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. Advising/mentoring is a critical, but often underappreciated, dimension of teaching that is essential to helping students succeed. The advising of doctoral students has elements of both teaching and research. The goal of the teaching-learning endeavor is to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits that should culminate in degree completion.

**Commented [A13]:** Expansion  
We have expanded the definition, examples and evaluation metrics for the teaching, research, and service mission areas. In addition, there was some sentence restructuring here to align mission-critical faculty work with the rewards system.

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; attentiveness to diversity; and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. A faculty member applying for promotion and/or tenure must submit a teaching portfolio when teaching is an area of significant contribution. At a minimum, the supporting documentation in the teaching section of the digital evaluation file must include a syllabus (when appropriate) for each course, student feedback of instruction (which may include the eSEI or other standardized student evaluation of instruction instrument approved by the University), at least one peer evaluation prior to the mid-tenure/promotion review, and a teaching narrative.<sup>5</sup>

**Commented [A14]:** There was some sentence restructuring here to ensure that we align mission-critical faculty work and the rewards system.

Supporting documentation for the evaluation of effective performance in teaching may also include evidence drawn from such sources as the assessment of student learning outcomes; the collective judgment of student advisees and/or mentees; peer and/or supervisor analyses of course content; peer and/or supervisor 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; early semester course feedback; or other evidence deemed appropriate by the department, college, or in Teaching Appendices #1. 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

**Commented [A15]:** Expansion  
We expanded what is now required for documenting one's teaching quality and impact.

---

<sup>5</sup> West Virginia University Board of Governors Rule 4.2 requires student feedback as part of the faculty evaluation process.



teaching must be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file rather than over-reliance on student feedback of instruction.

**Commented [A16]:** Expansion  
We added a clarifying statement about the appropriate use of student feedback of instruction.

Faculty engaged in teaching that helps to enact the diversity, equity, inclusion, and/or social justice mission work of the University, and/or who wish to receive credit for their work, must document their contributions in their Digital Measures evaluation file. Criteria for the evaluation of diversity, equity, inclusion and social justice teaching efforts must be clearly stated in the unit's guidelines. Contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including contributions to recruiting, advising, retaining, and graduating students from historically under-represented groups and program or curriculum development related to supporting a diverse student body. Such activities include but are not limited to learning activities that support inclusivity and diversity in the classroom and extracurricular activities outside of the classroom related to a field or program of study, such as modules on cultural competence and classroom activities that support inclusivity and diversity.

**Commented [A17]:** Replaced Digital Measures with evaluation based on comments.

**Commented [A18]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

Public and community-engaged teaching are direct and meaningful formal and informal knowledge generating, transmitting, sharing, and/or applying for the benefit of external audiences. Community-engaged teaching may include, but is not limited to, curricular development; developing, implementing and evaluating experiential, off-campus assignments for students, such as those in service-learning classes, as well as study abroad programs with community engagement components, and online and off-campus education; pre-college courses for K-12 youth, occupational short courses, certificates, and licensure programs; conferences, seminars, not-for-credit classes, and workshops; educational enrichment programs for the public and alumni; educational media interviews or translating written materials for general public audiences; materials to enhance public understanding; and self-directed, managed learning environments, such as museums, libraries, or gardens. Criteria for the evaluation of public and community-engaged teaching must be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. A faculty member's achievements in these types of instruction must be documented by evidence in the file. Faculty must also highlight multi/trans/interdisciplinary teaching if applicable. Appropriately recognizing successful multi/trans/interdisciplinary work will require units to adapt their promotion, tenure, or annual evaluation guidelines to recognize and reward these activities as well as the time and effort it takes for them to be completed.

**Commented [A19]:** Expansion  
We expanded what is valued by recognizing and crediting diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice work, public and community engaged work, and multi/trans/interdisciplinary work across the teaching, research, and service sections of the document.

## B. Research

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, educational and community outreach, should also be part of the evaluation of research. Research published in predatory journals will not receive credit. Additional examples of research are detailed in Research Appendices #2.

**Commented [A20]:** Expansion  
We have expanded the definition, examples and evaluation metrics for the teaching, research, and service mission areas. In addition, there was some sentence restructuring here to align mission-critical faculty work with the rewards system.

**Commented [A21]:** There were additions here to ensure that we align mission-critical faculty work and the rewards system.

Research may be discipline-focused and individual, or it may be multi/trans/interdisciplinary and collaborative. Units must establish protocols for crediting co-authored work and faculty must document their specific contributions to these types of work. Faculty are encouraged to highlight multi/trans/interdisciplinary research, understanding that not all research fits into traditional disciplines. 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 must be identified in the appointment letter when possible, or in annual letters as assignments change. Reviewers throughout the evaluation process should recognize and credit interdisciplinary research that crosses multiple fields. Unit guidelines must address



and adapt the evaluative process for these activities. It should be noted that the advising of doctoral students has elements of both teaching and research and in some units is defined as research.

In most disciplines, refereed publications (print or electronic) of high quality are required as evidence of scholarly productivity. In some disciplines, the strongest such evidence may appear in published refereed proceedings rather than traditional journals; such cases must be recognized in the unit 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 required to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Criteria for the evaluation of research must be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations must be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

Faculty engaged in research that helps to enact the diversity, equity, inclusion, and/or social justice [mission work](#) of the University and/or who wish to receive credit for their work, must document their contributions in their [Digital Measure reevaluation](#) file. [Criteria for the evaluation of diversity, equity, inclusion and social justice research efforts](#) must be clearly stated in the unit's guidelines. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including scholarship completed in partnership with local entities or non-profits that is focused on improving equity and outcomes for diverse students; scholarship that adds to our awareness of the experiences of diverse students, faculty, staff, counselors or administrators in education and human development more broadly; public-engaged scholarship that emphasizes issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion for educators in higher education.

Commented [A22]: Edited and updated based on comments.

Public and community-engaged research and creative scholarship is characterized by creative intellectual work conducted in collaboration with and/or for the benefit of community partners. This work is based on a high level of professional expertise that is likely to inform and foster further scholarly activity. It may include but is not limited to community-based, participatory research, applied research, contractual research, demonstration projects, needs and assets assessments, and program evaluations; collaboratively created, produced, or performed film, theater, music, performance, sculpture, writing, spoken works, multimedia projects, and exhibitions; copyrights, patents, licenses for commercial use, innovation and entrepreneurship activities, university-managed or supported businesses ventures (business parks or incubators), new business ventures and start-ups, inventions, and social entrepreneurship.

Commented [A23]: Expansion  
We expanded what is valued by recognizing and crediting diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice work, public and community engaged work, and multi/trans/interdisciplinary work across the teaching, research, and service sections of the document.

Because of the nature of the enterprise, the forms of public scholarship evolve regularly and change more rapidly than do more traditional forms of scholarship (i.e., monographs, journal articles, and edited collections). Public scholarship is expansive in nature and includes, but is not limited to, print and digital forms of individual and collective scholarship, published in venues that reach broad audiences, such as media articles, op-eds, podcasts, websites and apps, and exhibits in public spaces. Public scholarship work may rely heavily on review and evaluation that involves community partners and other stakeholders outside of conventional academic or scholarly structures; this review should be regarded as meaningfully as is traditional peer review.

While some community-engaged research and creative scholarship may blur traditional distinctions between instruction, research/creative work, outreach/extension, and service activities, its significance must be validated through peer reviews by relevant internal and external communities, including community partners, or by adoption of creative products, protocol, or practices in the work of other peers in the field.

This work may involve generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences (i.e., the community) in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions.

Criteria for the evaluation of public and community-engaged research, creative scholarship and commercialized activities must be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. A faculty member's competence, achievements, and quality of excellence in community-engaged research/creative activity must be documented by evidence in the file.

Partial evidence of appropriate community engaged faculty research may include but is not limited to:

1. Clear academic and community change goals, including a final deliverable that will directly, positively contribute to the communities involved.
2. Appropriate use of scholarship to guide and inform community-engagement activities.
3. Disciplinary rigor and community engagement at all stages of each project.
4. Evidence of impact on the field/discipline, university (i.e., student learning, faculty scholarly outcomes, etc.), and relevant communities.
5. Effective dissemination and presentation to community audiences.
6. Consistently ethical behavior.
7. Peer reviews.

Faculty must also highlight multi/trans/inter-disciplinary research if applicable, and academic units must adapt their promotion, tenure, or annual evaluation guidelines to recognize and reward these activities as well as the time and effort it takes for them to be completed.

### C. Service

Service activities involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society and the profession. These activities include service to the Institution (e.g., University, college, department/academic unit) state, region, and at national and international levels. ~~Faculty members must engage in behaviors consistent with the University Code of Conduct and University Values.~~ Service to the Institution also includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department, college, academic programs. Faculty must actively participate in the life of their academic unit. Examples of active participation can include but are not limited to attending faculty meetings; service on committees; mentoring of students and junior faculty, whether through formal or informal channels; facilitating relevant professional development opportunities, such as organizing reading groups; student and faculty recruitment; coordinating program-level assessment of learning and program improvement processes; overseeing specialized accreditation requirements; leading substantial curricular revision; and assuming leadership roles in the various activities listed above.

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 Institution, society, or the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of constituents, induces positive change, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal, professional, or institutional functions, problems, or issues. Important benefits to the university include faculty participation in the governance system and significant and sustained participation in large-scale improvement processes. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, approved by their academic leader, and performed with one's University affiliation identified. The definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of promotion and tenure must be identified in the unit's evaluation guidelines. Criteria for the

**Commented [A24]:** Expansion  
We have expanded the definition, examples and evaluation metrics for the teaching, research, and service mission areas. In addition, there was some sentence restructuring here to align mission-critical faculty work with the rewards system.

evaluation of service must be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations must be based on a holistic assessment of evidence provided in the file.

Faculty engaged in service that helps to enact the diversity, equity, inclusion, and/or social justice mission work of the University, and/or who wish to receive credit for their work, must document their contributions in their Digital Measure reevaluation file. Criteria for the evaluation of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice service efforts must be clearly stated in the unit's guidelines.

Commented [A25]: Edited and updated based on comments.

Public and community-engaged service and practice are the use of University expertise to address specific issues identified by individuals, organizations, or communities. This work may include but is not limited to technical assistance, consulting, policy analysis, expert testimony, legal advice, clinical practice, diagnostic services, human and animal patient care, and advisory boards and other disciplinary-related service to community organizations. Additional examples can be found in Service Appendices #3.

Commented [A26]: Expansion  
We expanded what is valued by recognizing and crediting diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice work, public and community engaged work, and multi/trans/interdisciplinary work across the teaching, research, and service sections of the document.

Criteria for the evaluation of multi/trans/interdisciplinary service, public and community-engaged service and practice must be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. A faculty member's discipline-based achievements in multi/trans/interdisciplinary service, diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice service, and public and community-engaged service must be documented by evidence in the file.

#### IV. CONTEXTS OF APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY

##### A. Tenured or tenure-track faculty

A faculty member is usually appointed without tenure. 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. A recommendation for tenure must be submitted by the department and college to the Provost's Office mirroring the college promotion and/or tenure process. Appointments can be made without or with credit toward tenure for previous experience.

Commented [A27]: This change aligns across all campuses and colleges and/or equivalents the rank at which tenure can be awarded.

Commented [A28R27]: Noting that this may come up elsewhere in the document.

##### 1. 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).

##### 2. With Credit

It is not uncommon for a new faculty member to have had full-time experience at our institution or another institution of higher learning where they were 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. Where potential credit years for prior service are identified in the offer letter, the faculty member decides at the end of the second academic year whether to accept all, some, or none of the available credit years and to adjust the tentative critical year accordingly. The faculty member's Dean will at this point confirm the faculty member's critical year in writing. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit must 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). The faculty member may not exercise both "with credit" and the "without credit" options.

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.

#### B. Teaching-track, Service-track, Research-track, and Librarian-track Faculty

These faculty members are appointed without tenure. Occasionally, appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor is possible. To be appointed at 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. A recommendation for associate professor or professor rank must be submitted by the department and college to the Provost's Office mirroring the college promotion and/or tenure process. Appointments can be made without or with credit toward promotion for previous experience.

**Commented [A29]:** Alignment  
This addition aligns the possibility of appointment at a higher rank so that it is comparable to tenure track faculty.

##### 1. Without Credit

An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful promotion, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the first year a faculty member may seek promotion. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the promotion year forward by one year (to year five).

##### 2. With Credit

It is not uncommon for a new faculty member to have had full-time experience at our institution or another institution of higher learning where they were 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 promotion may be allowed, unless the candidate does not wish such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative promotion year, shall be identified in the letter of appointment. Where potential credit years for prior experience are identified in the offer letter, the faculty member decides at the end of the second academic year whether to accept all, some, or none of the available credit years and to adjust the promotion year accordingly. The faculty member's Dean will at this point confirm the faculty member's critical year in writing. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit must 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 promotion year forward by one year (to year five). The faculty member may not exercise both the "with credit" and the "without credit" options.

**Commented [A30]:** Alignment  
This addition aligns awarding credit towards promotion for all types of faculty positions (tenure, teaching, service, research, librarian)

If, by the end of the second year, the faculty member does not request modification of the promotion year identified in the letter of appointment, that year will become the recognized promotion year. Action on promotion earlier than the thus-defined 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 annual review, reappointment, mid promotion and/or tenure review promotion, tenure, or non-continuation.

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 termination of appointment/[employment](#) shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested", first class mail and electronic mail. Under certain circumstances the critical year may be extended, although under no circumstances may the critical year be extended beyond the ninth full-time year in a tenure-track status, nor may the critical year be extended when the faculty member is in their critical year. See WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5.<sup>6</sup>

In the case of a tenure-track full-time faculty member holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, 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 December 31.

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;
- Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
- Non-renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
- ~~Non-continuation-renewal~~ of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year;
- [Non-continuation of the appointment of a non-tenure track faculty member on greater than one year contract;](#)
- Non-continuation of the appointment of a tenured faculty member;
- Termination of the appointment of a faculty member for cause (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.2);
- Termination of the appointment of faculty member due to a reduction or discontinuance of an existing program, or financial exigency (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.7).

**Commented [A31]:** Consistency  
This change would ensure that a faculty member that is not being retained would be notified two (2) months earlier than the time frame in the current document allowing the faculty member more time to find another position. The time period would increase from 90 days to about 150 days.

**Commented [A32]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

**Commented [A33]:** Consistency  
This list was expanded to make transparent all the different types of personnel actions that exist.

<sup>6</sup> See also: <http://faculty.wvu.edu/policies-and-procedures/work-life-integration>, "Work-Life Integration."

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 two full years after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

**Commented [A34]:** Expansion  
The edited text expands the waiting period from one year to two years in order to ensure the faculty member has the appropriate time to address any deficits in their promotion package.

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 at WVU or 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 must 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 promotions, special weight will normally be placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period. For example, a long-term associate professor will not be penalized, 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 their field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for their contributions to the discipline. A professor sustains high levels of performance in their 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. 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 (~~Digital Measures/Watermark Faculty Success~~). Also included among that evidence 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 Digital Measures~~. In principle, the record in the evaluation file must be sufficient to document and to support all personnel decisions. Each unit must 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. A Productivity Report without supporting documentation for a given area should receive a rating of "Unsatisfactory" for that area on an annual review. Evaluation file materials will be in electronic form, provided that the integrity of the information and the date of entry in the file are maintained.

**Commented [A35]:** Consistency  
This text makes it clear that a faculty evaluation file without documentation receives an "Unsatisfactory" rating.

**Commented [A36R35]:** Added language based on comments.

The faculty member's evaluation file must 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, memoranda of understanding, annual reviews, and subsequent letters of agreement.

2. An annual workload plan that distributes the effort must be reflected in the faculty evaluation file. The workload plan is assigned and approved by the unit leader.
3. 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.
4. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught, syllabi, student feedback of instruction and enrollments in each, graduate students supervised, clinical assignments, committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work.
5. 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.
6. A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses.
7. Other information and records that the Chairperson and/or Dean may wish to add. Faculty members shall be notified of such additions and may respond to the additions within ten (10) working days, which may be after the file closing date.
8. 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 narrative is required for areas of significant contribution(s).

**Commented [A37]:** Consistency  
This text clearly states that an approved and signed annual workload plans must be in the faculty evaluation file.

The faculty member is responsible for assuring completion of Items 2-3, 4 and 7. The Chairperson and in some cases the Dean shares responsibility for Items 3 and 4 and has responsibility for Items 1, 2, 5, and 6, and 7. 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.

**Commented [A38]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

### 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 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. Faculty evaluation committee members are authorized to access personnel files for the purpose of carrying out their responsibilities of evaluating the faculty members the committee is charged with reviewing. Unauthorized access to or use of personnel files for purposes unrelated to faculty evaluation is prohibited and will be sanctioned up to and including termination of employment/appointment. 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

**Commented [A39]:** Consistency  
This statement was added to make sure faculty members access the personnel files appropriately and outlines the potential consequences for violating these expectations.



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 careers at West Virginia University. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members,<sup>7</sup> 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~~individual strengths 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, teaching-track, service-track, clinical-track, librarian-track, or not eligible for tenure (including faculty with prefixes of "research" and lecturers), will be conducted at the departmental level by the Chairperson 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.

A fully promoted faculty member (e.g., Professor or the equivalent) may be evaluated annually only by the department chair or equivalent unless the faculty member petitions the faculty evaluation committee to also conduct an annual review. The faculty member must inform the department chair -or equivalent, in writing, 90 days in advance of the faculty member's file closing.

**Commented [A40]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

The annual evaluation shall be related to one's assignment and performance and must be both formative and summative. All levels of review shall 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.

**Commented [A41]:** Consistency  
Using must/shall makes it clear that formative and summative feedback on annual reviews and/or cumulative reviews is required. This addition ensures consistency across the campus in annual review processes.

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 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, such as voting. They are

---

<sup>7</sup> Occasional or clinical-track part-time faculty must receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment.

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 must be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion and tenure.

For some new faculty members, the time period under review will include research, teaching, and/or service efforts for 4.5 months (or less) of work instead of a full year. In such cases, the efforts and outcomes should be recalibrated for that shorter time period. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member's results in their first review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. [A Productivity Report without supporting documentation should receive a rating of "Unsatisfactory" on an annual review.](#) ~~For the first 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 to assess progress.~~

While the absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure, negative evaluations shall apprise tenure-track faculty members of performance deficiencies and shall 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 Rule 4.2.

### 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. [Units must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor.](#) While not all faculty members may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations shall guide them toward that achievement. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion. 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 shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's productivity and success. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member's results in a review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of limited evidence of the faculty member's results normally would receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s).

### 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 provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's continued productivity. 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 shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving the next Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. The annual evaluation process is also

**Commented [A42]:** Consistency  
This new paragraph clarifies for the campus, how to handle the first annual review for faculty with a shorter amount of time and outputs/results to review. It also normalizes the "Satisfactory" rating.

**Commented [A43R42]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

**Commented [A44]:** Consistency  
This text establishes that unit criteria for promotion to Professor must be more rigorous than promotion to Associate professor across all unites.

used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member's results in a review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of limited evidence of the faculty member's results normally would receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s).

#### 4. Teaching-Track Faculty

Teaching-track faculty members have renewable term appointments in which the principal assignment is teaching, and are designated with the prefix "teaching," accompanying a traditional rank. Teaching-track 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. BOG Faculty Rule 4.2 extends contracts based on on-going need for the position and meritorious teaching performance up to three, six, and nine years upon promotion to or appointment at the rank of Teaching Instructor/Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor.

Normally, a teaching-track faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. The balance might address needs of the unit and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission; for example, the faculty assignment may be 80% teaching, 10% research, and 10% service. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness fulfills this expectation.

Teaching-track appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. No number of appointments at any teaching 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 teaching-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a teaching-track faculty member and their Chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For teaching-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the evaluation 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.

The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion. 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 shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving success and productivity. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member's results in a review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of limited evidence of the faculty member's results normally would receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s).

Promotion to the rank of teaching professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for their instructional contributions to the discipline. Evidence of a faculty member's national/international reputation can be established by external reviews. Academic units must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria for promotion to associate professor.

#### 4. Service-Track Faculty

Service-track faculty members have renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is service and are designated with the prefix “service,” accompanying a traditional rank. Service-track faculty members are hired to respond to program, unit or department needs. BOG Faculty Rule 4.2 allows extended contracts based on on-going need for the position and meritorious service and teaching performance up to three, six, and nine years upon promotion to or appointment at the rank of Service Instructor/Service Assistant Professor, Service Associate Professor, and Service Professor.

Normally, a service-track faculty assignment will be at least 60% service. The balance might address needs of the unit and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission; for example, the faculty assignment may be 60% service, 20% research, and 20% teaching.

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

The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member’s progress toward promotion. 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 shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member’s chances of achieving success and productivity. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member’s results in a review, a “Satisfactory” rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of limited evidence of the faculty member’s results normally would receive an “Unsatisfactory” rating(s).

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a service-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a service-track faculty member and their Chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For service-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of service excellence, the evaluation file is expected to show evidence of ongoing contribution to adding value to the unit and addressing unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives, as well as needs of the institution and community. These contributions may be related to administration, governance, community outreach, or other areas of service outlined in the appointment letter. Academic units must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor.

Promotion to the rank of service professor designates that the faculty member’s achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues, both within the University and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for their service to the program, unit, or department. Evidence of a faculty member’s national/international reputation can be established by positive external reviews.

##### 5. Research-Track Faculty

Evaluation of research-track faculty members who are not eligible for tenure may emphasize different criteria from those applied to other faculty. 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~~individual strengths 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. Academic units shall set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor. While not all promotable faculty members will attain promotion, annual evaluations shall 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 despite 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.

**Commented [A45]:** Consistency  
This new text for research faculty was added so that there was consistent text for all types of faculty positions.

#### 6. Clinical -Track Faculty and the Health Sciences Center

Clinicians are non-tenure track and must be committed 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 shall assist them toward that goal. Academic units must set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor.

#### 7. Librarian-Track Faculty

Renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is librarianship, are evaluated annually. The 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 their ~~talents~~individual strengths 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 shall assist them toward that goal. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion. 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 shall be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion. These evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties and occasionally will lead to notices of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. If there is limited evidence of the faculty member's results in a review, a "Satisfactory" rating(s) may be appropriate. A second year of limited evidence of the faculty member's results normally would receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating(s).

**Commented [A46]:** Expansion  
New text was added here to expand out this section so that it is comparable with text for other faculty categories.

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.

**Commented [A47]:** Alignment  
This is where we would insert the following text to give them equivalent longer-term contracts as the TAPs and Service Professors. BOG Faculty Rule 4.2 allows extended contracts based on on-going need for the position and meritorious librarianship performance up to three, six, and nine years upon promotion to or appointment at the rank of Assistant University Librarian, Associate University Librarian, and University Librarian.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a librarian-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a librarian-track faculty member and their Chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. For librarian-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of service or professional development/research excellence, the evaluation file is expected to show evidence of ongoing contribution to the unit, addressing the needs, priorities, and initiatives of the unit, the institution, the profession, and community. These contributions may be related to administration, governance, community outreach, or other areas outlined in the appointment letter. Academic units shall set criteria for promotion to university librarian that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate university librarian.

Promotion to the rank of University librarian designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues, both within the University and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for their service to the program, unit, or department. Evidence of a faculty member's national/international reputation can be established by external reviews.

#### 8. 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. 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~~individual strengths 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 shall 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.

#### 9. 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 their ~~talents~~individual strengths to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Occasional or part-time clinical-track faculty members must receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignments.

#### C. Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of a faculty member's performance in each of the mission areas, to which they are 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 [characterizing performance that is not meeting expectations]. 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. A "Satisfactory" rating is meeting expectations, not exceeding expectations and should be the baseline for ratings. Units are responsible for determining and publishing criteria that detail minimum expectations for each rating. Criteria developed must be approved by the Office of the Provost.

**Commented [A48]:** Consistency  
This is new text to be consistent across all four descriptors and to ensure everyone understands what unsatisfactory means.

**Commented [A49]:** Consistency  
This is new text to further clarify a "satisfactory" rating and to set it as the baseline for ratings.

The assessments provided by annual reviews are the primary basis for post-promotion/tenure five-year reviews, 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 shall be a basis for those periodic recommendations which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action that are forwarded to the Provost. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure must 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 consider the distinctive character of the faculty member's discipline. Copies of departmental and/or college criteria are available to all participants in the review process and are posted at faculty.wvu.edu.

The faculty body 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 must demonstrate significant contributions in the area(s) defined in their offer letter or subsequent memorandum of understanding. Further expectations will be described in the approved documents for that campus.

The term "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in the University, college, school, and/or departmental promotion and tenure guidelines and receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their teaching, service, or research efforts by external evaluators at peer or aspirational peer research universities.

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, research, or service are expected to demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in the other area(s) defined in their offer letter or subsequent memorandum of understanding. Absolute criteria must be evaluated every five (5) years and approved by the Office of the Provost. The faculty member hired under previous criteria would be evaluated under the approved criteria when they were hired or at the time of the faculty member's last promotion.

Successful teaching is an expectation for faculty who are assigned to teach, at any campus. If teaching is an area of significant contribution for either tenure and/or promotion, significant contributions must have been made in teaching.

In order to be recommended for promotion, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions in the area(s) identified in the letter of appointment or modified in a subsequent memorandum of understanding.

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 memorandum of understanding. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "Research," research will 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 impact which may include 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 "service" (as differentiated from faculty in the "clinical track"), service will be the area in which significant contributions are expected.

Service activities include service to the University, and service to individuals, groups, and organizations at the state, national and international levels that utilizes disciplinary expertise and is assigned and approved by the unit leader. A significant contribution in service includes the successful development and implementation of programs which address critical issues that impact society. Such programs are planned efforts to meet the needs of constituents; induce positive change in behavior or practice; impact societal problems and issues; effect policies or systems change; or lead to economic, civic, social, or environmental improvements. Programs may be on-going and carried out over a few years, or relatively short-term programs carried out over a few weeks or months. Service should not be measured just by the number of service roles and activities a faculty member is involved with. The impact and innovation, replication,

**Commented [A50]:** Replacement

This new text replaces the existing text and sets an absolute standard instead of a relative standard for significant contributions. In addition, the text outlines when and how the absolute criteria are routinely reviewed and updated.



and/or dissemination of the service activity are keys to demonstrating significance and merit. 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 shall be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

**Commented [A51]:** Expansion  
This paragraph on service activities more fully outlines what is required for significant contributions in service.

The decision by the Provost 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, shall 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**

**Commented [A52]:** Consistency  
The following two (2) paragraphs are written with no assumption about which area will be moved to a reasonable contribution.

When a faculty member achieves tenure, the criteria requiring significant contributions in teaching, research, and/or service may be modified on an individual basis to require significant contributions in a different pair of these mission areas, with reasonable contributions required in the third or outstanding contributions in a single mission area, with reasonable contributions required in the other two mission areas. 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 must be five (5) years 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.

**Commented [A53]:** Consistency  
This text establishes the actual time period that must be met prior to promotion when areas of significant contribution change.

A request for a change in areas of significant contribution(s) will be accompanied by a document which identifies both the types and quantity of the areas of significant contribution expected in the new context and the ways in which the quality of that significant contribution will be measured. Reasonable contributions must also be defined, in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

#### **Multiple Pathways to Professor**

**Commented [A54]:** Consistency  
Alternative Pathways was changed to Multiple Pathways

##### **A. Via Administrative Service (Filed with the Faculty Senate, March 13, 2017)**

A tenured Associate Professor can presently achieve promotion to Professor using service as one of the two areas of significant contribution, although such an assignment has typically been focused on service provided externally, beyond the University proper to the citizens of West Virginia. However, the possibility to achieve such a promotion presently exists, via “extraordinary and extended service to the University.” In rare instances, such opportunity may be available to individuals who are or have been willing to serve in an administrative role and who may intend to have an administrative career. Academic Administrative Service as Department Chairperson or Associate Dean (or the equivalent) for a normal term and executed at a high qualitative level may be interpreted as “extraordinary and extended service to the University” for purposes of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, with the support of the Dean of the college or school.

For clarification of the more specific conditions for such consideration under the presently approved process, the opportunity to seek this path for promotion would need to be approved by the Dean at a time that would allow at least three years in the administrative position. Thus, for example, the candidate could receive approval during the second year of a five-year term, with the first two years being considered retroactively. Under these circumstances, significant contributions would be required in (administrative) service and one other mission area, with at least reasonable contributions required in the third. Achievement in teaching, research, and service must be demonstrated in the tenure home during the period under consideration, normally the last five years. Teaching, research, and service must be evaluated annually by the unit in which the candidate was tenured; the administrative service must be evaluated annually by the Dean. Annual evaluations omitted during the evaluation period will not be considered and will therefore delay the application for promotion.

The availability of this opportunity would be limited to those faculty who, based on the previous award of tenure, had achieved an appropriate level of success in their area(s) of significant or outstanding contribution at that time.

Upon completion of a “360 review” during the final year of the term, resulting in an unequivocal reappointment in that role, the candidate could be considered for promotion using academic administrative service as the basis for making a significant contribution in service. A memorandum of understanding delineating these expectations in greater detail would be prepared upon appointment to the administrative role or at the point of approval of the Dean, and subsequently by the Provost to pursue this option. External reviews of administrative service and the other area of significant contribution would be required. Documentation for these purposes must include annual goal statements and their metrics, as well as annual assessments of the achievement of the goals, prepared by the individual and validated by the Dean. Reappointment in the administrative role and promotion to Professor would result in a 10.0% performance-based salary increase.

#### **B. Via “Outstanding Contributions” (Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 10, 2017)**

Under some circumstances, based on the needs of the unit, the appropriate balance of assignments within the unit, consultation with the unit, and with the approval of the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost, a tenured Associate Professor could be considered for promotion to Professor if a memorandum of understanding allowing this option was developed and was subsequently in place for at least five full academic years prior to consideration. The standard, for which metrics would be described in the memorandum of understanding, would require sustained “outstanding” contributions in any one mission area, with “important” contributions in a second area, and at least reasonable contributions in the third mission area.

“Outstanding” contributions meet a higher standard than “significant” contributions and demonstrate sustained performance at an exceptionally high qualitative and quantitative level that is rarely achieved. This departmental standard would require approval by the Dean and the Provost. If promotion to Professor were achieved, this configuration could continue as the future basis for the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement, assuming that, per the conditions for that award, a supporting work agreement had been approved.

In such a scenario, the proportional value of the mission areas would more closely resemble 70:20:10. For these purposes, colleges and schools shall develop definitions for “outstanding” contributions and “important” contributions in each of the three mission areas.

## **XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS**

In years when a faculty member is being considered for tenure or for promotion to the associate professor or professor rank, the evaluation file must contain external evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's

**Commented [A55]:** Consistency  
Changing this language to areas of significant contributions instead of research and teaching, allows additional flexibility to recognize and reward faculty.

area of significant or outstanding contribution(s) as identified in the offer letter or subsequent memorandum of understanding. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered when evaluating all faculty members.

The external reviews will be maintained in a separate section of the evaluation file ~~in Digital Measures~~. The various committees and individuals directly involved in the promotion and tenure review process shall be provided with this section of the evaluation file as needed. The faculty member shall have the right to see the reviews after any identifying information has been removed and the first level of review is complete. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall not be used in any subsequent personnel actions.

**Commented [A56]:** Consistency  
This text establishes consistency by establishing a common date for uploading redacted external reviews. All faculty would have access at the same time.

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 to propose a list of names of appropriate evaluators. These evaluators should be 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 must be identified. The Chairperson or Dean should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from both lists. A minimum of four external evaluations is normally required. If a minimum of four external evaluations is not met, the Chairperson or Dean must determine additional appropriate 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 with the written consent of the faculty member, Chairperson, and Dean.

Persons who have been closely associated with the person being evaluated, such as co-authors, doctoral research advisors, or advisees, may be asked for evaluations, but, as with all evaluators, must 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 must be forwarded to the Chairperson or Dean and included in the external evaluation section of the evaluation file.

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.

The term "significant contributions" in research are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in the University, college, school, and/or departmental promotion and tenure guidelines and receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their research efforts by external evaluators at peer or aspirational peer research universities.

**Commented [A57]:** Replacement  
This new text replaces the existing text and sets an absolute standard instead of a relative standard for significant contributions.

If external reviewers of research from non-university settings are used, there must be an explanation of 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 clinical service, teaching, service, and librarianship, it might be more appropriate to select referees at teaching intensive universities (that are not Doctoral Universities with very high research activity) or non-university settings.

**Commented [A58]:** Alignment  
This text allows external reviewers from Non R1s for faculty to be externally reviewed in teaching and service.

The term "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in the University, college, school, and/or departmental promotion and tenure guidelines and receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their service including clinical service, teaching, or librarianship efforts by external evaluators. For Assistant rank to Associate rank a minimum of four external evaluations is normally required. Up to two of the external reviewers may be external to the unit, but internal to the University. For Associate rank to Full all external reviewers must be external to the University.\*\*

**Commented [A59]:** Replacement  
This new text replaces the existing text and sets an absolute standard instead of a relative standard for significant contributions.

**Commented [A60]:** This text allows referees from Non R1s for faculty reviewed on teaching and service. In addition, this text builds in flexibility in terms of where external reviewers can come from, ensuring these faculty get at least four reviewers.

The Chair, using letters approved by the Provost, 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. The specific area of significant or outstanding contribution to be externally reviewed must be stated. Further, the other areas of contribution that should not be reviewed shall be explicit. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations must be included in the faculty member's file with identifying information removed. The external evaluator may also assess the faculty member's potential for continued excellent quality and impactful teaching, service, or scholarly development. For faculty, the standard should be based on one's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment, any relevant MOU, as well as University, College and/or unit promotion and tenure guidelines. The assessment of whether the quantity of scholarly work is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a judgment best left to the Department, College, and the University. If an external evaluator comments on an area of contribution that was not specifically stated or provides information and characteristics unrelated to the criteria, those comments must be ignored. The evaluations should be forwarded to the Dean by the external evaluators.

Tenure-track faculty members who received an approved extension of the tenure clock under Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5 should be evaluated on their overall record. The overall time since their original appointment is not a factor to be considered by the external evaluator.

**Commented [A61]:** Consistency  
This new text was added to create consistency in how faculty are evaluated when they utilize modifications of duties and/or extensions to the tenure clock. The standard is the same, regardless of the time period under review.

### XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluations of the achievements of faculty will normally be carried out at three to four levels of University organization: department, college, Vice President of Health Sciences, if applicable, and Provost. A judgment is made at each of these levels both by the faculty committee and by the administrative officer of the unit. All full-time faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor can serve on the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel, regardless of their type of position. All full-time faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor can serve on a college faculty evaluation committees, regardless of their type of position. Faculty members at the rank of instructor and above can serve on department faculty evaluation committees. All faculty who serve on department and college committees also vote on each case, but the majority of voters for tenure cases must be tenured faculty members. In colleges without departments, the committee functions like a departmental committee. Faculty members shall 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 shall not participate in any other promotion and tenure decisions in a year in which a case so described is under consideration.

**Commented [A62]:** Consistency  
These three sentences establish consistency in who serves and votes of departmental and/or college/school FECs. All can serve, if you serve, you vote.

Each level of review will consider the material in the candidate's evaluation file. For an annual review, the previous year's review is considered. For a promotion, tenure, non-continuation or post promotion/tenure five-year review, previous annual reviews are considered. In each situation, the previous reviews 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-continuation of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member automatically receive review at all levels, including that of the Provost. Participants at each level of review will exercise professional judgment regarding their assessment of the evaluation file in arriving at a recommendation or, in the Provost's case, a decision.

If any member of the evaluation process believes that inappropriate and/or prejudicial remarks were made, as defined as Prohibited Conduct outlined in BOG Rule 1.6 or for faculty utilizing BOG Faculty Rule 4.5, the member is obligated to raise their concern during the meeting, citing University rules. Further, the member of the evaluation process must discuss the issue with the appropriate leader which may be the Chairperson, Dean, or Office of the Provost.

A. Department Level in Colleges

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. Membership should reflect the types of faculty positions excluding FEAPs (e.g., if units have teaching track faculty, they are eligible to serve) within 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. This supplementation may occur where multi/trans/inter-disciplinary work is involved. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure is not eligible to serve on any committee reviewing his/her evaluation file. Members of the committee vote on tenure recommendations at the department level. The departmental committee will review and evaluate material in the faculty member's evaluation file. Based only on this evidence, the committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against continuation, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. The committee shall indicate, 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. An abstention (recusal) only occurs when there is a conflict of interest. If desired, committee members may include minority statements, which must 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. The department Chairperson shall indicate, 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 at the same time. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file and shared with the faculty member, including the signatures, votes or abstentions, and minority statement from the department committee, if applicable.

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 non-continuation 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 must 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 or non-continuation cases are automatically reviewed by the college committee and the Dean.

6. Responses to annual reviews must be forwarded to the Chairperson and/or Dean within ten (10) working days of receipt of the evaluation(s) submitted by December 31 of the year was written and The response 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. After working informally with the Chairperson, the faculty member may 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 the 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 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 without departments, the committee functions like a departmental committee. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or the award of tenure shall not serve on the college committee reviewing his/her personnel file. Each faculty evaluation committee shall normally consist 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. Membership should reflect the types of faculty positions excluding FEAPs (e.g., if units have teaching track faculty, they are eligible to serve) within the unit. The method of selection of members is at the discretion of the Dean of the college. No faculty member shall serve on both a departmental and college committee and no Chairperson shall 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 with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, tenure, and/or promotion, as applicable. The evaluation must indicate, 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 non-continuation 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 at the same time. Copies of all written statements shall be forwarded to the faculty member and also placed in the faculty member's evaluation file and shared with the faculty member,

**Commented [A63]:** Consistency  
This new text establishes consistency by setting a specific date (to the end of the year in which it was written) when faculty can write responses to annual reviews.

**Commented [A64R63]:** Edited and updated based on comments.

**Commented [A65]:** Consistency  
This text allows faculty who are not tenured to also serve on college committees.

including the signatures, votes or abstentions, and minority statement from the college committee, if applicable.

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 must 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 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; this Panel will consist 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 the following 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 such. 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 Level

1. For the purposes described in these guidelines, the decision-making authority of the President has been delegated to the Provost.
2. Decisions on promotion, tenure, and non-continuation recommendations will be made by the Provost, after review of the recommendations by departments, colleges, and their administrators, as well as the Advisory Panel's findings. If the final decision by the Provost is non-continuation a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Such notice of termination of appointment/employment shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested", first class mail and electronic mail.
3. The President or designee will report the decisions to the Board of Governors. This 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.

Commented [A66]: Edited and updated based on comments.

#### E. Negative Decisions

##### 1. Non-retention 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 non-retention during the tenure-track period, the reasons for the decision (Section 6.7 of West Virginia University Board of Governors Rule 4.2). 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 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.

##### 2. Tenure Denied; Termination of employment/appointment during Tenure-Track Period in the "critical year"

A faculty member may appeal a decision on termination of employment/appointment within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.

Commented [A67]: Consistency  
Non-retention and tenure denied are separated out in the proposed text instead of all in the same category to clarify the processes.

##### 3. Promotion Denied; Other Personnel Decisions

A faculty member may appeal a decision on promotion or other personnel decisions not included above by using W.Va. Code §6C-2, as described in Board of Governors Rule 4.2. 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 Rule 4.2 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 on-line at <http://bog.wvu.edu>, 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.

## TEACHING APPENDICES #1

### TEACHING EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Teaching at WVU takes a range of forms, and teaching workloads are multifaceted and diverse in their composition. Evaluations of teaching files should be responsive to the unique constellation of teaching contributions of each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement.

**Types of Contributions:** This document enumerates different types of teaching contributions (e.g., course teaching, clinical supervision, advising). The particular composition of an individual teaching workload will be determined by a range of factors (e.g., involvement in a graduate program, assigned advising responsibilities) and should be explicitly laid out in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments or individuals may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all teaching activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count undergraduate advising as teaching and others as service).

**Considerations:** Because teaching takes a range of different forms, not all teaching activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of teaching a course, the course could be assessed on how much students learned, students' assessment of their experience, the course's design, and the instructor's demonstrated commitment to inclusivity and equity. In the context of student advising and/or mentoring, the considerations might include advisor/mentor availability and responsiveness, student success in achieving program benchmarks on time, and advisee load.

Because no two teaching activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the teaching task.

**Examples of Teaching:** By its nature, teaching is difficult to capture and measure. The most successful teaching files will present a range of examples that comprehensively convey each teaching activity and its impact. For example, the activity of teaching a course could be represented by the course syllabus, eSEIs, anonymized student work, pre- and post-course test data, instructor-designed course evaluations, screen shots from eCampus, peer observation, etc. Different examples communicate different types of information.

One consideration is the *example author or creator*. In other words, who generated or developed the example? Some examples are created by the instructor themselves. In the case of a course, this might include a syllabus, course assignment descriptions and associated rubrics, and eCampus shells. While the information conveyed by these examples is important, to understand the impact of these examples (on student learning, for example), examples generated by students is essential. These might include anonymized student work, eSEI responses, pre- and post-course assessment data, or a screen shot of an (anonymized) eCampus discussion board. To help triangulate information gleaned from and student-generated examples, the instructor could ask a colleague to observe a class or have a faculty associate from the Teaching and Learning Commons consult on a course. These peer- and expert-generated materials would provide a different perspective on the success of the course.

Another consideration is the *example type*. In other words, what does this example accomplish in the context of the file? Some examples, like peer observation, explicitly evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction and eSEIs evaluate the student's experience of the instruction. Other examples, like syllabi or student work, help to illustrate what happens in the course. Some materials, like a TLC consultation, are provided to demonstrate the instructors' professional development and learning related to their pedagogy. Finally, some file materials, like the teaching narrative, help to explain the course. Explanatory examples may be less formal, like a note in Digital Measures, which could explain that a syllabus revision was completed in response to the previous year's annual review letter or to student feedback on the mid-semester evaluation.

Where *evaluative* examples are included, it is helpful to consider whether those were anonymous (as in the case of eSEIs or instructor-designed evaluations delivered through Qualtrics) or not (peer observation or student letters of appreciation). It is also helpful to note whether the example was a formative (like an early- or mid-semester evaluation intended to inform instruction in progress) or summative (intended to provide feedback about the course and its effectiveness after it is completed).

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or offer letter, and – perhaps most importantly – the teaching narrative.

One key to a successful teaching file is that it balances a range of example types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized.

Rather than providing a list of examples that could be associated with each teaching activity, this document

provides guiding principles to help faculty and evaluation committee members consider different examples and the types of information they convey. We have also included an appendix that lists a range of possible examples. **Again, this list is not meant to be prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.**

**Evaluative Tools:** What follows is a series of tools to help evaluators – those serving on faculty evaluation committees, as well as chairs and deans – assess faculty teaching files. Faculty themselves should also consult these tools when developing their files and their narratives. These tools are meant to be flexible and generative. If an FEC or chair recognizes a teaching activity often performed by their faculty but not captured here, they should develop that table and associated metrics. If the considerations or metrics enumerated in a table do not effectively capture that activity for a particular department, the faculty of that department should revise the table to better fit its needs. Included in this document are the following tools:

*Tables* outline each type of teaching contribution and its associated metrics for consideration. *Matrices* could be used by faculty or evaluators as a way to check on the inclusion and balance of different types of evidence. *Appendices* list examples of evidence types for each teaching activity. Once again, it is important to underscore the flexible nature of these tools.

**COURSE TEACHING TABLE**

Activity	Considerations *Not required to address each of these topics	(Possible) Associated Evidence * <b>Bold Required</b>
<b>COURSE TEACHING</b>	<b>Student Learning</b> (Do students demonstrate knowledge development over the course of the semester?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anonymized student work</li> <li>• Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>• Accreditation and/or Annual assessment reports</li> <li>• Exam pass rates</li> </ul>
	<b>Student Experience</b> (Did students feel positively toward the instructor, the materials, and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>eSEIs</b></li> <li>• Early semester assessments</li> <li>• Student emails/correspondence</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all students in this course have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade data (with attention to D/Fs)</li> <li>• <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>• Screen shots of eCampus pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> <li>• Anonymized modifications for students with individual needs</li> </ul>
	<b>Course Design</b> (Is the course deliberately designed to effectively develop knowledge among students?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>• Screen shots of eCampus pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions and rubrics</li> <li>• Student work</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, unit specific mission, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program curriculum requirements</li> <li>• GEF descriptions</li> <li>• Credits associated with course</li> <li>• SpeakWrite documentation</li> </ul>

**GRADUATE ADVISING/MENTORING TABLE**

*Note:* Graduate advising takes a range of forms: advising graduate students on program requirements, overseeing graduate work in a laboratory or other assistantship, scholarly mentoring on a dissertation or thesis. Some departments or individuals may count some of these duties towards teaching (e.g., dissertation mentorship, teaching assistantship oversight), others towards service (e.g., program requirement advising), and others towards research (e.g., laboratory assistantship oversight). The faculty member and their chair should agree upon the designation of each type of advising and provide a clear rationale that aligns with the faculty member’s workload agreement, MOU, etc. The faculty member should explicate any ambiguous designation in their teaching narrative and/or digital measures. **None of this is required beyond the minimum 4 unless required by the unit.** Quality and impact should be emphasized over quantity. Faculty should choose items of evidence that most effectively demonstrate the quality and impact of their teaching. There is no reward for simply increasing the quantity of evidence submitted

Activity	Considerations *Not required to address each of these topics	(Possible) Associated Evidence * <b>Bold Required</b>
<b>GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISING/ MENTORING</b>	<b>Student Learning</b> (Do students demonstrate knowledge development?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student work</li> <li>• Papers, presentations or other scholarly activity produced by student</li> <li>• Participation as the chair or member of graduate student penultimate paper</li> <li>• Job placement of trainees immediately upon program completion</li> <li>• Awards or recognition received by students or other trainees under the faculty member's direct mentorship.</li> </ul>
	<b>Student Experience</b> (Did students feel positively toward the graduate advisor/mentor and the learning experience?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>eSEIs (when appropriate and/or more than five (5) students)</b></li> <li>• Early semester assessments</li> <li>• Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Number of transfers into/out of student mentorship (not via graduation)</li> <li>• Number of students completing program</li> <li>• Nominations of faculty for mentorship awards</li> <li>• Student assessment of mentor</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all advisees/mentees have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Fulfillment of Expectations (MOUs), Research Contracts</li> <li>• Completion of grant work</li> <li>• Attendance/organization at specified seminars</li> <li>• Participation in the educational component of research grants</li> </ul>
	<b>Design</b> (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop knowledge among students?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>• Screen shots of eCampus pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> <li>• Student work</li> <li>• Attendance/organization at specified seminars</li> <li>• Participation in the educational component of research grants</li> <li>• Structured engagement with students through meetings, lab meetings, journal clubs, etc.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of incorporation of research data or practice guidelines into mentoring/advising</li> <li>• Development of tools and guidelines that promote effectiveness; expectations agreements, lab contracts, etc.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Program/University Needs</b>  (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>• Organization of departmental/unit/college seminar for graduate students</li> <li>• Service as graduate student advisor</li> </ul>

**UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING/MENTORING TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ADVISING/ MENTORING	Student Experience (Did students feel positively toward the advisor, the mentor, the advice given, and the experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on the advisor/mentor with a survey</li> <li>• Number of transfers from/to advisor</li> <li>• Average wait time between the requested appointment time and appointment</li> <li>• Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Letters of recommendations including, but not limited to applications for internal/external awards, internship placements, graduate applications, nominations for mentoring awards</li> <li>• Independent study or advanced research/service project including Honors Excel program, SURE, McNair Scholars, internships supported through grants, lab experiences, etc.</li> <li>• Postgraduate job placement or acceptance into graduate or professional programs</li> <li>• General assessment of advisor</li> </ul>
	Accessibility for All (Do all students have equal opportunity and access to advising and/or mentoring?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of students advised</li> <li>• Successful retention rate in the program</li> <li>• Successful retention rate in the University</li> <li>• Universal design in class materials</li> <li>• Attendance of training and certification (badges) to support accessibility for all</li> </ul>
	Design (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop students?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of specialized mentorship tools for retention</li> <li>• Expectation agreements and guidelines</li> <li>• Structured engagement or meeting schedule, lab meetings, etc.</li> </ul>
	Program/University Needs (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metrics for advisement being met (# of times per academic year, etc.)</li> <li>• Timely progress towards benchmarks</li> <li>• Time to degree completion</li> </ul>



**COMMUNITY-ENGAGED TEACHING TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
<b>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (as a Facilitator)</b>	<p><b>Participant Learning</b> (Do participants demonstrate development over the course of the semester?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participant work</li> <li>• Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>• Documented outcomes as a result of the training (projects, other behavioral change)</li> <li>• Did the course/training result in a certification or a badge being granted to the participant</li> <li>• Feedback from community partners regarding student development</li> <li>• Evidence of tangible outcomes</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Participant Experience</b> (Did participants feel positively toward the instructor, the materials, and the learning experience more broadly?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program assessments (minute papers, etc.)</li> <li>• Participant emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Periodic check-ins with all parties involved</li> <li>• Reflection exercise from participants</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all participants in this course have equal opportunity to be successful?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Participants</li> <li>• Scope of the training (local, state, national, international)</li> <li>• Design of alternate means of dissemination (hybrid, podcast, etc.)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Design</b> (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop participants?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of work as facilitator (e.g., slideshow, handouts)</li> <li>• Evidence of work as a mentor to the program development (not a facilitator)</li> <li>• Syllabus or overview of the program</li> <li>• New program development (e.g., program materials)</li> <li>• Substantial revision of program (e.g. revised program materials)</li> <li>• Screen shots of eCampus pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> <li>• Reflection exercise from all participants</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Program/University/Stakeholder/Community Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation, certificate, or continuing education unit/CEU programs?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>• GEF descriptions</li> <li>• Community Request for additional engagement</li> <li>• Stakeholder Request for Training</li> <li>• External Certification Requirements (new and renewals)</li> </ul>

**GRADUATE CLINICAL SUPERVISION TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
<b>CLINICAL SUPERVISION</b>	<b>Student/Supervisee Learning</b> (Do students demonstrate development over the course of the placement/rotation?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student/supervisee work</li> <li>• Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>• Mentor/On-site supervisor evaluation</li> </ul>
	<b>Student/Supervisee Experience</b> (Did students feel positively toward the supervisor and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student/Supervisee evaluations</li> <li>• Student presentations/publications/awards under mentorship of supervisor</li> <li>• Peer evaluations and/or observations</li> <li>• Awards for supervision</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all students in this experience have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade data</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> </ul>
	<b>Design of Supervision/Innovation of methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching tools</li> <li>• Evaluation tools</li> <li>• Supervisee work</li> <li>• Evidence of integration of scholarship of supervision methods into design</li> <li>• Evidence of design to support supervisee learning in diverse settings.</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/Accreditation Needs</b> (Does the supervision meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>• Credits associated with supervision</li> <li>• National survey program (ACGME, LCME, etc.)</li> <li>• Board pass rates</li> </ul>
	<b>Student/Supervisee Preparation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student/Supervisee satisfaction/efficacy</li> <li>• Completion of degree</li> </ul>
	<b>Alumni success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Job Placement data (short-term success)</li> <li>• Career trajectory (long-term success)</li> <li>• Letters of appreciation</li> </ul>

**SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING & LEARNING (SoTL) TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
<b>SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING</b>	<b>Dissemination of professional knowledge on teaching and learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference presentations (peer reviewed, invited, not peer-reviewed)</li> <li>• Research paper (peer reviewed, invited, not peer-reviewed)</li> <li>• Podcast production</li> <li>• Interview on podcast</li> <li>• News media production</li> <li>• Interview on news media</li> <li>• Video of lesson study/workshop</li> <li>• Book or workbook</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University Needs</b> (Dissemination of scholarship at the behest of the department/unit/University)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University workshop (e.g. TLC “Celebrate”)</li> <li>• TLC Faculty Associates</li> </ul>

**PROFESSIONAL LEARNING/DEVELOPMENT TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence**
<b>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b> (as a participant)	<b>Increased professional knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of completion of graduate courses</li> <li>• Evidence of completion of graduate degree</li> <li>• Evidence of completion of other trainings or continuing education or workshops</li> <li>• Evidence of completion of certifications through testing or alternate means (non-classroom)</li> <li>• Evidence of completion of badging or certification</li> <li>• Conference attendance</li> <li>• Internal development opportunities (TLC, Talent &amp; Culture, etc.)</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of required professional development for certifications</li> <li>• Internal/external awards</li> </ul>

## EVIDENCE MATRIX

TYPOLOGY OF TEACHING EXAMPLES															
Activity	Example	Required	Anon.*	Solicited*	Author/Creator					Type				Purpose*	
					Self	Student	Peer	Expert	Admin.	Evaluative	Illustrative	Explanatory	Developmental	Formative	Summative

\*If evaluative

## APPENDIX OF POSSIBLE EXAMPLES\*

### COURSE TEACHING

#### Evaluation

- eSEI
- Early Semester Feedback Tool
- TLC Peer Observation
- Dept. Colleague Class Observation
- Dept. Chair Class Observation
- Dept. Colleague Course Material Review
- Student letters, notes of appreciation
- Teaching Awards
- Evaluations by GTAs, GAs, RAs, or other instructional personnel

#### Design

- Syllabus
- Screenshots of eCampus
- Model Assignments Description/Rubrics
- Lesson Plans
- Class Activities (descriptions, notes, slides)
- Handouts
- Lecture/Seminar Notes
- Lecture/Seminar Slides
- Digital Learning Objects

#### Student Learning

- Student Letter of Appreciation
- Anonymized Student Work
- Student Pre-/Post-Course Assessments
- Screenshot of Discussion Board
- Student external publications related to course work
- External awards for student's course work

#### Other

- Sample anonymized feedback on student work
- Invitations to consult on teaching, provide workshops on teaching, etc.
- Self-reflection/teaching narrative
- Grants or funding for pedagogical innovations or teaching projects

## RESEARCH APPENDICES #2

### EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY PRODUCTION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Research at WVU takes a range of forms, and research workloads are diverse and multifaceted in their composition. Evaluations of research files should be responsive to the specific nature of research contributions by each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement.

**Types of Contributions:** This document enumerates different types of research contributions (e.g., publishing, grant activity, performance, presentation). The particular nature of an individual research workload will be determined by a range of factors and should be described in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all research activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count graduate student mentorship in a laboratory or on a research project as research and others count it as teaching).

**Considerations:** Because research takes a range of different forms, not all research activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of procuring a major grant, the grant could be assessed on the prestige of the funding agency, the amount of funding awarded, the selectivity of the award, and the faculty member's role on the project (e.g., PI, Co-I, etc.). In the context of publishing an article, the considerations might include the selectivity and prestige of the journal, the authors' role (e.g., sole author, first author, etc.), the time dedicated to research represented in the article (e.g., multi-year ethnography vs. secondary data analysis), and if graduate students or mentored junior scholars were included as authors.

Because no two research activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the research task.

**Evidence:** While some products of research activity are obvious – like publications, posters, and submitted grant proposals – not all research activity is easily communicated within a research file. The faculty member should present a range of evidence types that help to convey the full scope of the research activity.

One consideration is the *evidence type*. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like posters or published manuscripts, are explicit illustrations of research findings. Other evidence, like unfunded grant reviews, IRB protocols, or agendas of grant writing workshops, help to show a research project or researcher's development. Finally, some file materials, like the research narrative, performance review, or a scholar's research index or impact factor, provide some context for the research activity. One key to a successful research file is that it balances a range of evidence types.

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or offer letter, and – perhaps most importantly – the research narrative.

Rather than providing a complete list of evidence that could be associated with each research activity, this document provides a few illustrations to guide faculty and FECs in how to consider different evidence and the types of information they convey. Again, this list is not meant to be exhaustive or prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.



**TYPOLGY OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE**

Activity	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Journal article	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer review</li> <li>• Authorship order</li> <li>• Co-author, sole-author or corresponding author</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> <li>• Acceptance letter</li> <li>• Reviews</li> <li>• Evidence of citations</li> </ul>
Invited article	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of outlet</li> </ul>	
Book Chapter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manuscript length</li> </ul>	
Book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of students or mentored junior faculty</li> <li>• Scale of research being presented (e.g., longitudinal ethnography vs. secondary analysis)</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the field</li> </ul>	
Book Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of publisher</li> <li>• Editor order (if more than one)</li> <li>• Prestige/diversity/importance of authors in volume</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the field</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> <li>• Acceptance letter</li> <li>• Reviews</li> <li>• Evidence of citations</li> </ul>
Book Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of publisher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> </ul>
Conference Proceedings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IEEE</li> <li>• Peer review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstracts</li> </ul>
Translations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literary and non-literary works as a noteworthy contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty members submitting translations for evaluation should include a statement clarifying how that work is appropriate to their research program and their field of study. The Department considers other types of translation, e. g., legal and commercial documents, as service.</li> </ul>
Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success of submission (funded or unfunded)</li> <li>• Amount of award</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant/contract proposal</li> <li>• Reviews</li> </ul>
Contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selectivity of award</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance letter</li> </ul>
Foundation-supported funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prestige of granting agency</li> <li>• Role on grant/contract (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-I, etc.)</li> <li>• Internal vs. external</li> <li>• New vs. renewal</li> <li>• Competitive vs. non-competitive</li> <li>• Nature of the grant vs. Contract</li> <li>• Research, Teaching or Service related grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Green sheet"</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clinical trials (investigator initiated or industry sponsored)</li> </ul>	
Scholarly Presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reach of lecture (attendance, recording views)</li> <li>• Level of expertise used in presentation</li> <li>• Scope of exposure (regional/national/international)</li> <li>• Audience (scholars, general public)</li> <li>• Invited, keynote or plenary</li> <li>• Presentation submission</li> <li>• Workshop (invited, reach, federal agency)</li> <li>• Peer review</li> <li>• Co-author, sole-author, corresponding author</li> <li>• Feedback from a session about teaching practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to recording</li> <li>• Slides/Lecture transcript or notes</li> <li>• Notes of appreciation</li> <li>• Link to publication</li> </ul>
Workshops		
Public lecture about Expertise		
Media Publication/Production		
Composition, Performance, Exhibit, Design for Juried Competitions, Exhibitions and Collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope</li> <li>• Venue/Location</li> <li>• Invitation/Commission</li> <li>• Sponsor</li> <li>• Collaborators/Ensemble</li> <li>• Creative/Artistic Innovations</li> <li>• Acceptance rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recordings, Videos, Images</li> <li>• Scores</li> <li>• Multimedia/Digital Examples</li> <li>• Contracts</li> </ul>
Extension publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer review</li> <li>• Authorship order</li> <li>• Co-author, sole-author or corresponding author</li> <li>• Prestige, impact, and selectivity of outlet</li> <li>• Manuscript length</li> <li>• Inclusion of students or mentored junior faculty</li> <li>• Scale of research being presented (e.g., longitudinal ethnography vs. secondary analysis)</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>• Originality/novelty in the field</li> <li>• Internal publications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published manuscript</li> <li>• Acceptance letter</li> <li>• Reviews</li> <li>• Evidence of citations</li> <li>• Fact Sheets</li> </ul>
Patents/Licensing Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invention disclosure</li> <li>• Patent filed</li> <li>• Published patents</li> <li>• Licensing agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patent</li> </ul>
Non-disclosure Agreements with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensing agreements</li> <li>• Non-disclosure Agreements</li> <li>• In-kind support</li> </ul>	

Industry Partners (Outside University)		
Community-engaged Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> <li>• Participatory Design</li> <li>• Training and Technical Assistance Activities</li> <li>• Community Presentations</li> <li>• Governmental Agency/Legislature Presentations</li> <li>• Publications for Community Engagement and Outreach</li> <li>• Description</li> <li>• Measures of Impact</li> <li>• Community Plan</li> <li>• Awards</li> <li>• External Reviews</li> <li>• Audience/Scope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Preparation</li> <li>• In Process of Engagement and Implementation</li> <li>• Submitted for Community Review</li> <li>• Revised and Final Submission</li> <li>• Published/Completed</li> </ul>
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Social Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Evidence listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>
Multi/Inter/Trans Disciplinary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Evidence listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>

## SERVICE APPENDICES #3

### SERVICE EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Service is a core value at WVU, and faculty engage in service in a broad range of ways. Evaluation of service activity should be responsive to the unique service contributions of each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement in the area of service.

**Types of Contributions:** This document describes three areas of service contributions: *university*, *community*, and *profession*. The appropriate distribution of an individual's service contributions will be determined by a range of factors and should be explicitly laid out in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all service activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count advising as service and others as teaching).

**Considerations:** Because service takes a range of different forms, not all service activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of service to the profession, the activity may be evaluated according to the prestige of the professional organization, the type of expertise leveraged for the activity, and the scope of the organization's reach, along with the more standard assessments of how much time was devoted to the activity and if it entailed a leadership role.

Because no two service activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the service task.

An important consideration, especially for those who have service as outstanding or significant contributions in their workload, is the *leadership* involved in the service activity. For example, if someone serves as a committee chair or an editor of journal, these are important demonstrations of leadership in service. Another consideration is the way in which the faculty member became involved – or their *entry* – into the service activity. If they were nominated by other committee members, voted on by their peers, or nominated by their chair or dean, that suggests that the faculty member has earned prestige among their peers, which should be recognized. Additionally, the *scope* of the service should be noted. For university service, is the service being performed at the departmental, college, or university level? For community service, are they working in the local town or county, contributing to state-wide or regional efforts? For professional service, is the scope regional, national, or international?

Evaluators are advised to consider the faculty member's developmental trajectory of service contribution according to scope, entry, and leadership. For example, a new assistant professor will not have extensive opportunities for college or university service, nor would they be expected to take on leadership roles or be nominated or voted into important service positions. Once faculty have established themselves and begin to work towards promotion, then they should be supported and encouraged to take on service-related leadership roles across the institution, the community, and the profession, as appropriate for their unit, position, and expertise.

**Evidence of Service:** Evidence that represent service activity are not always obvious. The most successful service files will present a range of evidence that comprehensively convey each service activity and its impact. For example, the activity of serving on a university committee could be represented by meeting agendas, a subcommittee project, and a year-end report. The activity of serving on a journal's editorial board might include sample article reviews, a tally of the number of reviews assigned to colleagues, and a thank you letter from the journal editor. Different evidence communicate different types of information.

One consideration is the *author or creator of the evidence*. In other words, who generated or developed the artifact? Some evidence are created by the faculty themselves. In the case of a community outreach project, this might include agendas of community workshops, handouts provided at those workshops, and a copy of the community-service grant proposal that funded the project. While the information conveyed by self-generated evidence is important, to understand the full impact of these evidence, evidence generated by those benefitting from the service (i.e., the participants) is essential. These might include workshop participant evaluations and thank you notes from community organization staff. To help triangulate information gleaned from and participant-generated evidence, the faculty member could ask a project collaborator to describe the faculty's contributions to the project.

Another consideration is the *evidence type*. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like workshop evaluations or peer assessment, explicitly evaluate the effectiveness of the service. Other evidence, like an article review, help to illustrate the service. Some materials demonstrate the faculty member's development and learning related to their service activity. Finally, some file materials, like the service narrative, help to explain the activity. Explanatory evidence may be less formal, like a note in Digital Measures.

Where *evaluative* evidence are included, it is helpful to consider whether those were anonymous (e.g., evaluations delivered through Qualtrics) or not (peer observation or letters of appreciation). It is also helpful to note whether the artifact was a formative (like a mid-project evaluation intended to inform the project in progress) or summative (intended to provide feedback about the project and its effectiveness after completion).

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or offer letter, and – perhaps most importantly – the service narrative. One key to a successful service file is that it balances a range of evidence types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized.

Rather than providing a list of evidence that could be associated with each service activity, this document provides guiding principles to help faculty and evaluation committee members consider different evidence and the types of information they convey. Again, this list is not meant to be prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.

**Evaluative Tools:** What follows is a series of tools to help evaluators – those serving on faculty evaluation committees, as well as chairs and deans – assess faculty service files. The tables are filled out with examples, but contents should be erased and re-entered for each faculty member. Faculty themselves should consult these tools when developing their files and their narratives. These tools are meant to be flexible and generative. If an FEC or chair recognizes a category of service activity often performed by their faculty but not captured here, they should develop that table and associated metrics. If the considerations or metrics listed in a table do not effectively capture that activity for a particular department, the faculty of that department should revise the table to better fit its needs.

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE - INSTITUTIONAL					
Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Departmental Committee - Member	Dept.	Elected		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Chair letter Sample work/agendas Description
College Wide Committee - Chair	College	Invited	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Dean letter Sample work/agendas
University Committee – Member	Univ.	Appointed			
Advisor to Student Club	Univ.	Invited	x		
Advising Students	Dept.	MOU			
Service Learning Courses	Univ.	Volunteered			
Oversight of Students					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internships</li> </ul>	Dept.	Volunteered			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Learning</li> </ul>	Univ.	Volunteered			Anonymized Student Service Work Projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global Service Learning</li> </ul>	Univ.	Invited			
Meeting	Univ.				
Event	Univ.				
Special Event (e.g., art show, lab setup, software support)	Univ.				
Leader on student trips	Univ.				
TLC Celebrate Workshop Facilitator	Univ.	Volunteered			Workshop materials Participant evaluations
Meeting	Univ.	Invited	x		
Coordinator/Director of Centers	Dept.	Volunteered	x		Not an administrative appointment.
Recruitment and Retention	Dept.				
Representing University Externally	Dept.				
Advisor to Prestigious Scholarships	Univ.				
Writing Student Recommendations	Dept./College	Requested		Number of Letters	Listing of Students and recommendations written. Thank you notes from students,
Faculty Mentoring	Dept./College	Appointed or Volunteer?			









**GENERIC EVIDENCE MATRIX**

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE EVIDENCE															
Activity	Artifact	Required	Anon.*	Solicited*	Author/Creator					Type				Purpose*	
					Self	Student	Peer	Expert	Admin.	Evaluative	Illustrative	Explanatory	Developmental	Formative	Summative

\*If evaluative