

Department of History Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual***Approved by Department, April 2009*****Approved by the Office of the Provost, July 22, 2009**

The Department of History's Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Polices 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, those of 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, department.

The History Department's 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. Raises are based on the ratings received each year in research, teaching, and service.

The faculty evaluation process in 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.

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.

For Clinical faculty, Board of Governors Policy 2 stipulates the appointment must have the majority of the assignment be assigned service or other assignments, with classroom instruction secondary.

Research faculty may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as principal investigator in externally funded research. Per BoG 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 .80FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

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+% ²
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 History Department is four courses per year. "Research active" in

this context is defined as current graduate faculty status. (See college guidelines for definition of associate and full graduate faculty status.) Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted to eight courses 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.

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 personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. 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. All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are evaluated by both a committee of faculty and by the chair.

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 committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files.

The department/division FEC will normally include a minimum of five members. The History Department faculty evaluation committee is composed of three full professors and two

associate professors, with a majority being tenured faculty. The members are appointed by the department chair and generally serve three-year rotating terms. The members choose their own chair at the beginning of each year, and a member may serve consecutive terms as chair. The department chair shall make an effort to reflect the diversity of the department in the composition of the committee. The chair will be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on FEC. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure may not serve on the committee reviewing her/his personnel file. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty.

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.

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 that single deliberation. 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.

Faculty Personnel File

Each faculty member has a personnel file. Faculty must update personnel files with activities for the academic year under review before the beginning of the review cycle. Therefore, all faculty files must be updated and submitted for annual review no later than three days following the closing date for the submission of course grades for the fall semester. No material may be added after this date except for candidates seeking promotion that year; they have until the last business day of the calendar year for further additions. Both part-time and full-time faculty must file a productivity report each year. The complete personnel file is, in fact, taken to be the sum of all the annual updates for all of an individual's years at WVU.

The faculty personnel file consists of the following components:

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 annual productivity reports, which may include a narrative by the faculty member about his/her performance during the year; and (e) other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include. Each faculty member will be informed when a document is added to his or her file. While faculty members cannot remove a document from any folder of the personnel file, they are entitled to copies of all documents, and they have the right to place explanatory materials in any folder concerning anything found there.

2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify to which file each piece of documentation is submitted. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is highly recommended.

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 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. Each document should be tagged with its inventory number.

Once an item is entered into the personnel file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. Although the inventory of the administrative folder is maintained by the chair (or designee) annually, the department expects the faculty member to create a draft of the inventory (a draft log) to expedite the annual evaluation process. 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.

Supporting materials:

It is each faculty member's duty to document clearly and unambiguously efforts in each of the three areas of endeavor: research, teaching and service. The personnel committee's evaluations and those of the chair are limited to the materials in these files. The materials faculty place in their files are defined in general terms in the university, college, and department faculty evaluation guidelines and in the annual faculty evaluation and productivity reports, yet there has been a remarkable inconsistency through the years which seems to reflect questions as to the extent of documentation required for evaluation. While the absence of materials from the file can result in more negative evaluations than would otherwise be expected, excessive documentation can also hinder effective evaluation.

The following paragraphs are illustrative and not exhaustive of ways in which one must document one's professional activities.

Research:

Offprints and copies of published items must be included in the folder. It is not necessary to include the complete issue of a journal. Works in progress or items newly accepted for publication may be documented in draft form (as a practical suggestion, lengthy materials not yet in print should be submitted on a disk or in an electronic format to save space in the files); professional presentations should be documented with printed programs, annotated for the personnel committee's ease of reference; copies of letters of acceptance, contracts, and other agreements should be placed in the file wherever appropriate. Informal agreements and personal letters bearing on one's research should be noted as such when placed in the folder.

Faculty whose principal specialization is public history are expected to publish and to present papers and to participate in scholarly meetings as well as take an active part in applying history outside of the academy through consulting work, advisory reports, museum exhibits, and so forth. At the same time, research and creative activities related to public history may take forms beyond those of traditional scholarship. Because this research and creative activity will take both traditional and public forms, it is the responsibility of the candidate initially to explain and to document the quality and quantity of work and the contribution to knowledge behind his or her submissions. This may require explicit explanations of the scholarly contributions of a

faculty member's work within the personal narrative in the productivity report and other documentation. For instance, scholars submitting evidence of their scholarly role in curating museum exhibits might include not only the exhibit script and the text of all object labels, but also primary and secondary sources bibliographies consulted, data bases of exhibition checklists, photographs of the installation, press release and publicity materials, educational material developed in conjunction with the exhibition, and media as well as scholarly journal reviews.

The following list includes the kinds of scholarly activities representative for the discipline of history. The items in the list that follows are not of equivalent weight and all need to be documented in the annual file as well as for the tenure and/or promotion file. If any published work is co-authored, the collaborators must document the percentage of their contribution to determine how their publication is to be evaluated.

Books

- Books written for a scholarly audience
- Books written for a general audience if based on original research and contributions
- Monographs (a short scholarly book or pamphlet that focuses on a specific and usually limited topic)
- Edited collections of solicited or reprinted scholarly works, with substantial contributions by the editor
- Edited collections of primary sources
- Textbooks may be considered on the same basis as scholarly books only if the author can document that a significant component of the work is based on original research which advances the historiography of the subject matter.
- Ordinarily, textbooks are considered as contributions to teaching.

Articles, chapters or grants

- Articles in scholarly or critical publications where acceptance depends on peer-review
- Articles in scholarly or critical publications where acceptance depends upon the recommendation of the editors alone
- Chapters in peer-reviewed books
- Awarded major grants

Examples of other scholarly activity

- Review Essays
- Book reviews in professional journals
- Published edited archival material
- Published bibliographies
- Published translations of books and/or articles
- Entries in reference books
- Contract reports and team research projects

- Presentations of papers at international, national, regional, state and local meetings
- Reviews of manuscripts for professional journals and/or academic presses
- Work in progress (including books, articles, other scholarly papers and submission of major grant applications, clearly documented in the file)
- Participation in international, national, regional, state and local meetings (chairing a panel, serving as discussant or respondent)
- Attendance at seminars, workshops, or other programs designed to provide advanced training in an area relevant to our discipline

Examples of scholarly activity in Public History

- Interpretations of scholarship delivered through museum exhibits, through films, radio or television programs or through contract research papers, policy statements, or other commissioned studies.
- DVDs, podcasts, film or video scripts, websites, catalogs, or other evidence of public programming (exhibits, tours, etc) in museums and other cultural and educational institutions
- Interpretive plans for historic sites
- Historic preservation and cultural resource management projects
- Successful grant applications and reports on such grants
- Archival documentation strategies

Teaching

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways. Syllabi and evaluations of teaching performance must be provided as part of the documentation for teaching. It is expected that student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. The Faculty Senate Form must be used for undergraduate classes. The departmental form must be used for graduate classes. Copies of syllabi (including printed copies of electronic syllabi) for all courses taught must be included in the files. Student evaluations must be included in packets clearly marked with the course and semester in which it was taught. The packets must include statistical summaries and the original questionnaires completed by the students. (WVU senate evaluations all include a statistical summary which is available on line and must be printed by the faculty member. The website is <http://labs.wvu.edu/sei/reports>.) For a given year's annual review, teaching evaluations should include the two most recently completed semesters for which evaluations are available. Because evaluations for the fall semester ordinarily arrive after the closing date for files, fall evaluations come from the previous calendar year. There are separate evaluation forms for graduate classes available in the History Department. There are no summary forms available for these graduate classes. It may be appropriate to provide grade distributions, samples of examinations and handouts, peer assessments of teaching, publications and/or presentations relating to teaching, evidence of the development of new courses, the enhancement of courses, syllabi and other descriptive materials. Appropriate documentation related to working with graduate students may also be included.

Faculty with an appointment in public history should document their work in the development, administration, and leadership of the Public History Program, including recruitment and facilitating, coordinating, and supervising internships, as well as advising and outreach efforts.

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. 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.

Additional documentation, such as the *Sources of Evaluation* listed below, is encouraged.

Sources of evaluation

- Course load and number of students
- Sample examinations, course handouts, etc.
- Graduate committees chaired
- Instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, manuals, outline resources)
- Advising
- Graduate committees served on
- New course proposals
- Special projects, such as independent study projects or guest lectures given in other departments
- Peer evaluations
- Letters from former students
- Data on student performance
- Participation in seminars or workshops designed to improve teaching
- Evidence related to the development and supervision of internships including, evaluations of internship programs by students, employers and outside evaluators.
- Lists of students placed in internships and of agencies and organizations taking interns; lists of paid internships; a log or other record of time spent in travel and supervision of internships
- Evidence of grants or contracts secured with and for students
- Records of collaborative projects carried out with students

Sources of evaluation of Public History

- Lists of students placed in internships and of agencies and organizations taking interns; lists of paid internships; a log or other record of time spent in travel and supervision of internships
- Evidence of grants or contracts secured with and for students
- Records of collaborative projects carried out with students

- Tracking and reporting the achievements of the program including enrollments and employment statistics for students
- Raising money for graduate fellowships either through grants or contract work
- Creation of partnerships with cultural and historical institutions throughout the region

SERVICE

Major service activities should be documented with letters from those who requested the service, but it is important to remember that the best documentation of service will also include a careful analysis of time and other resources required to provide the service. If a service activity resulted in a product — such as a working paper or policy guidelines, etc. — that product should be included in the annual folder. If a service activity was publicized in news media, copies of these articles may be provided as well.

Satisfactory performance in service is expected of department faculty members. Service requirements may be fulfilled through participation in a wide range of professional activities. Although faculty members' service will frequently be sought, it is also a faculty person's duty to seek service opportunities.

Following is a list (in no rank order of value) of some appropriate professional service activities.

To the Profession

- Office holding and committee membership in professional organizations within the discipline
- Peer review evaluations of articles and book manuscripts
- Peer review evaluations for grants, fellowships, or promotion/tenure at other universities, colleges, or institutions
- Editing, or significant participation in editing, a scholarly journal or book series.
- Management of online discussion groups (such as H-NET)
- Organizing, chairing or commenting on panels at professional meetings

To the State and the Community

- Professional activities in a public program
- Participation in university off-campus, non-credit programs
- Consultancies to public and private agencies for which you are not remunerated beyond a token honorarium.
- Development and direction of special educational programs for the public
- Membership on committees and commissions at the international, national, state, and local levels in a professional capacity
- Professional presentations to community groups, schools, and civic organizations

To the College and University

- Work on committees of the college and university
- Service as a representative of the university
- Faculty adviser to professional associations, honorary organizations, and other student organizations
- Contributions to other programs and courses in the university through interdisciplinary teaching, research, and other consultation

To the Department

- Service on departmental committees
- Providing administrative services to the department as chair, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Coordinator of Practicum and Coordinator of Colloquium
- Development of special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, and catalogs
- Involvement in program and curriculum development
- Organizing and/or coordinating colloquia and other departmentally-sponsored seminars
- Service as advisor to Phi Alpha Theta/History Club

Other:

- Service to accrediting agencies and other non-disciplinary, professional activities for which one is not remunerated beyond a token honorarium.
- Service to non-academic agencies performed specifically in the area of one's expertise.
- Creation of partnerships with cultural and historical institutions.

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.

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.

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 would 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 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."

Descriptor Criteria

Research:

Publication of a peer-reviewed book, peer-reviewed book chapters, refereed articles in disciplinary and related journals based upon historical research, and major grants will be designated as "excellent." Edited volumes may receive a designation of "excellent." Faculty may receive a designation as "excellent" for a book manuscript when it is forthcoming (unequivocally accepted by the press board), the year of publication, and in two subsequent years. Likewise, publication of more than one article or book chapter in a year will lead to an additional year(s) of credit in the absence of a publication or a substantial work of research. A rating of "excellent" for a journal article may be given either in the year in which it is unequivocally accepted for publication or in the year in which it appears in print, if those years differ. In their annual evaluation/activities reports, faculty members must indicate in which year they wish credit to be awarded for accepted journal articles. In the absence of a publication, a designation of excellent may be given for substantial activities from the list above, in particular if it is related to a new project.

Public history is a way of understanding and doing history that has important consequences for academic departments and faculty who become involved in the practice of public history. Public history legitimately uses an array of vehicles to communicate their research, analysis, and professional perspective to public audiences that goes much beyond the traditional scholarly monograph and refereed article. These include museum exhibits, government reports, project papers, slide/tape and videotape presentations, historic preservation plans, oral histories, cultural resource management reports, and National Register nominations. These public history products should be evaluated on the basis of their depth, significance and the extent to which they have been through a peer review process. Therefore if a faculty member's appointment is in public history, in addition to the above criteria for the designation of excellence, a single work or combination of other works that are the equivalent of a referred article will be designated as "excellent."

For all faculty, a designation of "good" will ordinarily require several examples of ongoing productivity from the above list of other scholarly activity. A single instance of an activity listed under "other scholarly activities and unaccompanied by any item from the "publication" list may support a "satisfactory" rating." "Satisfactory" is also appropriate where new scholarly activity is clearly under way and documented in the file. A faculty member's teaching and/or administrative assignment should be taken into account in this evaluation.

Teaching

Meritorious teaching must include good student evaluations. Other evidence of achievement includes but is not limited to the following: commitment and effectiveness in such activities as graduate examinations, graduate theses and dissertations; sponsorship of student organizations or teams; advising; curriculum development; instructional leadership and coordination; internship development and supervision; publications of textbooks or of research on instructional techniques or receipt of a grant for instructional purposes; involvement with

graduate students in presenting papers and/or in publishing; encouraging quality in the curriculum.

In the area of public history, in addition to classroom performance, meritorious teaching includes effectiveness in the development, administration and leadership of the Public History Program. Evidence of achievement includes recruitment, effective student advising, and the facilitating, coordination and supervising of quality internships, which are an extension of classroom teaching and a key component in the training of students. The formation of relationships with cultural and historical institutions in the region provide further evidence of effectiveness in teaching in public history.

Service:

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which 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 should submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment. For example, faculty whose specialization is public history, by the very nature of the field, will demonstrate a strong record of service to the community outside of the university, as well as the usual record of service to the department, school, and university. The director of the Public History Program must also demonstrate effective leadership of the program as part of his/her 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.

Evaluation of service is a measure of time and energy expended as well as the quality of the contribution. "Excellent" service goes substantially beyond what is expected of a faculty member in the ordinary course of duty and should be represented by an array of activities such as those listed above. "Good" service goes beyond what is expected of a faculty member in the ordinary course of duty. "Satisfactory" service constitutes the minimum amount of service activities expected of a faculty member in the ordinary course of duty. A faculty member's teaching and/or administrative assignment should be taken into account in this evaluation. A faculty member with service as an area of significant contribution will be expected to document his or her contributions more extensively.

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.

Prior to such action, the History Department also allows a faculty member to communicate with the chair of the department and/or the chair of the FEC if the faculty member feels that there are inaccuracies, errors, or omissions in his or her annual evaluation(s). After reviewing the faculty member's appeal, the chair and/or the FEC can provide a corrected document if either the chair and/or the FEC feel(s) a correction is warranted.

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.

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 History Department uses the college formula. 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.

$$40\% \text{ teaching} = 40 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 100$$

$$40\% \text{ research} = 40 \times 4.0 \text{ (rating of "Excellent")} = 160$$

$$\underline{20\% \text{ service} = 20 \times 1.0 \text{ (rating of "Satisfactory")} = 20}$$

$$\text{Merit Score} = 280$$

$$80\% \text{ teaching} = 80 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 200$$

$$\underline{20\% \text{ service} = 20 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 50}$$

$$\text{Merit Score} = 250$$

If the Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the department 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.

The receipt of performance-based pay in one or several years does not guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted or tenured. The department makes a clear distinction between the process of promotion and tenure review and the annual ratings that are used for performance-based pay increases. Exemplary performance in teaching must be matched by an appropriate record in research following the criteria laid down in this document in order for a faculty member to be promoted or tenured.

Fourth-Year Review

Tenure track faculty are subject to a more rigorous 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 West Virginia University 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.

Department committee and department 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.

Tenure and/or Promotion Policies and Procedures (including Emeritus Status)

Eligibility

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," or earlier if so identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the subsequent 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 personnel 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.

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 her/his publication record.

To be eligible for consideration for promotion, faculty are expected to present a record of annual reviews evaluating research, teaching, and service at or above "satisfactory," with a preponderance of "good" or "excellent" ratings in research and teaching and a preponderance of "satisfactory" or better ratings in service. This record shall have been established, in the case of persons seeking promotion and tenure in the critical year, since the faculty member's hiring. In the case of persons seeking discretionary promotion, a significant portion of this record shall have been established in the five years preceding the request for promotion.

Departmental Criteria for Promotion

In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion in rank, a faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and in teaching in the classroom or other settings. The term significant contribution in this context means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in instruction at West Virginia University and in research at West Virginia University and at peer research universities. The term "satisfactory" means performance which is comparable to that of a typical faculty member in a department similar in kind and quality at a peer research university. Peer research universities are determined by the department, which seeks to carefully identify valid peer institutions, subject to approval by the dean.

The department of history expects significant contributions ("excellent" or "good") in research and teaching and reasonable contribution or "satisfactory" performance in service for promotion and/or tenure. The committee and chair consider promotion and tenure as separate issues when and where applicable.

Consideration of required or discretionary personnel actions, i.e., retention, termination, advancement in rank or for tenure follows established university procedures and guidelines and conforms to the critical year identified in a faculty member's letter of appointment. Consideration of discretionary promotion in rank must be initiated by the faculty member. Faculty members will

be evaluated with or without credit for previous service on the basis of their letters of appointment. As specified in the university policies and procedures, up to three years credit towards tenure may be awarded. Such procedure must be approved by the dean, and the critical year identified in the letter of appointment.

In the area of **research**, for promotion from assistant to associate professor, or for the granting of tenure, the department expects scholarly publication. The department also recognizes that there is a fixed period of time during which faculty members may produce the publications needed for promotion to associate professor and the granting of tenure. The department expects assistant professors to publish a book or equivalents for promotion to associate professor. As a very general guideline, five articles published in refereed journals or equivalents would be required in place of a book. Works literally “in press” or unequivocally accepted for publication may be appropriate in support of the promotion to associate professor and/or a tenure decision.

For promotion from the rank of associate professor to professor, the department expects continued evidence of scholarly publication since the previous promotion. Members are usually expected to have written a book in addition to what was considered for promotion to associate professor. For promotion to full professor without a second book, the candidate must already have a book in their profile and must have produced a substantial and exceptional body of work beyond their dissertation and since their promotion to associate professor that has had a demonstrated impact on the field. Continued emphasis again is on quality, not merely the number of publications. In addition, for promotion to professor, faculty must demonstrate that they have a national reputation in their area(s) of specialization. This can be demonstrated by external evaluators, reviews of published works, evidence of grant support for research, evidence of service on editorial boards, presentation of papers at scholarly meetings, or other means as appropriate for that specialization. For promotion to the rank of professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works in print.

Faculty whose principal specialization is public history are also expected to take an active part in their profession—that is, applying history to practical problems outside an academic environment. While public historians do not necessarily produce standard-model academic literature, whether in book or journal form, it is important that they demonstrate a commitment to the advancement of both the academic and extra-academic sides of their field.

For promotion to associate professor or for the granting of tenure, a faculty member, whose principal specialization is public history may demonstrate significant contribution in research by publishing a book or the equivalent scholarly articles, as described above. For faculty with principal specialization in public history who do not publish a book equivalence may also include public history products. In that case, a minimum of five scholarly products including two peer reviewed research articles in refereed publications is expected. Applied scholarly public history products should be evaluated on the basis of their depth, significance and the extent to which they have been through a peer review process. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the quality and quantity of work behind his/her submissions. High quality applied history depends on well-grounded research which is made available to the public.

For promotion to full professor a faculty member whose principal specialization is public history must have produced a substantial and exceptional body of work beyond the dissertation and since promotion to associate professor. This may be demonstrated through publishing a book or research articles, as described above. Alternatively, faculty whose principal specialization is public history may produce a combination of scholarly applied public history products and research articles published in refereed publications. In addition, for promotion to professor, faculty whose principal specialization is public history must demonstrate that they have a national

reputation in their area(s) of specialization. For promotion to the rank of professor, evidence of scholarship must be supported with works in print.

Work in public history must demonstrate excellence to peers in the field of public history if it is to contribute to promotion and tenure. Academics who teach and do research and service in public history shall evaluate the quality of a public historian's accomplishments as a member of the university community. In addition, the work that the public historian does that is not public history shall be evaluated as is the work for any other member of the History Department. (The profession of public historians, academics who teach and do research and service in public history, has to evaluate the quality of a public historian's accomplishments as a member of the university community).

If a candidate who works in public history applies for tenure or promotion that area should be noted as being overlapping and inclusive of much that is also service. Outside evaluators should be asked to evaluate all aspects of the candidate's work from this perspective, including (but not limited to) letters from nonacademic public historians and professionals from other disciplines who are in a position to help document the candidate's work. Within these conditions, it will be necessary to document that the candidate's work has made a significant contribution to knowledge in the discipline.

In the area of **teaching**, significant contributions can be demonstrated by preparation of new courses, participation in panels and workshops, awards and testimonials, student committee or peer evaluations, or other methods deemed appropriate. While student evaluations are important, they are not the sole criterion for determining excellence in teaching. The department requires that faculty use university forms for undergraduate student evaluations, and the approved department form for graduate student evaluations. The department expects a continuous meritorious career in teaching, and encourages faculty to document their teaching by including in their files such documentation as teaching evaluations, copies of syllabi, supplemental materials prepared for classroom use (bibliographies, innovative assignments), the development or use of instructional technology and computer-assisted instruction, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications, studies of success rates of students taught, and other publications related to teaching.

Candidates whose principal specialization and teaching responsibility is in public history are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in developing, administering and leading a successful Public History Program. Significant contribution can be demonstrated by the conception and administration and supervision of a strong internship program that gives public history students practical experience. Public history faculty are also responsible for outreach efforts including establishing relationships and partnerships with cultural and historical institutions throughout the region and if possible securing support for graduate fellowships and internships through grants or contract work.

Evaluation of a Teaching faculty appointment is 80% teaching and 20% service. Normally, no research is assigned. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For Teaching faculty, this is defined as expectation that the annual file include systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

For Teaching faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of classroom teaching excellence, the file is expected to show evidence of significant 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 area of **service**, reasonable contribution with satisfactory performance can be demonstrated by documentation of service on committees, speaking engagements, and editorial reviewing through appointment letters, acknowledgment letters, newspaper clippings, or other means as appropriate for that activity. These various forms of documentation of service should be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

The department recognizes that West Virginia University Faculty Evaluation Guidelines include a provision to modify the areas of significant contribution for tenured faculty, noting that such modification should be initiated primarily to assist the department and the college in achieving their mission and goals. However, the Department of History recognizes the primacy of research in the discipline of history and the importance of excellent teaching. Therefore, tenured faculty members in history are normally expected to continue to demonstrate significant contributions in research and teaching for subsequent promotion. In an instance in which a faculty member has service approved as an area of significant contribution there must be more extensive documentation of service contributions. The MOU effecting this adjustment will identify both the types and quantity of service expected and the ways in which the quality of that service will be measured.

Per WVU policy, when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant area of contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to West Virginia University.

Decisions on tenure and promotion are based on materials in the faculty files and on comments and evaluations requested by the committee and the department chair. Access to the file and responsibility for maintaining it are defined by university regulations. Faculty members are encouraged to supplement their data sheets with supporting materials such as copies of publications, reviews, teacher evaluations, and evidence of service which should be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

The department follows university and college procedures in seeking external evaluations of research for those faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure.

The department will utilize an optional system of peer review as part of the process of evaluating teaching. Any faculty member may request this review as part of the evaluation process. It will be carried out by the chair of the department or the chair of the personnel committee. Written comments will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Promotion Procedures

When seeking promotion, a faculty member must present a file of his or her work that includes all of the Annual Updates. Faculty members may create an executive file which includes copies from the annual files to highlight the faculty member's accomplishments in research, teaching and service. They are responsible for preparing their files carefully so as to present the case for tenure and/or promotion.

External Evaluation Procedures:*Selection of External Reviewers:*

The department adopts the college's procedures for external evaluation of scholarship, employing the following procedures: By September 1 of the academic year in which the faculty member seeks promotion or when a faculty member is in his/her critical year, the chair of the department will ask the faculty evaluation (or personnel) committee to prepare and submit a list of at least six persons to serve as external reviewers of the applicant's scholarship. The faculty evaluation committee may request a brief description of the applicant's areas of scholarly emphasis and methodologies to aid in creating such a list. At the same time, the applicant will be asked to prepare a similar list of at least six persons to serve as external reviewers of his/her scholarship, and to submit the list to the chair.

The minimum qualifications to serve as an external evaluator are normally 1) that the individual so identified hold the academic rank to which the applicant aspires or a higher rank; and, 2) that the individual be a member of a History Department with a Ph.D. granting program or its equivalent generally recognized to be at least the peer of WVU's doctoral program. In special cases, individuals who do not hold an academic appointment or who are in departments other than history may be consulted if their areas of expertise are widely recognized in the profession and of the nature to qualify them to evaluate the work of an applicant for tenure and/or promotion. Such exceptions must be approved by the dean.

In selecting external reviewers for faculty whose principal assignment is in public history the faculty evaluation committee and the department chair must recognize that a file that includes applied scholarly public history products must be evaluated by peers in the field of public history who may or may not have academic appointments. However, the majority of external reviewers must be faculty who are in position to evaluate the quality of the public historian's accomplishments as a member of the university community. Frequently, faculty who work in public history integrate research and service work. Outside evaluators should be asked to evaluate all aspects of the candidate's work from this perspective, in assessing significant contribution to knowledge in the discipline.

Both lists should include the following information about the individuals listed: name; rank; current affiliation; and as much contact information, including addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses, as can be readily obtained. A brief description of the proposed reviewer's scholarly profile should also be provided. The applicant's list, furthermore, should include a statement concerning the applicant's professional and/or personal relationship (or the lack of any such relationship) with the reviewer.

The applicant will view the faculty evaluation committee's list of proposed reviewers in the chair's office and comment on each as he/she feels necessary. These comments will be recorded, the record signed and dated by the applicant. These comments should be taken into account when selecting the final list of reviewers, and when the external reviews are read by the faculty evaluation committee and the chair. The chair will select the names of a sufficient number of appropriate external evaluators from each list to ensure receipt of at least four evaluations. The faculty member is not informed of the names in the final list of external evaluators. The final list, and the evaluation solicitation letter, are then forwarded to the dean for approval.

Upon approval by the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, the chair will contact reviewers, gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College, and mail by October 1 a packet of the materials to be

reviewed. The applicant will prepare the packet of materials for review according to instructions below.

Preparation of the Packet for Review:

The packet for review should contain only materials that contribute to the record for the current review. Materials considered in a previous review or proscribed for consideration in the letter of agreement should not be included in the packet. An inventory of the materials offered for review should be included, and if it is necessary to indicate certain information about a work of scholarship, such information may be noted on the inventory. The applicant should provide an up-to-date *curriculum vitae* for the packet. Where it may be necessary to submit book-length studies for the review, the applicant must provide sufficient copies (usually six) for reviewer's packets at his/her expense.

Materials for the packet for review must be supplied to the chair in a timely fashion, and in no case must they be received later than September 30.

Emeriti Faculty

The department of history follows the university's guidelines for eligibility for emeritus/a status for retiring faculty and uses the university's guidelines for nominating faculty for this recognition.

Sabbatical Leave

The department of history follows the university's guidelines for eligibility for sabbatical leaves and for the process of applying for sabbatical leaves. The department chair makes recommendations to the dean following review of the application by the personnel committee.

Effective Date

These guidelines will be effective upon approval of the Provost's Office and will apply for the evaluation cycle immediately following approval.

Procedure for Modification of This Document

A member of the history 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 department faculty. If the faculty approve 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 Entries

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	1/20/09
A-08	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Personnel Committee	11/3/09
A-09	11/6/09	Annual review letter from Chair	11/5/09

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

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 SEI form	Fall, 2008
T-06	12/15/08	26 student evaluations of SE 340, Section 2 using SEI form	Fall, 2008
T-07	12/15/08	10 student evaluations of SE 640 using departmental form	Fall, 2008

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

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

Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

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	9/15/08	Memo from Chair appointing to Departmental Curriculum Committee	9/10/08

Appendix 2

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University

- A. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to teach must be able to:
1. Communicate effectively with students;
 2. Provide feedback to students, including but not limited to the timely return of assignments, papers, and examinations;
 3. Maintain an instructional environment that is conducive to student learning, based upon open communication and mutual respect;
 4. Disseminate knowledge and information at a level appropriate to the level at which the subject is taught;
 5. Stimulate critical thinking;
 6. Demonstrate intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students.

B1. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to conduct research must be able to:

1. Disseminate their research findings in appropriate venues;
2. Prepare grant proposals that can be understood by the potential reader;
3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in research activities;
7. Engage in research that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.

B2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in scholarly activity must be able to:

1. Disseminate their scholarly findings in appropriate venues;
2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;

5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in scholarly activities;
7. Engage in scholarly activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.

B3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in creative activity must be able to:

1. Disseminate the results of creative activity in appropriate venues;
2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
4. Undertake a continuing program of creative activity;
5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary projects when possible;
6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in creative activities;
7. Engage in creative activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.

C1. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the institution must be able to:

1. Contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college;
2. Take part in the department, college, and institutional shared governance process;
3. Assume an obligation to the unit's future;
4. Accept the expectation to help solve problems and respond to special needs in order to help with the future of the degree granting program.

C2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the profession must be able to:

1. Seek opportunities to serve appropriate professional organizations at a variety of levels, including but not limited to state, regional, national, and international organizations;
2. Represent the interests of West Virginia University in ways that reflect positively upon the institution.

C3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the external community must be able to:

1. Make contributions that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified;

2. Seek opportunities that apply the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society.

D. Faculty members at West Virginia University should strive to integrate all aspects of their assignment so that each dimension of the mission affects and informs the other dimensions.

NOTE: Some of these expectations could have ADA implications regarding providing accommodation.