

**Department of Psychology
Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual**

Approved June 7, 2010

Table of Contents

- I. Scope of This Document
- II. The Appointment Letter
- III. Annual Assignment
 - A. Sabbatical and Professional Development Leaves
 - B. Filing Leave Applications and Memoranda of Understanding
- IV. The Faculty Personnel File
- V. Faculty Evaluation Committee
 - A. Election of Faculty Members
 - 1. Departmental Representative on the College Promotion & Tenure Committee
 - B. Election of Graduate Students
 - C. Responsibilities of the Committee
 - D. Voting Rights
- VI. Annual Evaluation
 - A. Updating the File
 - 1. Annual Faculty Activities Report
 - 2. Supporting Materials for Research
 - 3. Supporting Materials for Teaching
 - 4. Supporting Materials for Service
 - 5. Timelines for Updating the File
 - B. Draft Summary of Activities
 - C. Performance Descriptors
 - 1. Teaching
 - 2. Research
 - 3. Service
 - D. Procedure for Annual Review by the Committee
 - E. Evaluation by the Department Chair
 - F. Distribution of Annual Evaluations
 - G. Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluations
 - H. Performance-Based Raises in Salary
 - I. Nomination for Awards
- VII. Fourth-Year Review
 - A. Career Activities Report
 - B. Procedure for Fourth-Year Evaluations
- VIII. Promotion Review
 - A. Career Activities Report
 - B. Procedure for Promotion Review
 - 1. External Reviews of Research
 - 2. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
 - 3. Recommendations
- IX. Procedure for Modification of This Document
- X. Timeline

I. Scope of this Document

The Department of Psychology's *Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual* supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure*. Because the basic review of faculty members takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, West Virginia University, and the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty members to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, Department.

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

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual assignment, the faculty personnel file, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure-track and promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure-track faculty members are subject to a fourth-year review to assess the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the areas of expected significant contribution, normally teaching, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program; or failure to fulfill the expectations in one's letter of appointment by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year..

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

II. The Appointment Letter

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

For Tenure-track faculty members, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Designated research-intensive appointments may be 30% teaching and 50% research, normally with two significant grants as principal investigator or major co-investigator required for award of tenure in research-intensive appointments.

For Teaching faculty members, responsibilities are defined as 80% teaching and 20% service. For Clinical faculty members, Board of Governors Policy 2 stipulates the appointment must have

the majority of the assignment in service, with classroom instruction or other assignments secondary.

Research faculty members may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as principal investigator in externally funded research. Per Board of Governors Policy 2, classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary. Teaching must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. There may be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are normally a maximum of .80 FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

III. Annual Assignment

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

The initial allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service effort is stipulated in the appointment letter. Appointments in the Eberly College are normally as those shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Faculty Classification	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure-track	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Clinical ¹	30-48%	5-10% max	50+%
Teaching	80%	---- ²	20%
Research		100%	
Senior Lecturer	100%		
Lecturer	100%		

¹ Expectations considered in annual evaluations and possible promotion or performance-based salary increases for Clinical faculty members in the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences will include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and reasonable contribution in research. In the Eberly College the criterion of "reasonable research contribution" for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank is normally one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference, per year. However, for discretionary promotion, a record of publication in refereed journals normally will be expected. Teaching assignments for Clinical faculty members are normally a maximum of 14 credit hours during the nine-month academic year.

² A Teaching faculty member's assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU policy, "faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For Teaching faculty members, the expectation is that the annual file include systematic assessment of instructional processes and outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

The normal annual teaching assignment for research-active Tenure-track faculty members with 40% teaching appointments in the Department of Psychology is four classroom courses or the equivalent thereof. To be regarded as “research-active” in this context, a faculty member should have (or, in the case of probationary faculty members, be developing) an active and independent program of research that yields publications (normally in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals) and supports the thesis, dissertation, and other research of graduate students. If required by the letter of appointment, Memoranda of Understanding, or annual assignment as summarized in the Workload Plan, a classification of “research-active” may also require the receipt of external research support or demonstrable progress towards such support. Tenured faculty members who are not research-active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments increased by one or more courses (or equivalent) per year. Such adjustment in the annual teaching *assignment* does not automatically change the faculty member’s expectations for promotion.

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

III.A. Sabbatical and Professional Development Leaves

For faculty members approved for sabbatical or professional development program leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a Memorandum of Understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member’s assignment for the leave period.

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

Faculty members on a full year’s sabbatical leave would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester’s sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member’s regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

III.B. Filing Leave Applications and Memoranda of Understanding

Copies of the approved leave application and plan (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

IV. The Faculty Personnel File

Faculty members must annually update personnel files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On the department-specified deadline date, the file shall be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Each faculty personnel file must have an inventory of its contents to ensure the integrity of the file. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, all faculty files and file inventories in the Eberly College will be organized following a format that maintains four separate inventories for (a) the administrative file, and for (b) teaching, c) research, and (d) service documentation. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound. The Department Chair's office is responsible for creating and maintaining these inventories.

The *administrative file* includes: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; (d) annual curriculum vitae and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the Department Chair or Dean may wish to include.

The *teaching, research, and service files* include documentation for each respective area of responsibility.

Faculty will submit documents for the personnel file to the Department Chair's office. Faculty members will specify the destination of each document (i.e., administrative, teaching, research, or service file).

Each document will be tagged with its inventory number by the Department Chair's office.

Once an item is entered into the personnel file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. Generally speaking, files may not leave the administrative office suite where they are housed. These are the only records of faculty productivity at WVU, and their integrity must be scrupulously maintained.

Detailed information about the material faculty members should submit for the file can be found in Sections VI.A, VII.A, and VIII.A.

V. Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Evaluation Committee serves as an evaluating body for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and (rarely) termination. Its responsibility is to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty personnel files.

The Department of Psychology's Faculty Evaluation Committee consists of six regular faculty

members – four tenured faculty members who serve staggered two-year terms, two untenured faculty members who serve one-year terms – and two advanced graduate students who serve one-year terms. The faculty members eligible for Committee membership are those full-time faculty members in the Department of Psychology who qualify for performance-based salary increases (e.g., faculty members in the Clinical, Teaching, and Tenure-track categories). A majority of the Committee members voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty members (see Section VIII.B.3 for procedural details on such votes).

V.A. Election of Faculty Members

In the Spring semester the full-time members of the faculty elect two tenured faculty members and two untenured faculty members, each to serve a term that begins the following academic year. The two tenured faculty members will serve two-year terms and the two untenured faculty members will serve one-year terms. Regardless of tenure status, faculty members are not eligible for membership on the Committee for two consecutive years after completing a term of service, or if any of the following conditions will be met during their potential term of service: (a) they will be considered for promotion or tenure, (b) they will be in the critical year of employment at WVU, (c) they will serve on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or (d) they will be on a professional leave. For purposes of identifying “consecutive” years, time spent on unpaid leave is disregarded. The names of faculty members who meet any of these conditions will be excluded from the ballot. The Department Chair is not eligible for membership on the Committee.

The ballots are prepared, distributed, and collected by the Department Chair. The marked ballots are kept for two years so that members who are unable to complete their terms can be replaced. If a replacement must be found, the Department Chair will order the remaining candidates in the same tenured or untenured category of the person who must be replaced according to the number of votes received, breaking any ties on a random basis, and work through the resulting list in order until a person who is available to serve as a replacement is identified. If this procedure does not yield a replacement for an untenured faculty member who must be replaced, the Department Chair will apply the same procedure to find a replacement from among the tenured faculty members on the ballot. If this procedure does not yield a replacement, the Department Chair will hold a special election to fill the vacated position for the unexpired portion of the term.

V.A.1. Department Representative on the College Promotion & Tenure Committee

As noted in Section V.A, the Department’s representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee is not eligible for election to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Department’s representative is a tenured faculty member who is appointed by the Department Chair to serve on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee for a two-year term. In the Department of Psychology, an individual normally will serve no more than two consecutive terms. At the end of service on the College Committee, whether the service was for one or two terms, the representative should not be reappointed for the next two years.

V.B. Election of Graduate Students

In the Spring semester the graduate students, acting at large, elect two representatives from a list of nominees (one student per program area) prepared by the Graduate Training Committee with the assistance of the program area training committees. The student representatives serve a one-year term. The ballots are prepared, distributed, and collected by the Graduate Training Committee. The marked ballots are kept for one year so that representatives who are unable to complete their terms can be replaced. If a replacement must be found, the Graduate Training Committee will rank the remaining candidates according to the number of votes received, breaking any ties on a random basis, and work through the resulting list in rank order until a person who is available to serve as a replacement is identified. If this procedure does not yield a replacement, the Graduate Training Committee will hold a special election to fill the vacated position for the unexpired portion of the term.

V.C. Responsibilities of the Committee

The Committee has five general responsibilities, which are summarized below and elaborated in later sections of the report.

1. The Committee evaluates the annual activities of faculty members (see Section VI).
2. The Committee evaluates the career activities of faculty members in the fourth year (Section VII) and of faculty members who have applied for promotion and tenure (Section VIII).
3. The Committee serves as the Department's nominating body for College, University, State, and National awards (Section VI.I).
4. The Committee Chair reports to the Department Chair the numerical performance ratings of each faculty member's performance for the purpose of calculating performance-based pay raises (Section VI.H).
5. The Committee reports annually to the Department on its activities. The report includes the composition of the committee; a summary of the business conducted; statistical summaries of the annual evaluations of teaching, research, and service; and recommendations to improve the evaluation process.

In addition to these general responsibilities, the Committee may receive other charges from the Department Chair or the Dean.

The Committee's work each year is initiated by the Department Chair, who schedules a meeting of the Committee early in the Fall semester. The Department Chair provides the Committee with its charge; distributes University, College, and these Departmental guidelines; and discusses any new procedures. Faculty seeking promotion or requiring career reviews are identified. After the Department Chair departs, the Committee elects its Chair and Recording Secretary. The Committee Chair will be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Committee Chair then

schedules the meetings for the Committee.

V.D. Voting Rights

All members of the Committee have full voting rights except in the case of votes for tenure, where University guidelines require that more than 50% of those voting be tenured faculty members. In these cases, following the discussion of the faculty member's case, one of the untenured members of the Committee is randomly selected not to vote. The selected person could be an untenured faculty member or a graduate student, depending on the outcome of the random selection process.

Each member-of the Committee should recuse himself or herself during the deliberations involving their own evaluation or the evaluation of their partner, spouse, or other member of the immediate family and they do not vote on these evaluations. When this proviso affects the Committee Chair, another member of the Committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation.

Members may abstain from voting.

All members of the Committee must sign every evaluation to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting. When members recuse themselves from the Committee's consideration of any individual, they are not part of the Committee for that particular action and they do not review or sign the evaluation.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep their deliberations and all information contained in faculty files strictly confidential.

VI. Annual Evaluation

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. All faculty members receive annual evaluations. All Clinical, Research, Teaching, and Tenure-track faculty members should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will normally participate in this process. All faculty members who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and by the Department Chair based on material in the faculty member's personnel file.

The *West Virginia University Policy and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure*, 2009-10 (p. 8), states that "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."

VI.A. Updating the File

Each year, by the department-specified deadline, the faculty personnel file should be updated with (1) a Faculty Activities Report prepared by the faculty member; (2) supporting materials submitted by the faculty member to document accomplishments over the period of evaluation in teaching, research, and service, or to establish the quality of these accomplishments; (3) student evaluations of the faculty member's teaching during the evaluation period, summarized and reported by the Department's Student Records Office; and (4) a current vita submitted by the faculty member. The Department Chair's office will ensure that the files available for the annual review include (5) a copy of the faculty member's letter of hire or other official agreements indicating the nature of the faculty member's institutional role, including the Workload Plan that summarizes the annual assignment; (6) evaluations written by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair for the last three years; and (7) a copy of any letters awarding promotion or tenure.

The completed and signed Faculty Activities Report is submitted to the Department Chair's office, along with a current vita and supporting materials such as research articles, pre-prints, letters regarding service, student evaluations of teaching, and course-related materials described below.

VI.A.1. Annual Faculty Activities Report

Each faculty member in the Department of Psychology must complete an annual Faculty Activities Report that covers the evaluation period (usually one year, but less for faculty in the initial year of their appointment). The report form contains three sections in which the faculty member summarizes all activities in teaching, research, and service. The form is designed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, subject to approval by a vote of the faculty. Because changes are made annually, the form itself is not considered a part of the present guidelines (which require approval by the Dean and Provost).

The Faculty Activities Report is intended to collect a comprehensive set of information from each faculty member in a standardized format, and to remind the faculty member to include appropriate supporting materials.

VI.A.2. Supporting Materials for Research

Publications must be documented by a preprint or reprint of the item (or a copy of the first page or table of contents for lengthy items). Drafts of items designated as "submitted" or "in press" must be included in the file. Items designated as "in press" must include the letter from the action editor or other responsible party indicating that the item is unequivocally in press.

For grant proposals submitted, received, or renewed during the reporting period, submit the abstract, budget page, and Office of Sponsored Programs cover sheet. For funded grants, submit a copy of the green Award Notification sheet or its equivalent.

VI.A.3. Supporting Materials for Teaching

Evaluations of classroom teaching are based on three components: (1) information on the course structure and content, (2) information about the performance of the students in the course, and (3) student evaluations of the course and the faculty member's performance.

The student evaluations of teaching normally are collected on the University Senate's form for Student Evaluation of Instruction (for classroom courses) and on Departmental forms (for out-of-class supervision) and summarized and reported by the Department's Student Records Office. Because changes are made occasionally, the student evaluation forms themselves are not considered a part of the present guidelines (which require approval by the Dean and Provost), but for informational purposes copies of the current forms are presented in Appendix B. A faculty member who wishes to use a student evaluation form other than the ones designed by the Senate or the Department may do so under the conditions described in Appendix 3.

Secretaries are assigned to compile and type written comments from the students. Personnel in the Student Records Office normally compile the quantitative student ratings obtained via the Departmental forms, although the Office may delegate some of this work to the graduate-student members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Such delegation is appropriate for courses that use a rating form that is not machine-scored; in such cases, the graduate students tabulate summary statistics for each item on the form.

The faculty member is responsible for preparing and submitting a formal report for each classroom or practicum course taught or supervised. The report should include information about the course objectives and methods, information about teaching assistants or other instructors who participated in the course, a course syllabus, sample examinations and assignments, information about student performance, and an assessment of the degree to which the course objectives were met. The report for each course should be prepared according to the instructions included in the Faculty Activities Report form.

VI.A.4. Supporting Materials for Service

Submit letters of appointment or thanks related to committee service, consulting agreements, and any other materials that document the service work reported in the Faculty Activities Report.

VI.A.5. Timelines for Updating the File

The Department of Psychology uses a July 1 to June 30 reporting period for annual evaluations, with the subsequent September 15 as the deadline for updating personnel files. Exceptions are made for first-year faculty members, whose reporting period is from the beginning of the faculty member's contractual obligation to December 15 of the appointment year. December 15 is the deadline for first-year faculty to update personnel files. (For deadlines concerning fourth-year evaluations and evaluations for promotion or tenure, see Sections VII and VIII.)

VI.B. Draft Summary of Activities

In addition to submitting an Annual Activities Report and supporting materials as described above, each faculty member should submit a summary of their activities in research, teaching, and service. The summary should be prepared in a format specified by the Secretary of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and submitted electronically to the Department Chair's secretary by September 15 for continuing faculty members and by December 15 for first-year faculty members. The draft summary is intended to facilitate the work of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and reduce the likelihood of factual errors in the Committee's evaluation of each faculty member's performance. The draft summary is regarded as a departmental work product, *not* as an item to be logged into the personnel file.

VI.C. Performance Descriptors

The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed as Excellent (characterizing performance of high merit), Good (characterizing performance of merit), Satisfactory (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or Unsatisfactory.

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

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

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

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

It is incumbent upon faculty members to provide for the file evidence (1) that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the personnel file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the reader's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I must conclude that the faculty member's work is unsatisfactory."

To assist faculty members in assembling annual file materials and to assist the Faculty

Evaluation Committee in making informed and consistent evaluations, the College suggests the following framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes in the areas of teaching, research, or service. One, some, or all of the following criteria may apply:

1. *Significance or Impact:* To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) benefit or affect students, our department, our college, our university, our profession, or other communities or individuals? To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect originality and development within a body of work?
2. *Engagement:* To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) generate, apply, and/or use knowledge and insight consistent with current directions in our field of study? To what degree does the faculty member demonstrate thoroughness, reliability, and availability?
3. *Context:* To what degree are the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) consistent with goals important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or keep current with changes?

In weighing the faculty member's contributions, the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair take account of the faculty member's institutional role as defined in the letter of hire, subsequent annual evaluations, leave applications, memoranda of understanding, and annual assignments as summarized in the Workload Plan. For example, a faculty member's administrative or other nonacademic responsibilities might change expectations of performance in any of the three areas of evaluation.

VI.C.1. Teaching

"Teaching" includes but is not limited to courses and seminars; directed studies; supervision of practica; practica consultation; supervision of the teaching of others; supervision of research; supervision of honors theses; development of materials used in teaching, including course guides, study materials, practicum objectives, and so forth; curriculum development; chairing or serving on thesis and dissertation committees; procuring grants related to teaching; and miscellaneous teaching activities such as academic advising, grading preliminary examinations, consulting with students and faculty, and delivering guest lectures.

Evaluation of teaching is based on course syllabi and related materials submitted by the faculty member regarding the structure of classroom courses and the performance of the students in the courses as well as student evaluations of teaching. The student evaluations are summarized and reported by the Department's Student Records Office. The Student Records Office reports both the quantitative ratings of teaching and the typed student comments, and normally these are logged into the faculty member's personnel file for consideration by the Faculty Evaluation

Committee and the Department Chair. For out-of-class teaching (e.g., supervision of practica, teaching, or research) or a small seminar, the student evaluations are reported and filed only if at least three evaluations are received. The purpose is to preserve the anonymity of the students who make the evaluations. In the case of out-of-class teaching, if there are fewer than three evaluations, the Student Records Office holds the evaluations for one additional year. At that time, if at least three evaluations are available, the accumulated out-of-class evaluations are reported and filed. Otherwise, the Student Records Office destroys the older evaluations and the ones from the immediately preceding year are held and accumulated for another year.

The Committee's consideration of the student evaluations depends on the number of students who provide the evaluations. For classroom courses, the quantitative ratings are considered only if at least 50 percent of the enrolled students provided ratings, and the typed comments are considered only if at least 50% of the students provided comments.

Average ratings to all questions on the student evaluation forms and, when appropriate, students' written comments are considered, with particular attention to consistent patterns of positive or negative reactions to the instruction. Credit is given for course development by faculty members who teach a new course or substantially revise an established course. In evaluating out-of-class teaching activities, additional considerations include the number of students contacted, particularly at the graduate level (e.g., involvement in student research projects, number of advisees, number of theses and dissertations chaired).

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For Teaching faculty members, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. In order to achieve a record of meritorious contribution in teaching/instruction, and to be promoted, it is expected that in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the annual file will include evidence of significant programmatic contribution to the University's teaching mission. Such evidence will normally include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes, application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness, and evidence of ongoing contribution to solving problems and addressing Department-, College-, and University-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

VI.C.2. Research

"Research" includes any professionally relevant scholarly activity. The following are examples of the products of research and scholarship: authored or edited book; article or monograph; invited chapter; funded grant; submitted grant; invited address; reprinted article; book review; technical report; published abstract; convention paper; responsibilities on an editorial board or as an ad hoc reviewer.

In evaluations of research, credit is given for manuscripts only if a significant change occurred between the current year's Faculty Activities Report and the previous year's Report. For example, a manuscript that changed from "submitted" to "in press" is counted. However, one that changed from "in press" to "published" is not, because it implies no further activity (except

possibly proofreading) on the author's part.

Evaluations of the scholarly value or importance of publications, presentations, manuscripts, and grant applications also consider oral testimony by a member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee familiar with the content area, as well as such indices of quality as the following: publication in refereed journals; prestige of the journal; funding status of a grant application; rating or score assigned to an unfunded grant; invitation to contribute to a book, journal, symposium, or conference; and reprinting of articles in books of readings. Theoretical viewpoints, however, are not considered in judging scholarly value. In the case of faculty being considered for promotion or tenure, written evaluations by outside experts are considered.

Judgments are made about the relative importance of finished products versus work-in-progress. For more junior faculty, credit is given for evidence of promise in research (e.g., laboratory set-up, grant applications and manuscripts submitted, data gathered) as well as for products such as publications or funded grants. For more senior faculty, however, greater emphasis is placed on products.

Judgments about grant applications consider the scope of the faculty member's contribution to the research project, whether the grant program is internal or external, whether the application is funded, approved but not funded, or not funded; and any score or rating assigned to an unfunded application. Judgments about grant applications also consider the role that grant-related activity plays in the faculty member's institutional role as defined in the letter of hire or subsequent letters of understanding from the Department Chair or the Dean. The quantity and quality of grant activity – writing and submitting grant applications as well as obtaining grant funds – are valued as part of each faculty member's research. Grant activity is judged favorably. The absence of grant activity will be weighed in consideration of the faculty member's institutional role inasmuch as some faculty members are required to seek and obtain grants, others are strongly encouraged to seek grants, and others are not expected to seek grants. The Department Chair will clarify each faculty member's role with regard to grant activity by preparing, in consultation with the faculty member, an annual workload plan and placing it in the Administrative section of the personnel file.

Certain invitations to perform professional service can be taken as evidence of a faculty member's visibility as a scholar, and therefore as evidence of quality. These are considered in evaluating research, in particular, invitations to edit for journals, to consult on research projects, and to present colloquia. However, the *performance* of editorial work, consultation, and presentation at colloquia constitutes professional service, and is considered in that area of the evaluation.

Clinical faculty assignments (a minimum of 50% service) may include a 5-10% research component. A Clinical faculty appointment asks for only a reasonable contribution in research, and the annual file will be expected to include one example of ongoing productivity, such as a presentation at a strategically selected professional conference. Other instances of scholarly activity such as peer-reviewed articles are welcome, but are not required to meet the criterion of reasonable research contribution for purpose of annual review and continuation in rank. However, should Clinical faculty members wish to stand for promotion, a record of publication

is expected.

VI.C.3. Service

"Service" includes professionally relevant activities other than research and teaching. To be counted as service, an activity must be performed in one's capacity as a psychologist or a member of the University. The following lists are not exhaustive.

Service to the Department: Examples include but are not limited to active involvement in a Department committee (including graduate training committees); organizing a colloquium or organizing or assisting in a Departmental conference (even though a book resulting from such activities would count as research); and service components of activities whose primary contributions are in teaching, research, or another area of service. For example, although obtaining a grant is credited as an accomplishment in research, the grant may provide additional funds to the Department as well as support for graduate students. Grants also may permit consultantships that are counted as community service. Grants may also benefit the Department if they result in support for students or opportunity for student research or practica.

Service to the College and University: Examples include but are not limited to involvement in College or University committees; consulting with students or faculty in another Department; formation of University interest groups or service groups; and representing the University or the Department at an appropriate function.

Service to the Profession: Examples include but are not limited to editorial work for professional publications; involvement in a professional association as an officer or a member of a committee; and presenting a colloquium or workshop to a professional (psychology or closely related) audience.

Service to the Community: Examples include but are not limited to presenting a speech or workshop to a "nonprofessional" audience (e.g., teachers, parents, general public); serving as a temporary or continuous consultant to an agency; serving on the board of directors of an agency; and providing professional service to clients (e.g., therapy, evaluation, organizational consultation). Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Faculty members are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

Evaluation of service is based on both quantity and quality. Quantity is evaluated by considering the number of service activities, the breadth of these activities, and the amount of time devoted to service. Quality of service is assessed by considering visibility, impact, continuation of a paid consultantship, demonstration of consultation efficacy, and generation of support for students or summer salary for faculty.

Seniority is considered when evaluating the nature and quantity of service. For example, expectations are lower for junior faculty, in part because of competing responsibilities (e.g., new course preparations) and in part because of limited opportunity, especially for professional and

University service. The same criteria are applied to faculty members in the Behavior Analysis, Behavioral Neuroscience, Clinical Psychology, Clinical Child Psychology, and Lifespan Developmental Psychology programs

Service activities that are acceptable when a faculty member is expected to make contributions characterized as “reasonable” – as is the case for most members of the Department’s faculty – would not be acceptable when a faculty member’s service is an area of “significant” contribution. The Workload Plan should delineate the service expectations of both types of faculty member.

VI.D. Procedure for Annual Review by the Committee

All members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee examine every faculty member's Faculty Activities Report and supporting materials while independently taking notes and evaluating performance. In addition, the Committee Chair assigns two faculty members the responsibility for presenting a written summary of the pertinent facts for inclusion in the Committee's report for each faculty member. These members are designated as the "First Reader" and "Second Reader." The First Reader drafts a summary of the facts, with separate sections related to background, teaching, research, and service. The summary should be based on the draft summary submitted by the faculty member (see Section VI.B); the First Reader, however, is responsible for ensuring that the summary is consistent with the material in the faculty member’s personnel file. Based on an independent examination of the file, the Second Reader verifies the accuracy of the summary to be presented by the First Reader.

At the Committee meeting, the First Reader presents the draft report orally, beginning with the background material, and then separately presents the sections on teaching, research, and service. After the oral report in each area of activity, the Committee members discuss the information. To promote a fair and honest evaluation, the discussions are candid, forthright, and confidential. Following discussion, each member independently assigns a rating using the following scale with a 0.25 gradation between whole numbers:

<i>Whole Number</i>	<i>Descriptive Term</i>
4	Excellent
3	Good
2	Satisfactory
1	Unsatisfactory

As described in the University guidelines, “Excellent” characterizes performance of high merit; “Good” characterizes performance of merit; and “Satisfactory” characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but not necessarily sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. A rating in the “Satisfactory” category in a particular year, especially for an area of activity in which “reasonable” (rather than “significant”) contributions are expected (normally the area of service), will not by itself prevent promotion or tenure. But “Satisfactory” ratings for several years in an area in which “significant” contributions are expected (normally the areas of teaching and research) could prevent promotion or tenure.

The Committee uses a modified "Olympics" style procedure in which all members simultaneously display a card with their rating. If the range of ratings is broad (range > 1.0), members making lower or higher ratings are asked to discuss the reasons for their ratings, and this information is added to the Committee's report. Occasionally, such discussions may lead members to change their ratings, but members are not directed to do so. The First and Second Readers are responsible for tabulating the ratings and adding the mean and range to the report. In the written summaries, the mean ratings are assigned the following descriptors:

<i>Numerical Ratings</i>	<i>Descriptor</i>
3.50-4.00	Excellent
3.00-3.49	Good
2.00-2.99	Satisfactory
1.00-1.99	Unsatisfactory

Comments and appropriate qualitative descriptors of performance are obtained from the members to be included in the report with the numerical ratings.

After the main part of the evaluation is completed, a motion is made regarding the Committee's final recommendation. The motion is discussed and a vote is taken and noted for inclusion in the report. For annual review of faculty members the possible motion is "continuation in rank." If the number of Committee members voting in favor of the motion equals or exceeds the number voting against the motion, the motion is approved and Committee's recommendation is "continuation in rank." If the number of unfavorable votes exceeds the number of favorable votes, the motion is disapproved and the Committee's recommendation is "termination." The recommendation is included in the final section of the report, along with the qualitative summary of the ratings for teaching, research, service, and any general observations or comments regarding the faculty member's activities. The final report is signed by all members of the committee who participated in the evaluation and then submitted to the Department Chair.

The Committee submits annual evaluations to the Department Chair at least two weeks before the deadline for submitting departmental reviews to the Dean. This deadline is published annually as part of the University guidelines. If the faculty member is a first-year faculty member, however, the Committee submits the faculty member's annual evaluation to the Department Chair at least one week before the deadline for submitting departmental reviews to the Dean.

VI.E. Evaluation by Department Chair

The Department Chair independently prepares an evaluation of each faculty member's work and provides the evaluation in the form of a letter to the faculty member. The letter includes qualitative and quantitative ratings for teaching, research, and service, using the same criteria and descriptors as the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Chair's quantitative ratings are expressed on the same scale as the Committee's, with 0.25-point gradations.

VI.F. Distribution of Annual Evaluations

The Department Chair distributes the Chair's evaluation letter and the Committee's evaluation report to the faculty member and the Dean by the deadline for submitting departmental reviews to the Dean. This deadline is published annually as part of the University guidelines. The Chair also sends the Dean a copy of the Faculty Activities Report signed by the faculty member and the Department Chair. The University cover page with the summary and recommendation and Department Chair's signature also is attached.

VI.G. Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation

According to University guidelines [<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4] faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the Faculty Evaluation Committee or Department Chair. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the Department Chair. If decisions have been made that are construed as arbitrary or capricious, or in violation of a rule, then a grievance might be appropriate. In such cases, to be prudent, faculty should work informally with the Department Chair while simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the 15-day window for filing a grievance will be met.

Appeal of a departmental descriptor (i.e., seeking action to have a descriptor changed) could be treated as described in the previous paragraph, and, if simultaneously grieved, must follow the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at pegboard.state.wv.us/ or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 304 293-9203.

VI.H. Performance-Based Raises in Salary

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations. Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college. "Excellent" and "Good" characterize performance of merit. "Satisfactory" characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

In the Department of Psychology, the Department Chair is charged with providing the Dean with pay-raise ratings for each faculty member to be used in the determination of raises in salary during years when raises are available. Each faculty member's *pay-raise rating* is calculated as follows:

1. The Committee's and Department Chair's annual ratings of the faculty member's performance are averaged, with the Committee's rating weighted 80% and the Chair's rating

20%. This is done separately for teaching, research, and service, resulting in a set of *performance ratings*.

2. To calculate the pay-raise rating, each performance rating (in the areas of research, teaching, and service) is multiplied by a *merit factor* that reflects the relative value assigned to performance ratings judged as excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Merit Factor</i>
3.50-4.00	Excellent	4
3.00-3.49	Good	2.5
2.00-2.99	Satisfactory	1
1.00-1.99	Unsatisfactory	0

3. The Department Chair calculates the pay-raise ratings and reports them to the Dean along with a set of *assignment factors* for each faculty member. Each assignment factor reflects the relative importance of the area of performance in the faculty member's work assignment. In most cases the weights are 0.4 for research, 0.4 for teaching, and 0.2 for service. Modifications may be negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Chair, subject to approval by the Dean. The new weights normally are recorded in a memorandum of understanding that is placed in the Administrative section of the faculty personnel file.

4. The Dean uses the pay-raise ratings and assignment factors to calculate each faculty member's raise in accordance with University and College guidelines.

5. If funds for performance-based raises are allocated during a faculty member's first year, the Dean may be authorized by University or College guidelines to disregard the department's pay-raise ratings and assignment factors in determining the faculty member's raise.

6. If more than one year has elapsed since the last distribution of funds for performance-based raises, then pay-raise ratings and assignment factors will be averaged over some greater period in accordance with University or College guidelines. In the absence of such guidelines, the pay-raise ratings and assignment factors will be averaged over all the years since the last performance-based pay raise, or over the last three years, whichever is less. If such a case arises when a faculty member has been on the faculty for less than the period used for deciding raises, the missing pay-raise ratings will be replaced by the average pay-raise rating in the Department – unless the faculty member's overall performance has been judged either unsatisfactory or so meritorious that an average pay-raise rating would be unjust, or unless University or College guidelines require a different procedure. If the Department Chair believes an average rating to be unjust, the Department Chair will consult with the Committee Chair to decide what rating, if any, should be used to replace the missing rating and explain the basis for the decision to the faculty member and the Dean in writing.

It is important to remember that the receipt of performance-based raises in salary does not guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted or granted tenure. For example, raises could be allocated for satisfactory performance whereas promotion and tenure require good or excellent performance. Another possibility is that raises could be received for occasional

performances that are good or excellent, whereas promotion and tenure require a preponderance of ratings of good or excellent in the areas of significant contribution for the faculty member's career for the period under review.

VI.I. Nomination for Awards

After all faculty members have been rated in a given year, those receiving "Excellent" ratings in teaching, research, or service are considered for nomination for awards, including the awards for Outstanding Teacher, Outstanding Researcher, and Outstanding Service in the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences; the Benedum Award for Distinguished Scholarship; and the Heebink Awards for Distinguished Service to the State of West Virginia.

The Committee Chair provides a list of the potential nominees and alternates to the Department Chair. The Department Chair, in turn, contacts the individuals and makes arrangements to submit formal nominations as appropriate. The Department Chair also maintains a list of the Department's nominees, alternates, and award winners, and makes this list available to the Committee as needed.

VII. Fourth-Year Review

Tenure-track faculty members are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. "Significant contributions" in teaching are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. "Significant contributions" in research are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Fourth-year reviews by the departmental committee and Department Chair are conducted following normal annual review procedures. For Tenure-track faculty members at the fourth year point, the Dean reviews the set of annual evaluations to date. Where concern arises regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the Dean will follow up with a request that the entire file be forwarded for assessment by the college committee.

In the Department of Psychology, fourth-year evaluations are based on information about performance during all years at the faculty member's current rank. Much of this information is contained in the Supplement to the Faculty Activities Report for Career Evaluations (hereafter, the "Career Activities Report") submitted by the faculty member. Additional information comes from the faculty member's institutional role from the letter of hire and subsequent letters of agreement, and all previous annual evaluations of teaching, research, and service by the Faculty

Evaluation Committee and Department Chair during the faculty member's career in rank. Consideration also may be given to the faculty member's vita, teaching evaluations from other institutions, and letters from prior employers.

VII.A. Career Activities Report

The Career Activities Report form contains sections in which the faculty member summarizes: (1) all activities in teaching, research, and service during the years in rank; (2) the annual ratings of these activities by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair; and (3) student evaluations of teaching. The form is designed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, subject to approval by a vote of the faculty. It is intended to collect a comprehensive set of information from each faculty member in a standardized format, and to remind the faculty member to include appropriate supporting materials. Because changes are made occasionally, the form itself is not considered a part of the present guidelines. The deadline for submitting the report and materials is September 15.

VII.B. Procedure for Fourth-Year Evaluations

In fourth-year evaluations, attention is paid to trends in the annual ratings in each area of evaluation, consistent with the faculty member's institutional role. Upward trends and uniformly high ratings are viewed more positively than erratic ratings over the years in rank. Another important factor is evidence of research activity of a systematic nature. This is assessed by considering, for example, the impact of the candidate's research on the field, logical development of a problem area or areas, and history of grant funding in an area.

The faculty member's career activity in the areas of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair, following the same general procedures, rating scales, and qualitative descriptors as described for the annual evaluations.

Within the Committee, after discussion of the faculty member's activity and ratings of the career in teaching, research, and service, the First Reader writes the Committee's evaluation. The document is checked by the Second Reader, read and signed by all Committee members, and submitted to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair independently prepares an evaluation of the faculty member's career and provides the evaluation in the form of a letter to the faculty member. The letter includes a qualitative rating for teaching, research, and service, using the same criteria and descriptors as the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

If the faculty member is not a candidate for promotion or tenure, the career evaluations may include judgments about the progress the faculty member is making towards promotion or tenure, and guidance about the course of future efforts to attain promotion or tenure.

If the faculty member is a candidate for promotion and tenure, the career evaluations include a specific recommendation as described in Section VIII.B.3.

VIII. Promotion and/or Tenure Review

In a Tenure-track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual's sixth year on the faculty, the "critical year," as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure-track faculty members with qualifying experience may in the appointment letter be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at West Virginia University should be included in the personnel file.

Tenure-track faculty members who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may during the fourth year of employment (by May 15th of the fourth year) request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean's approval of such request, the new critical year will be confirmed. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in Clinical, Research, or Teaching faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing Tenure-track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a Clinical, Teaching, or promotion-eligible Research faculty member and the faculty member's Department Chair may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion during the sixth year (with promotion effective beginning year seven), or later. A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

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. Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses.

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. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a "continuous program" of scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record.

Promotion reviews are based on information about performance during all years at the faculty member's current rank. Much of this information is contained in the Supplement to the Faculty Activities Report for Career Evaluations (hereafter, the "Career Activities Report") submitted by the faculty member. Additional information comes from the faculty member's institutional role

from the letter of hire and subsequent letters of agreement, and all previous annual evaluations of teaching, research, and service by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair during the faculty member's career in rank, as well as letters from external reviewers of the faculty member's research. Consideration also may be given to the faculty member's vita, teaching evaluations from other institutions, and letters from prior employers.

VIII.A. Career Activities Report

The Career Activities Report form contains sections in which the faculty member summarizes: (1) all activities in teaching, research, and service during the years in rank; (2) the annual ratings of these activities by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair; and (3) student evaluations of teaching. The form is designed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, subject to approval by a vote of the faculty. It is intended to collect a comprehensive set of information from each faculty member in a standardized format, and to remind the faculty member to include appropriate supporting materials. Because changes are made occasionally, the form itself is not considered a part of the present guidelines.

For a promotion review, the Career Activities Report and supporting materials are due to the Department Chair's secretary by December 15.

VIII.B. Procedure for Promotion Reviews

In a promotion review, attention is paid to trends in the annual ratings in each area of evaluation, consistent with the faculty member's institutional role. Upward trends and uniformly high ratings are viewed more positively than erratic ratings over the years in rank. Another important factor is evidence of research activity of a systematic nature. This is assessed by considering, for example, the impact of the candidate's research on the field, logical development of a problem area or areas, and history of grant funding in an area.

The faculty member's career activity in the areas of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair, following the same general procedures, rating scales, and qualitative descriptors as described for the annual evaluations.

Within the Committee, after discussion of the faculty member's activity and ratings of the career in teaching, research, and service, the First Reader writes the Committee's evaluation. The document is checked by the Second Reader, read and signed by all Committee members, and submitted to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair independently prepares an evaluation of the faculty member's career and provides the evaluation in the form of a letter to the faculty member. The letter includes a qualitative rating for teaching, research, and service, using the same criteria and descriptors as the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

An Assistant Professor in the critical year as defined by University guidelines receives career evaluations from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair that include a

recommendation regarding tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. An Associate Professor who applies for promotion receives career evaluations that include a recommendation regarding promotion to Professor.

VIII.B.1. External Reviews of Research

A major component of the evaluation process is a review of the faculty member's research by qualified individuals outside West Virginia University. At least four external reviews are required to compare the faculty member's research with that of faculty at comparable rank in peer institutions. Details about selecting these individuals and soliciting their reviews, including deadlines, are found in the College guidelines and the University guidelines. The Department Chair is responsible for informing appropriate members of the Psychology faculty about these deadlines.

The faculty member and the Faculty Evaluation Committee independently prepare a list of six reviewers. In preparing its list, the Committee employs the assistance of the candidate's training area committee (minus the candidate) in an advisory capacity. Normally each reviewer holds a faculty rank at or above the level to which promotion is sought, and employed in a Ph.D. - granting department of psychology in a University whose research mission is comparable to that of West Virginia University. Both lists should include the following information about each reviewer: (1) the reviewer's current position; (2) a paragraph indicating the reviewer's qualifications to serve in this capacity; (3) information about the reviewer's relation to the candidate (if any); and (4) contact information including the reviewer's address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address.

Both lists are submitted to the Department Chair, who selects six potential reviewers and several rank-ordered alternates from the lists and submits them to the Dean for approval. The Department Chair also sends the Dean a draft letter to be used in soliciting the reviews. After the Dean approves the list of reviewers and alternates and the letter, the Department Chair contacts the potential reviewers by telephone or e-mail and solicits the review using the same basic language in the approved letter. If one of the original six individuals declines the request, the Department Chair proceeds to contact the alternates in rank order until agreements have been secured from six individuals. The Department Chair then sends the formal letter soliciting the review, accompanied by the supporting materials prepared by the faculty member. The external reviewers are instructed to return their letters to the Dean's Office.

The supporting materials provided by the faculty member include a current vita, a 1- to 2-page research summary, and 4 to 6 reprints, preprints, manuscripts, or grant applications. The faculty member provides one copy of these materials to the Department Chair by a deadline that the Chair bases on the College guidelines. The Chair arranges for the materials to be duplicated and mailed to the external reviewers.

The Dean's Office notifies the Department Chair periodically about its receipt of external reviews. The Chair sends reminders to the reviewers as needed.

VIII.B.2. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

For promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, the minimal criteria are a preponderance of ratings of "Good" for the career in the areas of research and teaching, and "Satisfactory" in the area of service. Also considered is the candidate's emerging national visibility in research. For promotion to full Professor, the minimal criteria are a preponderance of "Good" career ratings in research and teaching, "Satisfactory" in the area of service, and evidence of national visibility in research.

VIII.B.3. Recommendations

In the Faculty Evaluation Committee's discussion of a candidate for promotion or tenure, one or more motions are made regarding the Committee's final recommendation. Each motion is discussed and a vote is taken and recorded for inclusion in the Committee's written evaluation. For an Assistant Professor in the critical year, the possible motions are "promotion" and "tenure," and the possible actions in each case are "approve" and "disapprove."

Recommendations regarding promotion and tenure are based on separate motions and votes, one for promotion and one for tenure. For an Associate Professor under consideration for promotion to Professor, the possible motions are "continuation in rank" and "promotion," and the possible actions are "approve" and "disapprove."

If the number of Committee members voting in favor of the motion equals or exceeds the number voting against the motion, the motion is approved. If the number of unfavorable votes exceeds the number of favorable votes, the motion is disapproved.

If a motion is approved, the Committee's recommendation coincides with the motion (e.g., if the approved motion is "continuation in rank," then the recommendation is "continuation in rank"). If a motion for "continuation in rank" is disapproved, the recommendation is "termination." In the case of an Assistant Professor in the critical year, if a motion for "tenure" is disapproved, the recommendation is "termination." In the case of an Associate Professor, if a motion for "promotion" is disapproved, the recommendation is "continuation in rank" (unless a separate motion for "continuation in rank" is disapproved).

As noted in Section V.D, in tenure cases University guidelines require that more than 50% of the votes be cast by tenured faculty members. In these cases, following discussion of the faculty member's case, one of the untenured members of the Committee is randomly selected not to vote. The selected person could be an untenured faculty member or a graduate student, depending on the outcome of the random selection process.

The Department Chair's evaluation of the candidate also includes a recommendation expressed in the same terms as the Faculty Evaluation Committee's recommendation.

IX. Procedure for Modification of This Document

This document may be modified by a vote of the Faculty Committee contingent on approval by the Dean of the Eberly College and the Provost of West Virginia University.

X. Timeline

Here is a list of the key dates in the faculty evaluation process that are controlled by the Department of Psychology. Other key dates in the process (e.g., deadlines for submitting evaluations to the Dean) are contained in the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*.

Reporting Period

The Department of Psychology's annual evaluations are based on a reporting period from July 1 to June 30. Exceptions are made for first-year faculty members, whose reporting period is from the beginning of their contractual obligation to December 15 of the appointment year.

February 15

This is the deadline for the Faculty Evaluation Committee to submit its annual report to the Department Chair. See Section V.C.

April 15

This is the deadline for the Department Chair and the Director of Graduate Training to conduct elections to select the faculty and student members of the next year's Faculty Evaluation Committee. See Sections V.A and V.B.

September 15

This is the deadline for continuing faculty members to update their personnel files with materials for the annual evaluation. This deadline applies to all faculty members beyond the first year, including faculty members who are subject to a fourth-year review and faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure. By this deadline:

All faculty members (except first-year faculty members) should submit their Annual Activities Report and supporting materials for the July 1—June 30 reporting period. See Sections IV, VI.A, and VI.B. (First-year faculty members should submit their report and materials by December 15 as indicated below.)

Faculty members who are subject to a fourth-year review should also submit their Career Activities Report covering activities through June 30 of their third year. See Section VII.A.

Faculty members who are under consideration for promotion or tenure should submit their Annual Activities Report and supporting materials for the July 1—June 30 reporting period (see Sections IV, VI.A, and VI.B), but they should defer submission of their Career Activities Report and additional supporting materials until December 15.

October 15

This is the deadline for the Department Chair to charge the Faculty Evaluation Committee. See Section V.C.

December 15

This deadline applies to first-year faculty members and faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure. By this deadline:

First-year faculty members should submit their Annual Activities Report and supporting materials for the period from the date of their appointment through December 15. See Sections IV, VI.A, and VI.B.

Faculty members who are under consideration for promotion or tenure should submit their Career Activities Report covering activities from the time of their appointment to their current rank through December 15. In addition, because this time frame extends 5.5 months beyond the reporting period for the annual review (June 30), faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure may submit additional supporting materials covering activities from July 1 through December 15. See Section VIII.B.