MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Colleagues

From: Michele G. Wheatly
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: August 19, 2013

Re: Annual Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Calendar for 2013-14

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

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

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

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

I want to call particular attention to the creation of “Academic Innovations,” under the leadership of Sue Day-Perroots. Among other opportunities, this unit will provide a variety of services to enable faculty members to enhance their effectiveness in teaching.

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

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

I also want to remind you of several procedural matters identified by previous University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panels that have been of concern to them as a result of their review of promotion and tenure files.

1. To the extent possible, College- and School-wide committees should be representative of the various departments or programs from which faculty are reviewed, as well as of the diverse makeup of the unit.

2. All members of review committees must sign committee statements, to verify the vote, even in those rare cases in which a member abstains from voting.

3. Particularly in the case of tenure-track (probationary) faculty members, departmental review committees and chairpersons should conduct the annual review in the context of the faculty member’s total record since starting in a tenure-track position at WVU, taking into account suggestions for improvement that may have been made in previous years. Such suggestions are typically found in earlier annual evaluation statements, which are considered to be “subsequent documents” for these purposes. The annual reviews should especially comment on the faculty member’s cumulative progress toward tenure and/or promotion, as well as on the quality of one’s productivity in the immediate previous year.

4. Review committees and chairpersons should not inflate the use of the terms “excellent,” “good,” and “satisfactory” in the annual review process. The use of the term “satisfactory” in one particular year, or especially when used in the context of an area (typically service) in which “reasonable contributions” are expected, will not by itself prevent promotion or tenure. “Satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” ratings for several years in an area in which “significant contributions” are expected could be a problem in that context.

5. Regardless of the activities that are assigned to a faculty member and therefore reviewed as “teaching,” faculty who teach are expected to provide evidence of effective teaching.

6. Deans should work to ensure that proper procedures are followed by committees at the departmental and college levels, and that the evaluation procedures are consistently applied. One such procedure should confirm that assertions of activity in one’s Productivity Report are supported by actual evidence in the evaluation file.

7. Deans and chairs should notify faculty when they have added material to the evaluation file, and should remind faculty of their right to respond to such material. Such material should be added to the file and the faculty member notified sufficiently in advance of the closing date so that the faculty member has a reasonable time to respond.
8. Please also be reminded that each faculty evaluation file must have an inventory of contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. [Evaluation files submitted to the office of the Provost or Chancellor for Health Sciences without inventories will not be reviewed.]

9. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly when suggestions for improvement are appropriate. Such statements are an important part of a comprehensive mentoring program, and should be taken seriously.

10. For promotion or tenure purposes, the comparison of a candidate with others “recently” promoted or tenured should be interpreted as separate comparisons of both one’s teaching and one’s research, normally within the last two years, if possible.

11. Faculty seeking promotion should work with chairpersons and deans to ensure that all necessary materials are present in the file at the beginning of the review process (that is, by the date on which the file is closed).

12. For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on work done in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. In addition, the candidate should have demonstrated a reasonably “continuous program” of scholarship, normally as shown by one’s publication record.

13. The attached calendar for annual review applies to all faculty (including non-tenure track faculty) on all campuses unless an exception has been approved well in advance.

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

For your information, I have attached a list of approved college evaluation guidelines and the dates the criteria were approved or accepted by the Provost’s Office. Any guidelines not listed or any guidelines with dates that differ from those on the attached list should not be used during this year’s review process. Included with these materials is Board of Governors Policy 38 regarding Emeritus status.

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

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

Best wishes for a productive and satisfying new academic year.

db

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

College of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Design - Approved 9-98

Eberly College of Arts and Sciences - Approved 7-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>6/25/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>6/30/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Amended 2/12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Geography</td>
<td>7/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>7/22/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6/30/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>6/30/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4/20/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>7/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6/07/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>6/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>1/11/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Applied Social Sciences/Division of Social Work</td>
<td>6/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocology and Anthropology</td>
<td>6/07/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>2/08/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies Program</td>
<td>1/23/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Languages, Literature and Linguistics</td>
<td>7/21/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Statler College of Engineering and Mineral Resources - Approved 6/99

WVU Extension Service - Approved 11/07

College of Education and Human Services - Approved 11/07

School of Journalism - Approved/Modified 10/08

College of Law - Approved 5/01

College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences - Approved 12/28/11

Potomac State College - Approved 8/07/06

Health Sciences Center

| School of Dentistry         | Accepted 6/13 |
| School of Nursing           | Accepted 3/8/12|
| School of Medicine          | Accepted 8/08  |
| School of Pharmacy          | Accepted 4/09  |
| School of Public Health     | Accepted 11/9/12|

WVU Libraries - Approved 12/08

WVU Institute of Technology - Approved 5/2/12

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

(rev. August 2013)
West Virginia University
Calendar for Annual Review 2013-14

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deadline Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>Deadline for updating evaluation file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Deadline for departmental reviews by committee and chairperson to be forwarded to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Deadline for college/school reviews by committees and the Dean or Campus Provost to be forwarded to the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences in cases of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Deadline for the Dean or Campus Provost to mail written notice of intended reappointment, or for the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences to mail written notice of termination to tenure-track faculty members in their first year of academic service at WVU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS WITH MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF SERVICE AT WVU AND TENURED OR NON-TENURABLE FACULTY FOR WHOM ACTION (other than merely continuation) IS RECOMMENDED (excluding Emeritus recommendations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>Date by which names of possible external reviewers (if appropriate) should be forwarded by the candidate and by the committee to the departmental chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Date by which external reviews (if appropriate) should be solicited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>Deadline for updating evaluation files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Deadline for departmental reviews by committee and chairperson to be forwarded to the Dean and/or CampusProvost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Suggested target for notifying tenure-track faculty of intent to renew by Dean and/or Campus Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Deadline for college/school reviews by committees and the Dean and/or CampusProvost to be forwarded to the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Deadline for the Dean and/or Campus Provost to mail to tenure-track faculty written notice of reappointment or for the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences to mail to tenured or tenure-track faculty written notice of promotion or tenure, or written notice of termination to non-tenured faculty members in the tenure-track with nine-month appointments who have completed more than one year of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Deadline for the Dean or Campus Provost to mail to tenure-track faculty written notice of reappointment or for the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences to mail to tenured or tenure-track faculty written notice of promotion or tenure, or written notice of termination to non-tenured faculty members in the tenure-track with twelve-month appointments who have completed more than one year of service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. **ANNUAL EVALUATIONS FOR ALL OTHER FACULTY (including Emeritus recommendations)**

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

- **January 1**
  - Deadline for updating evaluation files.

- **March 1**
  - Deadline for chairs' and departmental reviews to be forwarded to the Dean or Campus Provost.

- **April 1**
  - Deadline for evaluations to be completed by the Dean or Campus Provost. Full-time non-tenurable faculty should be mailed notification by this date if their contract will not be renewed.

- **May 1**
  - Deadline for recommendations for Emeritus status to be forwarded to the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences.

IV. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE**

- **January 15**
  - Deadline for chairpersons to forward sabbatical leave and Professional Development Programs (first round) recommendations to Dean or Campus Provost.

- **February 1**
  - Deadline for Dean or Campus Provost to forward recommendations for sabbatical leaves and Professional Development Programs (first round) to the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences.

**AUGUST, 2013**
I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

Consistent with this document, colleges, schools and divisions reporting to administrators on the Morgantown campuses and other appropriate units such as the Extension Service and the University Libraries shall supplement these guidelines with more detailed descriptions and interpretations of the criteria and standards that, when approved by the Provost, will apply to faculty members in the particular unit.

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

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

A. The Faculty Evaluation Process

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

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives; it forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that will encourage professional growth and provide support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition.

2) **Evaluation for Promotion in Rank**

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

3) **Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure**

For an award of tenure, tenure-track faculty undergo a particularly rigorous evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments and the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained.

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the university community. Primary responsibility for the quality and presentation of an individual's work lies with the particular faculty member. Faculty colleagues participate in annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure through membership on department, college, and division committees and on the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Independent reviews at the college and institutional levels assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments and colleges. The legal authority and responsibility of chairpersons, deans, campus provosts, the Chancellor 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.*

**B. Criteria**

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of specific departments, colleges or other academic units and are to be judged accordingly. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution. Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles.

Collectively, the faculty teach, advise, engage in research and creative activity, publish and disseminate their research findings and new knowledge, and provide public, professional, and institutional service. The extent to which a faculty member's responsibilities emphasize the university's mission will vary.

In the approved letter of appointment the university official (usually the dean or campus provost) 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 and may be changed by mutual consent, consistent with this document. 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.

---

*The term "department" refers throughout this document to departments, divisions or other discrete units. The term "college" refers to colleges, schools and divisions reporting to the Morgantown campus. The term "chairperson" refers to department or division chairpersons, directors, or other unit heads.
Each department, college, and division shall refine these broad criteria in areas of teaching, research, and service in ways that reflect the unit's discipline and mission. The criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways which equitably reflect the particular responsibilities and assignments of each. How the unit criteria apply to a faculty member's own set of duties should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed in the annual evaluation.

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

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Teaching, research,* and service constitute the heart of the mission of West Virginia University. Faculty responsibilities are defined in terms of activities undertaken in each of the three areas; therefore, faculty evaluation is based primarily upon a review of performance in these areas. Scholarship is an important indication of activity in each of the three areas; it occurs in a variety of forms, and is not restricted to the research area. The extent to which scholarship is recognized depends upon one's areas of expected significant contribution. Depending upon one's discipline and the unit's guidelines, publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields.

A. Teaching

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

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, respect for differences and diversity, and, above all, the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. Supporting documentation for the evaluation of performance in teaching might include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students, of student advisors, and of colleagues who have visited the faculty member's classes. It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or videotapes, the development or use of instructional technology and computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and college.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Research involves the creation and synthesis of knowledge, the creation of new approaches to understanding and explaining phenomena, the development of new insights, the critical appraisal of the past, artistic creation and performance, and the application of knowledge and expertise to address needs in society and in the profession.

*The term "research" is used in this document to include appropriate professional activities such as research, scholarly writing, artistic performance, and creative activities. These activities result in products which may be evaluated and compared with those of peers at other institutions of higher learning.
Research is a critical component of the mission of the university, contributing to the general body of knowledge and thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. It validates the concept of the teacher-scholar. Although often discipline-focused and individual, research also may be interdisciplinary and collaborative. In most disciplines, refereed publications (print or electronic) of high quality are expected as evidence of scholarly productivity. An original contribution of a creative nature relevant to one or more disciplines may be as significant as the publication of a scholarly book or article. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a program of worthwhile research. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works.

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 university, state, region, and at national and international levels. Service to the university includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college.

In keeping with its tradition as a land-grant institution, the university is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities on the part of its faculty as essential components of its mission. Enlightened perspectives, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable resources in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Service by faculty members to West Virginia is of special importance to the university mission.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients, induces positive change, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. One important benefit of service to the university is faculty participation in the governance system. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified. The definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of promotion and tenure should be identified in the unit's evaluation guidelines.

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

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

Without Credit
An individual's appointment letter 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).

*Occasionally, appointment with tenure is possible. To be appointed with tenure, or to the rank of Professor, the individual must have been interviewed by an official in the office of the Provost, Chancellor for Health Sciences, or Campus Provost during the interview process; the individual's curriculum vitae must be reviewed in that office; and a written request for tenure must be submitted by the department to that official.
With Credit

Depending upon the amount of successful experience at the intended rank or the equivalent, up to three years credit toward tenure could be allowed, unless the candidate did not wish such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative critical year, would be identified in the letter of appointment. In such a circumstance, during the first year the faculty member could accept the identified critical year, or all or part of the possible allowable credit to be applied in his or her instance, at which point the critical year would be confirmed by the dean. Action earlier than the established critical year would not be considered. If, during the first 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.

Exceptions to recognize unique situations are possible.

V. REQUIRED PERSONNEL ACTIONS/TIMELY NOTICE

A personnel action is required each year for each faculty member. Such personnel actions include reappointment, promotion, tenure, or non-renewal.

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. Under certain circumstances the critical year may be extended.*

In the case of a tenure-track full-time faculty member appointed after March 8, 2003 and holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, or one of the corresponding extension ranks, the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences shall give written notice concerning retention or non-retention for the ensuing year by letter post-marked and mailed no later than March 1.

For appointments after March 8, 2003, 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. If a faculty member petitions successfully to bring the critical year forward and tenure is not awarded in that year, notice of termination of appointment will be issued. Notice of non-retention shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested."

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

Time spent on a leave of absence normally shall not count when calculating years of service 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 Chancellor 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 or nonrenewal of contract for a non-tenure-track faculty member;
• Termination of the appointment of a tenured faculty member for cause (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Policy 2).

A 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, consideration of a faculty member for promotion is initiated by the faculty member. A faculty member whose application for promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

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

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at West Virginia University will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion.

While tenure and promotion are separate actions, only in the most extraordinary circumstances may a person be granted tenure without already being at or above the rank of Associate Professor, or being concurrently promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. Such extraordinary circumstances may be present for extension agents who enter the rank and tenure system as Instructors, who may be granted tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor. It also is university policy that the granting of promotion does not guarantee the award of tenure in a subsequent year. Neither promotion nor tenure shall be granted automatically or merely for years of service.

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Evaluations and recommendations are to be based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The primary evidence to be weighed must be contained in the faculty member's evaluation file. To it are added professional judgments as to the quality of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service, as applicable.

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

In the case of schools and colleges without departmental/division structure, the faculty evaluation file shall be maintained in the dean's office under the same provisions as specified above for departmental files. The dean shall maintain the faculty evaluation file of each chairperson.
The faculty member's evaluation file should contain, at the minimum, the following items:

1. The letter of appointment and other documents which describe, elaborate upon or modify one's assignment, including position description, work plans, memoranda of understanding and subsequent letters of agreement.

2. An up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography containing a) critical dates relative to education, employment, change in status, promotion, leave of absence, etc.; b) a list of publications with complete citations, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of scholarship; and c) a list of service activities.

3. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught and enrollments in each, graduate students supervised, clinical assignments, significant committee assignments, and other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work. Each unit may design a simple 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.

4. For faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of the individual's performance.

5. A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses.

6. Other information and records that the chairperson or dean may wish to include. Faculty members may include written responses to such material.

7. All other information that bears upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in all pertinent areas. This information may include, but need not be limited to, teaching evaluations, professional presentations, published materials, grant applications and awards, research in progress and the preparation of unpublished materials, other creative scholarship, and service to the university. A self-evaluative statement by the faculty member is strongly encouraged.

8. A continuing chronological inventory of entries to assure the integrity of the file.

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

VIII. COMPLETION OF AND ACCESS TO THE FILE

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

Faculty members have the right of access to their evaluation files at any time during regular office hours, without giving reasons. All others shall have access to the file only on the basis of a need to know. Members of a faculty evaluation committee, or administrative officers responsible for personnel recommendations are assumed to have a need to know. The appropriate
administrative officer shall determine what material is necessary to fulfill the need to know. All persons will treat the material from the file as confidential. The security of all evaluation files is to be assured. The confidentiality of each file is to be respected, except under legal subpoena.

IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

A. General Description

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

The evaluation procedures may be found in Section XIII, below. Annual evaluation for all faculty, whether tenure-track, tenured, term, clinical-track, librarian-track, or temporary (including faculty with prefixes of "Research" or "Clinical" and lecturers), will be conducted at the departmental level by the chair and the faculty evaluation committee or at the college level, if appropriate, based on documentation in the evaluation file (see Section VIII). Written evaluations will be forwarded to each faculty member and to the dean, who may provide an evaluative statement.

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

1) Tenure-Track Faculty

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

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

*
*Occasional or clinical-track part-time faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment. One's activities in research and service are useful in order to assess progress. As one moves through the tenure-track period, annual evaluations will focus increasingly on the successful outcomes of one's activities rather than simply on the activities themselves.

While the absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure, these evaluations should apprise tenure-track faculty members of performance deficiencies. Occasionally, the evaluations will result in termination of the individual's appointment, sometimes prior to the critical year, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts; in these cases, notice shall be given in accord with WVU Board of Governors Policy 2.

2) Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted
The annual evaluation of faculty who are tenured, but not fully promoted, will generally emphasize both quantitative and qualitative progress toward the rank of professor. Evaluation of extension faculty in the rank and tenure system will generally emphasize progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all faculty may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide faculty toward that achievement.

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

4) Clinical-Track Faculty
Clinicians who select this clinical emphasis, non-tenure track must be heavily committed by choice to clinical service as well as teaching. Faculty 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. Individuals in the clinical-track have voting rights in their respective departments and in the School and are eligible for appointment to any administrative office in the School, including Department Chair and Dean. Clinical-track faculty have all rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility.

Annual evaluation of clinical-track faculty 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 progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty may attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal.

5) Librarian-Track Faculty
Annual evaluation of librarian-track faculty will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents, and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. The annual evaluation of a promotable faculty member will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty may attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal. These evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties and occasionally will lead to notices of non-reappointment or termination of appointment.
Librarian-track faculty hold appointments which 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 have all rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility.

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

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

Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of one's performance in each of the mission areas to which one is assigned shall be assessed as Excellent [characterizing performance of high merit], Good [characterizing performance of merit], Satisfactory [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure], or Unsatisfactory. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" ratings, particularly in an area in which a significant contribution is required, would not qualify for promotion or tenure.

The assessments provided by annual reviews should be a basis for those periodic recommendations forwarded to the Provost or Chancellor for Health Sciences which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be supported both (a) by a series of annual reviews above the "satisfactory" level, and (b) beyond those reviews, by performance which is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" (see below).

X. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE

The University criteria for the awarding of promotion and the granting of tenure described below are general expectations; they should be elaborated by college or departmental criteria which take account of the distinctive character of the faculty member's discipline. Copies of departmental and/or college criteria shall be available to all participants in the review process.
The faculty of an outstanding university is a community of scholars whose scholarship is manifest in a variety of ways. These manifestations are commonly grouped into teaching, research and service.

In order to be recommended for tenure a faculty member reporting to Morgantown normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or other settings and in research. In order to be recommended for tenure an extension faculty member may be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or other settings and in service. Division faculty reporting to a Campus Provost may have other expectations.

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

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

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

In order to be considered for promotion, eligible temporary faculty members normally will be expected to make significant contributions in the area(s) of their assignment as outlined in the letter of appointment or as modified in a subsequent document. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "Research," research will normally be the area in which significant contributions are expected. In general, a research faculty member seeking promotion will produce research of equal or better quality and of greater quantity than a tenure track faculty member for whom research is one of two areas in which significant contributions are expected. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "Clinical" (as differentiated from faculty in the "clinical-track"), service will normally be the area in which significant contributions are expected.

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

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

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

XI. CHANGING AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION

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

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

XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

In years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University. The college or school shall have the option to determine if such external evaluations are required if the faculty member is to make reasonable contributions in the areas of research or service. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered when evaluating the faculty member. Reviews of the quality of teaching are also required, and may be conducted by peers within or without the university community.
The external reviews will be maintained in a separate section of the evaluation file in the office of the dean of the college. The various committees and individuals directly involved in the promotion and tenure review process shall be provided with this section of the evaluation file when they have need. The faculty member shall have the right to see the reviews after any identifying information has been removed. All copies shall be returned to the dean upon the completion of the review. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall be sealed and shall not be used in any subsequent personnel actions.

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

Persons who have been closely associated with the person being evaluated, such as co-authors or doctoral research advisors or advisees, may be asked for evaluations but, as with all evaluators, should be requested to identify their professional or personal relationship to the candidate for promotion or tenure. The faculty member has the right to review the list of potential evaluators, to comment upon those who may not provide objective evaluation and to request deletions. The faculty member's written comments and requests should be forwarded to the chairperson or dean. In selecting evaluators, the chairperson or dean may consider the faculty member's comments and requests, but the faculty member does not have the right to veto any possible evaluator, nor is the final selection of evaluators to be achieved through obtaining the consent of the faculty member.

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

The chair, using letters approved by the dean, should request the external evaluations, stressing that the standard used as a basis for review should be the quality of the work and the impact or potential impact on the field. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations should be included in the faculty member's file with identifying information removed. The external evaluator may also assess whether the quality of the work of the faculty member being reviewed is comparable to or better than that of persons recently promoted in the evaluator's university. For non-tenurable faculty, the standard should be based on one's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment. The assessment of whether the quantity of scholarly work is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a judgment best left to the local department, college, and the university. The evaluations should be forwarded to the dean by the external evaluators.
If four evaluations are not received by the time the file is closed, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended through the written consent of the faculty member, chairperson, and dean.

XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluations of the credentials of faculty can be carried out at three levels of university organization: department or division, college or school, and Provost or Chancellor of health Sciences. When appropriate, a judgment is made at each of these levels by a faculty committee and by the administrative officer of the unit. The goals of the university's affirmative action program are to be taken into account at each stage of the review process. Faculty members should neither initiate nor participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, annual evaluation, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate family or household.

All recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their critical year will be forwarded through the complete review process. Recommendations for non-retention or a terminal appointment automatically receive review at all levels.

A. Department /Division Level in Colleges and Schools

1) Each department shall have a faculty evaluation committee, normally consisting of a minimum of five members. 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. A small department may supplement committee membership with faculty members from an associated discipline. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the departmental committee reviewing his/her evaluation file. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty, although at the Health Sciences Center, clinical-track faculty who are at or above the rank of Associate Professor may vote on tenure recommendations at the department level. The departmental committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, the award of tenure, and/or 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 must be recorded. Committee members may include minority statements in the recommendation.

2) The chairperson will review the committee's evaluation and recommendation regarding each faculty member and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member. In a recommendation for tenure, the chairperson shall take into account the long-range staffing pattern of the department, including the department's affirmative action goals. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the evaluations and recommendations of both the department committee and the chairperson. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.

3) If the faculty member receives a positive recommendation for promotion or tenure from either the department committee or chairperson, the file is submitted for review at the college level. If both such recommendations are negative, the file is submitted to the Dean for information.
4) A faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations for review at the next 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 (i.e., when both the department committee and the department chairperson render negative recommendations). The petition should reach the Dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. The dean shall forward the petition to the college evaluation committee as a matter of course for its recommendation.

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

1) Each college shall have a college faculty evaluation committee. In colleges and schools without departments, the committee functions like a departmental committee. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or the award of tenure should not serve on the college committee reviewing his/her personnel file. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty. The method of selection of members is at the discretion of the dean of the college. No faculty member should serve on both a departmental and college committee and no chairperson should serve on a college committee.

2) The college faculty committee will review departmental evaluations forwarded by the dean. The committee will prepare a written evaluation in each case, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, tenure, and/or promotion, as applicable. 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 recommendation.

3) The dean 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. The faculty member shall be informed, in writing, by the dean of the evaluations and recommendations of both the college committee and the dean. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.

4) If either the college faculty committee or the dean supports a positive recommendation for a faculty member, a copy of the faculty evaluation file, including both department and college recommendations together with external evaluations, is forwarded to the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences.

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 Chancellor for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of the recommendations.

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

7) Deans have the responsibility for determining whether all committee evaluations have been conducted fairly within the college and for assuring that comparable norms are applied in like units.
8) Recommendations by the Dean for tenure must be accompanied by a statement indicating how the proposed tenuring of a probationary faculty member will affect the long-range staffing pattern of the department and/or college, taking into account expected attrition, accreditation, affirmative action goals, budgetary limitations, and the need for flexibility.

C. University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel

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

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

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

   (b) Have the review procedures at all levels been followed?

   (c) Is each recommendation consistent with university and unit policies and objectives?

   (d) Are the recommendations consistent with the department, college, division, and university criteria for promotion and tenure?

3) The Advisory Panel will prepare written statements addressing these issues. The statement must be signed by all members of the panel, dated, and added to the faculty member's file. Panel members may include minority statements with the general statement.

D. Provost and Chancellor Level

1) For the purposes described in these guidelines, the decision-making authority of the President has been delegated to the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences, as appropriate.

2) Decisions on promotion and tenure recommendations will be made by the Provost or the Chancellor for Health Sciences, as appropriate, after review of the recommendations by departments, colleges, and their administrators.

3) The President or designee will report the decisions to the Board of Governors. Such report will indicate the number of decisions as well as the individuals receiving positive action, and will verify that the appropriate standards and guidelines have been met.

4) The faculty member and the appropriate Dean will be notified in writing of the decision rendered.

E. Negative Decisions

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

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

WVU Board of Governors Policy 2 and W.Va. Code §6C-2 are available in the offices of the dean and department/division chairperson, and may be obtained from the Provost's Office, offices of the Campus Provosts, and the Wise, Evansdale, and Health Sciences Center Libraries. They are accessible on-line at http://bog.wvu.edu/r/download/7515, and http://pegboard.state.wv.us/. Faculty may wish to check with the Office of Human Resources (Morgantown) to assure that they have access to the most recent copy of the procedures.