

Substantive changes to ECAS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines:

Updated 10/30/25

1. Sponsored Research Expectations

a. Lines 107-129:

- i. Change “Specific Grant Expectations” to “Sponsored Research Expectations”
- ii. Remove: “Depending on the size and nature of the research startup support, the appointment letter may specify additional requirements for tenure. For Tenure-Track faculty members with intermediate startup budgets (about \$50,000 - \$250,000 in 2016 and subject to change), an award of tenure requires that the individual secure at least 1 significant grant as principal investigator or major co-investigator with the grantee West Virginia University or its affiliates. For Tenure-Track faculty members with high startup budgets (at or above \$250,000 in 2016 and subject to change), tenure requires at least 2 significant grants. If the grant requirement is not met, tenure may be recommended if the individual has accomplished achievements in research that, in the judgment of the Dean of the Eberly College, are equivalent to meeting the grant requirement”
- iii. Add: “Faculty are encouraged to seek funding for their research and scholarly pursuits. In disciplines where significant investments are required to conduct research, successful acquisition of awards is expected. Specific criteria for the pursuit of sponsored research will be developed at the unit level and updated every five years. Faculty appointments should contain specific expectations for research funding. If awards are expected but are not successfully acquired, promotion and/or tenure may nevertheless be recommended if the individual has obtained scholarly accomplishments that offset sponsored research expectations.
- iv. This section is re-written to de-emphasize specific dollar amounts when evaluating sponsored research expectations, and also clarify when those expectations apply.
- v. This also contains an option to nevertheless award promotion/tenure if specific criteria are not met.

- b. Lines 851-861: Add “In disciplines where significant investments are required to conduct research, successful acquisition of awards is expected. Specific criteria for the pursuit of sponsored research will be developed at the unit

level and updated every five years. Faculty appointments should contain specific expectations for research funding.”

- i. Context: This is a change that corresponds to Section II(A)(2-3) above regarding expectations for sponsored research funding.
- c. Line 864: Change “grant expectations” to “this expectation”
 - i. Context: “The departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Chair must consider the faculty member’s progress in meeting this expectation as part of annual, pre-promotion, and career evaluations of research.”
 - ii. Corresponds to sponsored research funding change above

2. Appointment of lecturers

- a. Line 237: Remove “and Senior Lecturers”
 - i. Context: “Some are appointed to meet short-term instructional needs without anticipating a long-term commitment; these include Visiting faculty, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers.”
 - ii. Change to reflect current college practice, Sr. Lecturers are a category no longer used by the college
- b. Line 257: Change “.80 FTE – 4 courses” to “0.60 FTE – three courses”
 - i. Context: “Lecturer positions are renewable part-time teaching appointments. Lecturers are hired to address teaching needs in a particular semester or year. Compensation is defined on a per course basis, normally not to exceed .60 FTE – three courses or the equivalent per semester.”
 - ii. Change to reflect current college practice
- c. Lines 260-264: Remove “Lecturers for whom there is confirmed expectation of employment across the year at 6 courses or greater (3:3 or 4:2), should be offered benefits-eligible appointments” and “Appointment letters for benefits-eligible Lecturers come from the Dean.” to reflect current college practice
- d. Line 266-267: Remove “Applications are accepted at any time and kept on file for 2 years” to reflect current college practice
- e. Lines 269-287: Remove section 3 on “Senior Lecturers,” a category no longer used by the college; corresponding renumber of “adjunct faculty” to section 3 (from section 4).
- f. Lines 155, 291-292: Remove “or Senior Lecturers” to correspond to other changes (*Change in response to feedback from faculty*)

3. Demonstration of teaching

- a. Lines 447-448: Add “Additionally, the College encourages faculty with a teaching assignment to participate in a peer-evaluation.”
- b. Line 452: Add “and response to student feedback” to “In particular, departments are encouraged to require assessment of learning outcomes and response to student feedback.”

4. FEC selection suggestion

- a. Lines 603-605: Change “again, the College suggests selection by faculty vote” to “the College encourages a selection process that ensures equal opportunity for participation”

5. College FEC changes

- a. Lines 705-706: Change “makes its recommendations to the Dean” to “presents its findings and makes recommendations to the entire committee. As a whole, the college committee then votes and makes its recommendations to the Dean”
 - i. Context: “Each subcommittee presents its findings and makes recommendations to the entire committee. As a whole, the college committee then votes and makes its recommendations to the Dean based on the evidence in the Faculty Evaluation File as forwarded, plus materials generated as a consequence of the faculty evaluation process.”
 - ii. This concerns how the college FEC operates and is intended to introduce committee members to cases from outside their disciplines and subcommittees.
- b. Lines 712-713: Add “the committee” and change “of the subcommittee” to “of either”
 - i. Context: “An exception to this rule is allowed if the committee, subcommittee or a member of either needs to report an apparent violation of WVU, Eberly College, or departmental procedures.”
 - ii. Goes along with proceeding change to procedure.
- c. Lines 733-739: change “ideal” to “required” and add “certain circumstances may arise where a member may need to participate remotely by electronic means. A request to do so may granted at the discretion of the Dean or the subcommittee chair,” remove “at the joint discretion of the Department Chair

and the Committee Chair, a minority of the members may participate remotely by electronic means. Remote members must be able to participate fully – that is, they must be able to see and hear what the physically present members see and hear, and they in turn must be seen and heard by the physically present members”

- i. Context: “Because of its importance in promoting faculty development and achievement, the deliberations of each College subcommittee are expected to involve the full participation of every member of the subcommittee. Although the physical presence of each member is required, certain circumstances may arise where a member may need to participate remotely by electronic means. A request to do so may granted at the discretion of the Dean or the subcommittee chair.”
- ii. Remove outdated language; full electronic participation is assumed if permitted.

6. Teaching faculty criteria for promotion to professor (*Change in response to feedback from faculty*)

a. Lines 972-990

- i. Remove: “For promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evidence showing that professional colleagues, both within the university and nationally or internationally, acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member’s programmatic contributions to teaching in the discipline. Departmental evaluations can document the judgment of colleagues within the university. To document the judgments of colleagues nationally or internationally, the candidate for Teaching Professor has two options: (a) The file includes evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's programmatic contributions in teaching from persons external to WVU, as described in Section IX of these Guidelines, and/or (b) the file includes a record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature, and/or a record of pedagogically related presentations at professional conferences of national or international stature.”
- ii. Add: “For promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor, in addition to documentation of significant curricular and/or programmatic contributions, the digital evaluation file must contain evidence of at

least two of the following: 1) nominations for, or receipt of, awards that focus on an aspect of teaching (including advising), either internal or external to the university, 2) a record of pedagogically related presentations at professional conferences of national or international stature, 3) a record of publishing pedagogically related articles in peer-reviewed journals of national or international stature, or 4) professional colleagues external to the university acknowledge the quality and impact of the faculty member's programmatic contributions to the teaching discipline."

- iii. Context: Criteria for promotion to teaching professor
- iv. The College received feedback which stated that due to the requirement that national or international reputation must be shown through either external reviews or a record of publication, for teaching faculty who have no research assignment or opportunity to publish, this effectively constituted a de facto requirement for external reviews of teaching faculty, which is prohibited by the new University guidelines. The College has responded by adding additional baseline criteria for promotion to teaching professor. While external evaluations are still an option, they are not required, either explicitly or implicitly.

7. Service Faculty

- a. Lines 1021-1022: Change "and teaching. At least reasonable contributions are required in research" to "and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment."
 - i. Context: "For a Service faculty member in the Eberly College, promotion depends on significant contributions in service and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment."
 - ii. This will resolve a potential inconsistency with Section II(D) of these guidelines, which states that "To be promoted, significant contributions are required in the area of service and at least reasonable contributions are required in the other area(s) of assignment."

8. External Evaluators

- a. Lines 1090-1093: Add "The purpose of external evaluation is to have candidates for promotion and/or tenure evaluated by experts in their field

with regard to the impact and quality of their work. Assessments as to whether the candidate would receive promotion and/or tenure at the external evaluator's institution are not required.”

- i. Context: This corresponds to the new University guidelines requirement that faculty must be evaluated against absolute criteria, not against recently promoted peers at this or peer institutions.
- ii. This is a change related to the University document's prohibition of comparison to recently promoted peers.