

**DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND LINGUISTICS
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION MANUAL**

Department approval (paper ballot) May 4, 2009

Approved by the Office of the Provost, July 21, 2009¹

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics has a deep and abiding commitment to quality, innovation, and rigor in teaching and research. Unique in its diversity and breadth, the Department encompasses languages, literary and cultural studies, theoretical and applied linguistics, pedagogy, language-learning technologies, and creative work. This diversity offers both an uncommon opportunity and a challenge to the faculty, as teaching assignments and research programs can span several disciplines. For this reason, the Department endorses the statement of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages with regard to “non-traditional fields”:

The nature of departments of foreign languages is rapidly changing. The new thrust toward interdisciplinary work and the study of fields of inquiry, including those made possible by technological advances, broaden the legitimate areas of both teaching and research within a foreign language department. Colleagues may be involved in disciplines closely related to foreign languages and literatures that have not in the past been considered an integral part of a foreign language department. Some examples of these fields include women's studies, film studies, literary and technical translation, creative writing, and foreign language methodology and pedagogy, including work in new technology.

In questions of promotion, tenure, and salary, colleagues working in these fields should be evaluated using the same procedures and standards as those used for more traditional fields but with proper consideration for the particular standards each discipline requires.

As the only master's degree producing foreign language program and as a major trainer of certified teachers in West Virginia, the Department also has a vital role in supporting foreign language programs in public schools throughout the State.

This document describes the typical kinds of work that are normally considered in the categories of teaching, research, and service as well as the criteria to be used for the purposes of annual evaluation of faculty and for evaluations of candidates for tenure and promotion. The Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics 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*. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the Board of Governors, West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, and Department.

¹ The following two changes were approved by the Provost Office on April 20, 2012:

- a. Departmental name change, from Department of Foreign Languages to Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, and
- b. Replacement of “personnel file” by “evaluation file”.

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

The faculty evaluation process in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics and the Eberly College includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual assignment, the faculty 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 are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research and service, 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 at that time.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted. Teaching faculty titles include Teaching Instructor as well as Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor.

A. THE APPOINTMENT LETTER

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

For tenure track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. 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, responsibilities are defined as 80% teaching and 20% service. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are normally .80FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

B. ANNUAL ASSIGNMENT

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

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

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

¹ Expectations considered in annual evaluations and possible promotion or performance-based salary increases for Clinical faculty at WVU/ECAS will include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and reasonable contribution in research. In ECAS, 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 are normally a maximum of 14 credit hours during the nine-month academic year.

² Evaluation in a Teaching faculty assignment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research will be assigned. Per WVU P&T document (Part III.B., page 4, 2006-07 version): "Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works." For Teaching faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

The normal annual teaching assignment for research active Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics is up to five courses. "Research active" in this context is defined as current graduate faculty status. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted, up to eight courses. 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.

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 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 would typically be 90% teaching and 10% service.

Faculty 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.

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

C. THE FACULTY FILE

Faculty must annually update their evaluation files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. For the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, the annual review year is August 16th to August 15th. Although only materials for activities that occurred on or before August 15th may be included in the file, faculty have until September 30th to make sure that their files are complete and to prepare their annual productivity report. The file will be closed for review after September 30. For first-year faculty and for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion, the file shall be closed on December 31st. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Each faculty evaluation 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 the sample format in Appendix 1. This format maintains four separate inventories

for (1) the administrative file, and for (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service documentation. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

1. 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 CVs and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include.

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify which file each piece of documentation is submitted to. Each document should be tagged with its inventory number. Once an item is entered into the evaluation file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. The inclusion of a narrative, which places materials in context, is highly recommended. Faculty members are encouraged to document their work in ways that emphasize annual activities as a part of an ongoing process and illustrate key points from their annual narrative.

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.

D. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND FEEDBACK

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status (Teaching faculty, Tenure track faculty, Senior Lecturers, and Instructors). All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both a committee of faculty and by the Chair.

E. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) 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 Faculty Evaluation Committee in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics is elected by and from the full-time tenure-line and teaching-line faculty of the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics. It shall be comprised of: three (3) tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor; one (1) tenure-line (probationary or tenured) assistant professor; and one (1) member of the teaching-line faculty at any rank. If at any time there is no tenure-line assistant professor in the Department, the position shall be filled by a tenured faculty member at the rank of associate professor or professor. Terms of service: Senior faculty members with tenure are elected to serve for two years; assistant professors and teaching faculty are elected to serve for one year. No member of the committee shall be elected to succeed him-/herself for a period of two years. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his evaluation file.

The chair of the FEC is selected by the committee. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC.

Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating a partner or spouse in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for the annual evaluation. Faculty members who serve on the College committee may not serve on departmental evaluation committees.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep committee deliberations and all information contained in evaluation files strictly confidential. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files. All members of the FEC must sign the

committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting.

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.

F. 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.

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

Ratings affect annual salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. 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 should be questioned.

It is incumbent upon faculty 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 evaluation file. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the committee’s response may be, “in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the committee must conclude that the faculty member’s work is unsatisfactory.”

II. ANNUAL REVIEW

A. TEACHING

Teaching involves the dissemination of knowledge and the stimulation of critical thinking. The prime requisites of an 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 the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interests of students. Teaching activities include traditional in-class instruction as well as out-of-class activities such as advising, thesis direction, graduate committee work, GTA supervision and practicum instruction, and directing departmental or university study abroad programs.

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member’s overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. It is required that Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) forms for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, be included in the file for annual review. It is expected that syllabi for all courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the evaluation file.

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, this is defined as ongoing engagement in

assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. For Teaching Faculty, 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. A terminal degree is required for promotion from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor. Faculty members are encouraged to avoid sole reliance on SEI ratings and syllabi to demonstrate their teaching performance. The quality of teaching can be further documented by offering materials from a variety of sources, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Instructional materials (handouts, study guides, in class visual tools, etc.)
- Innovation in instruction (technology, activities, etc.)
- Course development
- Sample examinations/assignments
- Advising (record sheet)
- Graduate exam/thesis committees
- Participation in teaching-related workshops/seminars
- Other evaluation instruments (mid-term evaluations, independent study/capstone evaluations, study abroad materials, etc.)
- Peer's/Chair's evaluations
- Teaching awards/recognition
- Correspondence from current/former students
- Other documents (e.g. written statements by current and/or former students)

1. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

For the purposes of annual evaluation, there must be adequate documentation of teaching activities in each faculty member's evaluation file.

a. Criteria for Evaluation

Minimum documentation - All faculty members will be required to submit the minimum documentation of (1) numerical SEI forms, (2) student comments, and (3) syllabi for all courses in order to be evaluated in the area of teaching. Teaching faculty should also include a "systematic assessment*" of contributions in teaching to the program in order to be evaluated. The absence of these required documents may result in the rating of "Unsatisfactory" by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

*Evidence of "systematic assessment" should include a reflective statement in which the faculty member identifies program and/or curricular needs and documentation of how he/she addressed those needs. The reflective statement could be supported by various types of documentation, including: syllabi of newly developed or revised courses, description and results of extracurricular activities, proposals or evaluation of study abroad programs, etc.

b. Rating of Teaching Performance

In addition to the **Minimum Documentation** stated above, the rating of **Excellent** in teaching normally requires SEI scores of 4.0 or above, the rating of **Good** normally requires SEI scores of 3.5 to 3.9, and the rating of **Satisfactory** normally requires SEI scores of 3.0 to 3.4. Substantial documentation that demonstrates the quality of the faculty member's teaching may warrant a higher rating. Faculty members are expected to place in their file those materials that best demonstrate the quality of their teaching and are encouraged to include in their annual report a self-evaluation of their teaching activities.

B. RESEARCH

Research involves the creation, discovery or 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 the application of knowledge and expertise to address needs in society and the profession.

Research is a critical component of the mission of the Department, contributing to the general body of knowledge and thus infusing instruction and service with rigor and relevance. Research may be discipline-focused or interdisciplinary, individual or collaborative. Faculty members are expected to undertake and demonstrate evidence of a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. The area of a faculty member's research is normally specified in the original letter of appointment; when there are reasons to modify that agreement, faculty members are advised to speak with the Chair of the Department and the Dean and to obtain a letter describing the change. Given both the multifaceted nature of the Department and the variety of teaching assignments any one faculty member may be asked to assume, it is likely that there would be circumstances when the focus of a research program would be relatively broad and that an individual could legitimately submit some research to be evaluated that explores areas beyond the scope of his/her established research program.

Faculty are expected to disseminate the products of their research through publication in print, electronic, or other appropriate media (e. g. CD-ROM or video). 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. All research activities and products must be documented by such items as letters of acceptance, off-prints, photocopies, or other appropriate documentation.

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the department. It is expected that faculty will include in the file print copies of all publications to be counted for the review period. Faculty members should describe the nature of the publication to which a manuscript has been submitted (e.g. book, journal, online journal, conference proceedings, encyclopedia) and the selection process involved (e.g. peer-reviewed or not). For the critical year review, the department may accept the original manuscript with letters of unequivocal acceptance.

1. TYPES OF APPROPRIATE PRODUCTS AND ACTIVITIES

Given its diverse nature, the Department recognizes that scholarly research, creative works, and pedagogical applications may have equal value in fulfilling the requirements for promotion and tenure. Faculty members can help the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Chair evaluate their work by organizing it according to the types listed below. This classification does not necessarily imply a ranking, but it should be understood that refereed and/or editorially reviewed works will receive higher consideration than works which have not been professionally assessed.

Faculty should submit evidence of research that might include:

a. Scholarly Books. Because of the variety of fields represented, the Department recognizes a range of book-length scholarly publications. Given this range, it is important for faculty members to describe and clarify the nature of their book-length works and, if appropriate, the extent to which each deserves to be recognized as a research product.

b. Articles. Because of the diversity of the Department, there is no single list of appropriate journals, but articles should normally appear in national or international refereed journals. Some disciplines represented within the Department use the term "Review Article"; such publications are considered scholarly works, for they are substantially different in character and form from what are commonly referred to as "book reviews" or "book notices," which are considered an element of Service. Faculty

members are advised to consult the *MLA Directory of Periodicals* and/or the Faculty Evaluation Committee or Department Chair to ascertain whether or not a particular journal is appropriate.

Book chapters which have been professionally assessed also count in this category. Introductions to books, editions, anthologies, or similar works may be considered the equivalent of one or more articles, depending on how they are judged in terms of the criteria listed above.

c. Creative Works of an Artistic Nature. This category recognizes publication or performance of creative (artistic) work, provided that it has a direct connection with the faculty member's professional specialization in foreign languages and cultures. It includes genres such as novels, plays, short stories, poetry, and interpretive dramatic performance or direction. The criteria to be applied in evaluating such creative work are the same as described in the section Evaluation of Research, but such work may also require review beyond the Department; faculty members must support the merit of their creative work with appropriate outside assessment (e. g. reviews).

d. Translations. The Department recognizes the translation of literary and non-literary works as a noteworthy contribution, although translations of others' works will normally count somewhat less than original work. Faculty members submitting translations for evaluation should include a statement clarifying how that work is appropriate to their research program. The Department also recognizes that some types of translation, e. g. legal and commercial documents, may best be considered as service.

e. Grants. The Department recognizes the preparation and submission of grants that involve active research. The evaluation of a grant submission will depend on its connection to the faculty member's research agenda and the proposed outcomes of the project for which grant monies are to be awarded.

2. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

a. Criteria for Evaluation

The Department believes that, in addition to publishing, continued intellectual involvement through research and other scholarly activity enhances each faculty member's record of professional achievement. Such a record, while not a substitute for publication, includes participating in professional conferences (presenting a paper, serving as a respondent or discussant); consulting within the profession; attending seminars, workshops, or other programs designed to provide advanced training in an area relevant to the Department; and receiving grants and awards for research activity.

The criteria to be used for evaluating research and publication include the following (not listed in order of importance).

i. Authorship. Single authorship generally counts more than multiple authorship, the weight of the latter varying with the extent of each author's contributions. In the case of multiple authorship, the faculty members are responsible for identifying as precisely as possible their contributions to the work(s).

ii. Originality. Original research, creative writing, or other types of original effort will be weighted more heavily than editing, bibliographical works, and similar activities.

iii. Place of Publication/Granting Agency. National and international publications generally carry more weight than regional or local presses. It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the character of the press or journal.

iv. Length

v. Format of Publication. Self-contained work is regarded more highly than appended work.

vi. Audience. Works intended for specialists or professionals are normally weighted more than those intended for the general public.

vii. Process of Selection. Works in refereed publications are regarded more favorably than those in non-refereed publications, and works published in proceedings have more prestige if there is a selection process involved. Book chapters are considered the equivalent of refereed journal articles provided that they have undergone a demonstrable refereeing process. Books that have been professionally assessed prior to publication carry more weight than those which have not been so assessed.

viii. Reception. The quality of the work and its contributions to the field may further be established through such processes as outside evaluations, citations, and reviews.

ix. Relevance. Works which are relevant to the faculty member's discipline and which contribute to her/his program of research as stipulated in the original appointment letter or subsequent memorandum(a) of agreement will be weighted more heavily than those extraneous to the discipline or to the faculty member's program of research. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate this relevance.

x. Amount and Duration of Grant Award.

b. Rating of Research Performance

Based on the committee's overall evaluation of the above criteria, the following ratings will be applied to the research activity of a faculty member. Faculty must fulfill at least one of the criteria in a category to receive that rating.

For a research expectation of 40% or more

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present at least one of the following or the equivalent:

- Acceptance or publication of a book***; or
- Acceptance or publication of one scholarly article in a refereed journal or book; or
- Acceptance or publication of a chapter in a book or selected proceedings from a national or international conference; or
- A published annotated translation of a scholarly or creative work with proof of performed background research; or
- A grant award based on a grant submission requiring active research related to the faculty member's area of expertise.

*** A peer-reviewed creative or scholarly book submitted for evaluation will be counted for up to three years upon acceptance or publication. To gain credit upon acceptance, faculty members must provide the final publication contract and a manuscript copy.

For a rating of GOOD, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable on-going research (i.e., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, or conference proceedings, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of a completed chapter in an on-going book project)

PLUS one of the following:

- Another example of demonstrable on-going research; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly journal; or
- A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference.

For a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty members must present one of the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable on-going research (i.e., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, or conference proceedings, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of a completed chapter in an on-going book project); or
- Presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly journal.

For a 20% to 39% research expectation:

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable on-going research (i.e., an acceptance or publication of an article in a refereed or non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, or conference proceedings, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of a completed chapter in an on-going book project)

PLUS one of the following:

- Another example of demonstrable on-going research; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly journal; or
- A presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference.

For a rating of GOOD, faculty members must present the following or the equivalent:

- Demonstrable on-going research (i.e., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, or conference proceedings, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of a completed chapter in an on-going book project); or

Two of the following:

- Presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly journal.

For a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty members must present at least one of the following or the equivalent:

- Presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- Two invited talks (on campus or off campus) related to the research area; or
- Drafts of work in progress in the form of scholarly articles, original pedagogical materials or translations.

For a research expectation of less than 20%

For a rating of EXCELLENT, faculty members must present one of the following:

- Demonstrable on-going research (i.e., an acceptance or publication of a scholarly article in a non-refereed journal, encyclopedia, or conference proceedings, articles or pedagogical materials submitted for publication; evidence of a completed chapter in an on-going book project); or
- Presentation at a state, regional, or (inter)national professional conference; or
- An accepted or published book review in a scholarly journal.

For a rating of GOOD, faculty members must present one of the following or the equivalent:

- Two invited talks (on campus or off campus) related to the research area; or
- Drafts of work in progress in the form of scholarly articles, original pedagogical materials or translations.

For a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty members must present one of the following or the equivalent:

- An invited talk (may be on campus).

***The ratings of excellent or good in themselves do not guarantee promotion or tenure.

C. SERVICE

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

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

Faculty must submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment. Circumstantial service is valuable but cannot compensate for service that is considered part of the faculty member's workload assignment.

1. TYPES OF APPROPRIATE SERVICE

For the purposes of evaluations, service activities are classified in the following categories.

a. To the Profession, e. g. service on committees, task forces, etc. and offices held in regional, national, and international professional organizations related to one's discipline; consulting for publishers; book reviews and notices; chairing/moderating panels at professional conferences; organizing national or international conferences and colloquia.

b. To the State and Public, e. g. work with State foreign-language teachers; translating and interpreting for public and private agencies; educational programs for the public and international exchange programs.

c. To the College and University, e. g. work on committees, councils, task forces, and other participation in the governance/administrative system of the College and University; faculty advisor to College- and University-wide student organizations; translating and interpreting for units within the University.

d. To the Department, e. g. work on department-level committees, task forces, and other administrative duties; faculty advisor to language clubs and honoraries; library representative; operation of special programs.

The above listing does not imply any ranking of the four categories of service, but some activities will necessarily count more than others. The evaluation will be based upon criteria listed below.

2. EVALUATION OF SERVICE

a. Criteria for Evaluation

i. Benefit. The degree to which the service yields important benefits to the Department, University, Profession, or Community.

ii. Impact. The degree to which the service meets the needs of clients, induces positive change, improves performance, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues.

iii. Duration. Capacity and term of service.

iv. Effort. Time and energy required by service activities.

b. Rating of Service Performance

Documentation. It is the faculty member's obligation to document time and effort devoted to service, including attendance and the level of activity performed as a committee member. The dossier should therefore include such items as minutes, attendance sheets, letters from the committee chair or clients, or the faculty member's self-assessment of involvement. In order for participation to be accurately assessed, the annual report should also provide a few lines explaining the extent of participation, number and length of meetings, level of preparation, and if possible assessment of the value of the service for each activity. The absence of documentation may result in a rating of Unsatisfactory.

Evaluation of Service is a measure of time and energy expended as well as the quality of the contribution and its outcomes. A faculty member's teaching and/or administrative assignment should be taken into account in this evaluation.

To receive a rating of **EXCELLENT** a faculty member's service must be of exceptional quantity **AND** result in a significant accomplishment.

For example, a faculty member receiving a rating of excellent might serve actively and effectively on four committees (at least two outside of the department), write a successful service-related grant application, and be an officer in a professional association. Regardless of the type of service performed, the faculty member receiving this rating must evidence excellent leadership and commitment.

To receive a rating of **GOOD**, a faculty member's service must either be of exceptional quantity **OR** result in a major accomplishment.

For example, a faculty member receiving a rating of good might serve actively and effectively on three committees (at least one outside of the department), represent the department in recruitment, retention, or technology initiatives, help out with language club or honorary society activities, and be active in a professional association. Regardless of the type of service performed, the faculty member receiving this rating must evidence good leadership and commitment.

To receive a rating of **SATISFACTORY**, a faculty member's service will be expected to participate in departmental activities and must demonstrate active participation and commitment.

For example, a faculty member receiving a rating of satisfactory might regularly attend faculty meetings, be engaged in the concerns of his or her individual programmatic unit, serve actively and effectively on two committees (at least one outside of the department) and represent the department in recruitment, retention, or technology initiatives.

A faculty member whose dossier shows a general lack of participation in departmental activities and serves on fewer than two committees, or the equivalent, will receive a rating of **UNSATISFACTORY**.

Membership on committees may be replaced by equivalent service approved by the chair. Such equivalence should generally be specified in the contract or in the workload plan.

Faculty members are reminded that the number of service activities is not in and of itself an indicator of quality and are encouraged to write an evaluative statement and submit other products to document the quantity and quality of their service activities. A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution normally includes evidence of leadership in and/or outcomes of assigned service responsibilities.

Per the University *Procedures* document, service activities that are acceptable when one is expected to make contributions characterized as reasonable should be differentiated in the unit's guidelines from those activities expected when service is an area of significant contribution. In the Department of World

Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, service expectations for faculty with service as an area of significant contribution will be defined by the following language in the University guidelines:

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. (WVU P&T Document, Part X)

D. OTHER PROCEDURES RELATED TO ANNUAL REVIEW

1. 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 FEC and/or the 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 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 chair while simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the fifteen-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 293-9203.

2. PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY POLICY

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations. Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college.

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

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

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

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

[Note: Under the University's current performance based salary policy, separate amounts are allocated in each unit by employee category type. That is, employee category FT – Tenure track faculty—have a separate raise pool from 1.0 FTE FN/AP/NC employees.]

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

III CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The assessment provided by annual reviews is the basis for all recommendations related to tenure and promotion. Positive recommendations should be supported by both a series of annual reviews above the "Satisfactory" level and, beyond these reviews, by performance which is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" in the faculty member's primary areas of assignment. Additionally, all appropriate guidelines must be met.

A. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

In order to be recommended for tenure a faculty member will normally be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in both teaching and research and reasonable contributions in service.

In the teaching context "significant contributions" are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. All teaching activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.A. of this document.

"Significant contributions" in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities; peer research universities are determined by the Department, subject to approval by the Dean. Within the Department a candidate for tenure must normally present a minimum of a book published by an appropriate press or at least three articles (or the equivalent; see section II.B.1.b.) in appropriate national or international refereed journals. This is a minimal number to be considered for tenure but is not necessarily sufficient in itself to justify the granting of tenure. All research activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.B. of this document. In addition, external reviews of research will be required for tenure decisions; see section XII. of the University guidelines and section IV. of the College guidelines.

"Reasonable contributions" in service are normally those activities at or beyond the departmental level which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure at West Virginia University.

1. FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

Tenure track faculty 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 emphasis on the development of an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. "Significant contributions" in teaching are normally those that 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 that meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving

similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research 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.

Department/Division committee and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. For Tenure track faculty 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.

2. PROMOTION 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 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 evaluation file.

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

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 her/his 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. A terminal degree is required for promotion from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor.

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.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

1. FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In order to be promoted to associate professor, a Tenure track faculty member will normally be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in both teaching and research and reasonable contributions in service. Teaching faculty standing for promotion from assistant to associate professor are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and reasonable contributions in service. In addition, the file is expected to show 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. External evaluations will not be required for promotion in Teaching positions.

In the teaching context "significant contributions" are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to associate professor who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. All teaching activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.A. of this document.

"Significant contributions" in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving promotion who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities; peer research universities are determined by the Department, subject to approval by the Dean. Within the Department a candidate for promotion to associate professor must normally present a minimum of a book published by an appropriate press or three articles (or the equivalent; see section II.B.i.b.) in appropriate national or international refereed journals. This is a minimal number to be considered for promotion but is not necessarily sufficient in itself to justify promotion. All research activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.B. of this document. In addition, external reviews of research will be required for promotion decisions; see section XII. of the University guidelines and section IV. of the College guidelines.

"Reasonable contributions" in service are normally those activities at or beyond the departmental level which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to associate professor at West Virginia University. All service activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II. C. of this document

2. FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR

In order to be promoted to the full professor level, a Tenure track faculty member will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in two of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, research, and service) and reasonable contributions in the other. Normally, faculty will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and research, but once tenure has been achieved, the criteria for subsequent promotion can be modified to establish a different pair of areas of significant contribution. Such a change should be requested primarily to assist the Department or College in carrying out its mission; a change of areas should not be considered solely because of a faculty member's lack of achievement in one area or her/his recent accomplishments in another. Such a modification must be agreed to by the faculty member, Chairperson of the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee, the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost, and must be stipulated in subsequent letters of agreement. In the event the change involves replacing research with service, the document must identify both the types and quantity of service expected and the ways in which that service will be measured; in addition, reasonable contributions in research must be defined, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, in the agreement. A period of at least two years must elapse after the approval of the change of areas before the faculty member can be considered for promotion using the new areas of significant contribution. If such a request is granted, external reviews of service will be expected. Faculty members are reminded that successful teaching is an expectation of all members of the Department who are assigned to teach, and as a criterion for promotion to full professor significant contributions must be made in teaching.

Teaching faculty standing for promotion from associate to full professor are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and reasonable contributions in service. In addition, the file is expected to show 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.

In the teaching context "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to full professor who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. All teaching activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.A. of this document.

"Significant contributions" in research means performance that meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving promotion to full professor who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities; peer research universities are determined by the Department, subject to approval by the Dean. Within the Department, a candidate for promotion to full professor must normally present, beyond the work used to achieve the previous promotion, a minimum of a book published by an appropriate press or five articles (or the equivalent; see section II.B.i.b.) in appropriate national or international refereed journals. This is a minimal number to be considered for promotion but is not necessarily sufficient in itself to justify promotion. This work should be done since last promotion, within a relatively recent period of time, and within the context of an ongoing and cohesive research agenda. For purposes of this document, the term "relatively recent period of time" will normally be interpreted as not longer than six (6) years.

"Reasonable contributions" in research means performance which demonstrates the faculty member's ongoing participation in scholarly activities. Such activities should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

All research activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.B. of this document. In addition, external reviews of research will be required for promotion decisions for faculty for whom research is an area of significant contribution; see section XII. of the University guidelines and section IV. of the College guidelines.

"Significant contributions" in service are normally those activities which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to full professor at West Virginia University and who have service as an area of significant contribution. For said faculty members, service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the State of West Virginia will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion to full professor. While service to the University and profession are noteworthy 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 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.

"Reasonable contributions" in service are normally those activities at or beyond the departmental level which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion to full professor at West Virginia University.

All service activities will be evaluated according to the policies stated in section II.C. of this document; in addition, external reviews of service will be required for faculty members for whom service is an area of significant contribution; see section XII. of the University guidelines and section IV. of the College guidelines.

C. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Department follows the procedures described in section IV. of the College guidelines and section XII. of the University guidelines.

Work literally “in press” or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate to count for the tenure decision, but the majority of the work presented for a tenure decision should normally be in print.

For discretionary promotions, particularly promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works actually in print.

External Review. Per WVU policy, 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. Procedures for soliciting external reviews are as described in section IV. of the College guidelines and section XII. of the University guidelines.

D. PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair of the Department. The Committee and the Chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the Faculty. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.

APPENDIX 1

Sample Chronological Inventory of Evaluation File Entries

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Administrative and Other Entries

(The letter "A" precedes the number of administrative and other entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
See search files for this position for letter of application, reference letters, etc.			
A-01	4/15/08	Offer letter from Dean Sotope	4/12/08
A-02	10/14/08	Curriculum vitae	10/1/08
A-03	12/29/08	Faculty Productivity Report	Fall, 2008
A-04	1/8/09	Annual review letter from Promotion and Tenure Committee	1/8/09
A-05	1/11/09	Annual review letter from Chair	1/10/09
A-06	5/18/09	Summary sheet from application for Faculty Development Grant funding to attend ASEA meeting	5/15/09
A-07	10/20/09	Faculty Productivity Report	10/20/09
A-08	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Evaluation Committee	11/3/09
A-09	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Chair	11/5/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Teaching Entries

(The letter "T" precedes the number assigned to teaching entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
T-01	8/24/08	Syllabus for SE 240	Fall, 2008
T-02	8/24/08	Syllabus for SE 340	Fall, 2008
T-03	10/14/08	Report of Professor Trumble of classroom observation	10/12/08
T-04	12/3/08	Report of Professor Trumble of classroom observation	12/1/08
T-05	12/15/08	24 Student evaluations of SE 240, Section 1 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-06	12/15/08	26 student evaluations of SE 240, Section 2 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-07	12/15/08	10 student evaluations of SE 340 using departmental form	Fall, 2008
T-08	1/11/09	Syllabus for SE 62	Spring, 2009
T-09	1/11/09	Syllabus for SE 340	Spring, 2009
T-10	2/20/09	24 Senate evaluation forms for SE 240, Section 1 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-11	2/20/09	27 Senate evaluations forms for SE 240, Section 2 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-12	2/20/09	10 Senate evaluation forms for SE 340 taught Fall, 2008	2/11/09
T-13	3/10/09	Report of chairperson's observations of classroom instruction	3/7/09
T-14	3/15/09	Memo from S. Smart to Chair McKee clarifying some issues raised in report of teaching observations	3/14/09
T-15	6/22/09	30 Senate evaluations for SE 62, Summary sheet and summarized student comments	6/18/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Research Entries

(The letter "R" precedes the number of research entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
R-01	11/5/08	Application for Senate Research Grant	11/1/08
R-02	3/6/09	Notification of award of Senate Research Grant	3/1/09
R-03	3/20/09	Letter indicating acceptance of article in <u>The Social Ecology Reporter</u> and copy of article	3/14/09
R-04	3/22/09	Memo of congratulations from Chair on article acceptance	3/22/09
R-05	4/2/09	Copy of article submitted to <u>The Professional Ecologist</u> for possible publication with cover letter	3/29/09
R-06	7/30/09	Letter from Dr. P.C. Bees to Editor of <u>The Social Ecology Reporter</u> commenting on Smart's article	7/10/09
R-07	9/3/09	Report on research conducted in summer on Senate Research Grant	8/30/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

Service Entries

(The letter "S" precedes the number of service entries.)

<u>Inventory Number</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Item Date</u>
S-01	9/15/09	Memo from Chair appointing to Departmental Curriculum Committee	1/10/09
S-02	9/15/09	Minutes from January, February, March, and April Curriculum Committee Meetings	Spring 09
S-03	9/15/09	Note of appreciation from Departmental Curriculum Committee Chair	4/30/09
S-04	9/15/09	Memo from Provost appointing to Committee to Reduce Asinine Procedures.	2/14/09
S-05	9/15/09	Minutes from WVFLTA Executive Council Meeting	3/21/09
S-06	9/15/09	Letter of Appreciation from SCOLT Planning Committee for moderating panel on "Assessment in Higher Education"	3/23/09
S-07	9/15/09	Program from SCOLT highlighting Panel on "Assessment in Higher Education"	Spring 09
S-08	9/15/09	Note of appreciation from Departmental Curriculum Committee Chair	4/30/09
S-09	9/15/09	Thank you from Dean for Parents Weekend lecture	5/2/09
S-10	9/15/09	Note of appreciation from chair of CRAP	5/14/09
S-11	9/15/09	Invitation to join Board of Editors for Hispania	6/2/09