

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
Department of Mathematics

Approved by the Department November 2010

Approved by the Office of the Provost June 30, 2011

Policies and procedures for faculty evaluation in the Department of Mathematics are governed by five documents:

- (1) WVU Board of Governors Policy 2
- (2) West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluations provided annually by the Office of the Provost.
- (3) West Virginia University Calendar for Annual Review of all Faculty provided annually by the Office of the Provost.
- (4) Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure, Eberly College of Arts and Sciences.
- (5) Performance-based Pay Policy, Department of Mathematics
- (6) This document.

Should a conflict occur between this document and a document (1), (2), or (4), the document (1), (2), or (4) will take precedence in that order.

The purpose of this document is to set forth faculty evaluation guidelines and procedures for the Department of Mathematics that are supplemental to University and College guidelines. Amendments to this document must be approved by majority vote of promotion-eligible faculty in the Mathematics Department, to include Tenured and Tenure-track faculty, Clinical, Teaching, Research and other faculty who are by terms of their appointment letters promotion-eligible.

In the event that a faculty member cannot be present to cast a vote, the faculty member may email their vote to the Department office manager who will then add that vote to the count, provided this email originates from a Department or University email account assigned to that faculty member.

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, including Teaching Assistant Professors and Teaching Instructors, responsibilities are normally 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, with classroom instruction or other assignments 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 100% teaching, but are limited to a maximum of .80 FTE.

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 participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The allocation of a faculty member's teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. 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 are to be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty Personnel File. The primary instrument for evaluating faculty is the personnel file.

The Department's annual productivity report will be completed by each faculty member. This form is distributed to faculty at the beginning of the Fall semester and is also available from the Chair of the FEC or Department. The productivity report should contain a comprehensive listing of activities to be considered in the evaluation, with documentation provided elsewhere in the personnel file.

The updated curriculum vita and bibliography will be in the form specified by the Department. This form is also available from the Chair of the FEC or Department.

Faculty must annually update personnel files with documentation of activities completed during the year under review. Documentation expectations are described later in this document. On December 31 of each year the file shall be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Each faculty personnel file must have an inventory of its contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, all faculty files and file inventories in the Eberly College will maintain four separate inventories: (1) the administrative file; (2) the teaching file; (3) the research file; (4) the service file. File materials should be organized in a folder or folders in a way that clearly indicates the division of documentation into these areas and not permanently bound.

1. The administrative file includes (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that 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 or Dean may wish to include, provided that such additions follow appropriate University and Board of Governors guidelines and processes.

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. The research file consists of reprints/preprints of works (preferably reprints) listed in the curriculum vita or productivity report, copies of research grant proposals, and copies of reviews of the faculty member's work. When a faculty member reports the acceptance of a paper (rather than its appearance), he/she should place in the personnel file a letter of acceptance for publication from the journal. A faculty member who reports funded research or funded academic activity should file proper documents from the funding agency or the OSP. The documents should identify the nature and source of the award, whether or not the faculty member is a

principal investigator, and what is the duration and amount of the award. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is highly recommended.

Materials submitted as electronic documents may be added to the file provided they are submitted on a medium that is suitable for retention in the file location. Each document should be tagged with its inventory number.

Faculty should document their own efforts and successes to the extent possible in the annual productivity report and in the faculty file.

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

Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). The FEC consists of four tenured faculty members elected by faculty members of the department and one tenured member appointed by the Chair. Voting is by tenured and tenure-track faculty and those faculty with appointments whose title includes the prefixes of “Teaching”, “Clinical”, or “Research”. The four elected members are at the rank of associate professor or full professor, with at least two members being at the rank of full professor. The appointed member can be from either rank. Each year, two members are elected to serve two years each; at least one member elected each year must be a full professor. The appointed member serves one year. No faculty member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive years on the FEC. No faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure can serve on the FEC. The FEC elects its own chair.

Two elections to fill the positions on the FEC described above are held in the last four weeks of the Spring semester and are conducted by the FEC chair of the current year. In the first election, all eligible faculty members are included on the ballot, and one member is elected. If an associate professor is elected on the first ballot, then in the second election only the eligible full professors are included on the ballot. For each election, if on the first ballot no one receives a majority of the votes cast, subsequent ballots will consist of the person who has the most votes and continuing with the next highest number of votes including ties until a majority of those voting are represented. Voting will continue until someone receives a majority of the votes cast. Repeated ties will be resolved by a meeting of the Chair and the tenured and tenure-track (probationary) faculty. Immediate¹ elections will be held as required to fill vacancies caused by members unable to complete their terms on the Committee.

Annual Evaluations. The FEC and the Chair of the Mathematics Department evaluate all faculty annually. The FEC prepares written evaluations of every faculty member; the Chair, who prepares an independent assessment of each faculty member’s activities, reviews these evaluations. The evaluations consist of the following: an evaluative summary of the faculty

¹Within the first week of the Academic Year following notification of inability to complete.

member's activity as described in the member's Productivity Report and supported by evidence in the personnel file for the review period in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service; and a recommendation for or against retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion in rank, as appropriate. Summative statements may also be included, as suggested or mandated in University guidelines. Evaluations are carried out based on the faculty member's assignment, within the context of their appointment letter and any subsequent modifications.

The FEC's report is signed and dated by all the members of the FEC (except that members do not sign their own report); the signature shows that each member of the FEC has read the report and concurs with the accuracy of the vote as reported. Recommendations and other decisions by the FEC are by majority vote. The descriptors used in the annual evaluation will be assigned by a committee majority, except that for a member of the FEC, the descriptor used in a given area will be the highest rating acceptable to two or more of the four other members. Individual FEC members may provide minority statements in the recommendation, which will be included in the FEC evaluation report; the number of FEC members who support a minority report will be recorded on the minority report.

Evaluation Period. The evaluation period is for one calendar year related to one's assignment and performance, and will also be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed. The departmental deadline for the updating of personnel files is the last business day on or before December 31 of the evaluation year. All faculty are expected to comply with this deadline (except second year faculty for whom Option 1 is appropriate under University guidelines). Material placed in the personnel file after the departmental deadline will be considered as part of the faculty member's evaluation for the next year.

Probationary faculty will complete a *preliminary* Annual Productivity Report by November 1 of each year and will subsequently meet with the Chair to discuss their progress before the file closes on December 31. This preliminary report will not be finalized or added to the file until the faculty member has approved its final form. For faculty who are to be considered for promotion and/or tenure, all material submitted before file closure will be considered in their evaluation.

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

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

developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are appropriate.

Meritorious work should be appropriately documented; for example, if information is provided for one course when one's assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating for the entire assignment should be questioned. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to "satisfactory" or lower is appropriate. 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."

Professional Activities. Faculty are evaluated on their activities in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Some activities may fit into more than one category. An accepted university adjective will be assigned in each category defined by the letter of appointment; the abbreviation N/A, (not applicable) may be used in a yearly evaluation in cases (such as sabbaticals) where a written memorandum of understanding exists which sets forth a different basis of evaluation.

Teaching. Teaching includes the dissemination of knowledge, the stimulation of critical thinking, supervision of independent study or research, classroom lecture, the introduction of innovative methods and courses, practicum instruction, and various activities that are commonly called mentoring (mentoring involves, for example, the guidance and advising of students). Faculty members are encouraged to provide evidence of their teaching effectiveness in a variety of ways such as those identified in documents (1), (2) and (4) .

Consistent with the Eberly College Guidelines, the Department of Mathematics avoids sole or excessive reliance upon the student evaluation forms provided by the Faculty Senate. Both clarity of presentation and maintaining the necessary standard for each course are equally essential. Peer review by faculty in the Department of Mathematics will be taken into consideration by the Department in the evaluation of teaching and will be done in any year requested by the individual to be reviewed.

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 expected that student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period, with student comments, will be included in the file for annual review. Evaluations should be provided through the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) system or other student feedback instruments. Self-administered evaluations should be administered under the same conditions as the SEI's, with an accompanying form (available from the Chair) verifying those conditions and signed by a disinterested party such as a student or faculty member. Faculty who expect to seek tenure and/or promotion or to be awarded descriptors above the level of "satisfactory" will be expected to present a comprehensive annual record of student evaluations. This evidence will be

interpreted within the context of other factors such as class composition, course requirements, individual teaching style, possible limitations of student feedback in assessing teaching effectiveness, and context provided by the faculty member for the file. Student feedback can, and should, be complemented by other evidence of contributions to teaching in any of the many forms described in faculty evaluation guidelines, and such evidence can carry substantial weight as part of the evaluation. It is expected that syllabi from a representative sample of courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the personnel file.

External funding that supports improvements in teaching and learning, and the development of innovative materials, approaches, courses, or curricula will be considered in a highly positive light by the FEC, as will similar, though generally more modest, unfunded efforts by faculty. Evidence of impact or effectiveness will help in evaluating the outcomes.

Mentoring students through advising, research supervision or independent study is also crucial to the functioning of the Department's academic programs, and so represents another particular area of focus of faculty efforts, and their assessment in the annual evaluation.

Eligible Teaching faculty who are seeking promotion, in addition to documenting outstanding classroom teaching, should build a supporting record by engaging in activities that demonstrate significant professional development as educators, and by making important contributions to the Department's courses and curricula. 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.

Research. Research involves the creation and synthesis of results which advance the state of knowledge in mathematics or mathematics education, the creation of new mathematical approaches to the understanding and explanation of phenomena or learning, the development of new mathematical insights, and the application of mathematical knowledge and expertise in interdisciplinary research. Evaluation of research will be based on quality and quantity. The quality of research is of prime importance.

The primary means by which faculty make research contributions to the profession and document the quality of research is through publication of their results in refereed journals appropriate to the discipline. The rigorous standards common to high quality peer-reviewed journals serve as a reliable indicator of research quality and its acceptance within the discipline. Results of research may also be reported for example, in books, chapters in books, publication in refereed conference proceedings, or through patents.

Interdisciplinary research, and research in mathematics education, often involve such other types of research venues or products. In such cases, when not widely known, faculty may

provide context or supporting materials that speak to the significance of the venue and/or the particular research being considered.

Primary weight to research papers will be assigned the year the paper is reported as appearing in print although significant credit can also be applied upon unambiguous acceptance, particularly in cases of promotion.

Further indications of the quality of research and status as a researcher are provided through documented evidence such as impact on other researchers, evaluation by external experts in the field, funding of research grants, invited talks at professional meetings or colloquia, and awards for research.

Research grants and other avenues of external funding have grown in importance within mathematics in general, and among Department faculty in particular, and are a specific expectation for faculty in some cases. As such, successful grant activity leading to significant research products will be considered as a highly positive outcome in evaluating research, within the context of the faculty member's expectations as indicated in the initial letter of appointment or subsequent agreements. Competitive grants at the national level are one of the strongest indicators of a body of significant research accomplishments and of the faculty member's national reputation. Overall, grant activity can be a significant part of a faculty member's research record, although the essential importance of research publications within that record remains.

Because of the considerable time lag between research activity and its ultimate publication and impact, and the variability of research projects, the evaluation of research, while emphasizing current year activity, will generally consider activity over the past three years.

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

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, as discussed in the teaching section.

Service. Service means administrative or professional service to the department, the college, the university, the state, the nation, and the profession. Service includes the following: service on committees; service to the educational system at WVU or other institutions and

organizations; outreach activities that promote mathematics in education or in industry; talks at departmental seminars and colloquia; talks on service projects at state, national and international conferences; organizing seminars; refereeing for journals and granting agencies; editorial work; obtaining grant support for service or professional outreach activities; and extra effort with students, either formally or informally, whether or not the student receives credit for the activity. The quality and impact of service activities, particularly those that are not commonly known, can be documented using appropriate evidence.

As in the case of teaching and research, external grants for service activities allow the Department to extend its efforts in directions or to extents that would not otherwise be available using its own resources. Grants also attest to the quality of the proposed activities and their potential impact. As such, grants for service, and their resulting impact, can represent a particularly significant contribution in this area. We also recognize the contributions of faculty whose service activities are well beyond those accounted for in their normal assignment.

Tenure-track (Probationary) faculty will normally be assigned a light service role on a temporary basis to provide time for the development of their research program and instructional contributions.

Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation. According to University guidelines [<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4] faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the Faculty Evaluation Committee 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.

Performance-Based Salary Policy. Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations. 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.

Every unit is required to develop a performance-based salary policy that must be approved by the Dean of the college. The Departments of Mathematics' policy is described in the document, *Performance-based Pay Policy, Department of Mathematics*.

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

Department FEC and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. An assessment of progress toward tenure may also be a part of this annual review. 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.

Promotion and/or Tenure Review. In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual's sixth year on the faculty, the "critical year," as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure track faculty 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 their publication record.

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 personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

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 if recommended by the FEC and the Chair for further consideration, the promotion-eligible Faculty as defined at the beginning of this document will vote on the proposal as an amendment to this document. 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.