

Approved by faculty August 24, 2010
Approved by the Office of the Provost September 28, 2010¹

West Virginia University
Department of Physics
Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
The Appointment Letter	2
Annual Assignment	3
The Faculty Evaluation File	3
Annual Performance Reviews by the Faculty Evaluation Committee	4
Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation	7
Performance-Based Salary Committee	7
Fourth-Year Review	8
Reviews for Tenure and/or Promotion	8

Note: The topics are arranged in the order in which a new faculty member would encounter them in his/her career. In particular, faculty will be eligible for performance-based salary increases well before they receive a fourth-year review or a promotion review.

¹ The following changes were approved by the Provost's Office on April 20, 2012:
a. Adding "filing patents, patent applications, and intellectual property disclosures" under "Evaluation of Research" (page 6).
b. Replacing "personnel file" with "evaluation file."

Introduction

The Department of Physics Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements two documents: the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure*. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the Department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the Departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, 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 Department of Physics faculty evaluation process serves a variety of purposes: to guide faculty toward enhanced success; to clarify annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term goals of the department; and to provide consistent and clear criteria for both performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations.

The faculty evaluation process includes several components. Among them are the letter of appointment, the annual assignment, the faculty evaluation file, and annual performance reviews.

Tenure track faculty as well as Teaching, Clinical, and Research faculty are eligible for promotion from assistant to associate to full professor. 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. 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; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations in one's letter of appointment by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty 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. Appointments that are designated as research-intensive appointments may be 30% teaching, 50% research, and 20% service.

For Teaching faculty, normal responsibilities will be 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.

For Research faculty, normal responsibilities will be 100% research. Although Research faculty may teach, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as lead investigator in externally funded research. In accordance with Board of Governors Policy 2, classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary. Teaching must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. There may be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are normally 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 Tenure-track faculty, Teaching faculty, Clinical faculty, and Research faculty participate in formalized annual assignment planning.

The initial 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 evaluation file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

The Faculty Evaluation File

Faculty must annually update evaluation files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. The file shall be closed for the review period on the final business day of the calendar year. Only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Each faculty evaluation file must have an inventory of its contents, to ensure the integrity of the file. Effective with the 2009-2010 academic year, all faculty files and file inventories in the Eberly College will 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 folders and not bound.

1. The administrative file should include (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.

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 inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is highly recommended.

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 evaluation 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.

Annual Performance Reviews by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The annual review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. All tenure-track and tenured faculty receive annual evaluations as do all Teaching faculty, Clinical faculty, and Research faculty.

Recommendations for performance-based salary increases are made by a separate faculty committee and by the Chair as described on page 7.

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

The Faculty Evaluation Committee in the Department of Physics consists of all tenured members of the Department of Physics, but excludes any faculty member being considered for promotion, the department representative to the Eberly College Promotion and Tenure Committee, any member of the University Board of Governors, the Chair of the Department, and any person holding a position in the Eberly College administration or the University administration. Tenured faculty will not be members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee during any semester in which they are on sabbatical, medical leave, professional development leave, or on leave resulting from the Intergovernmental Personnel Act.

The chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is selected by the committee. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Members must recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating anyone for whom there may be a conflict of interest such as their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation.

Assistant professors are evaluated by the entire committee. Associate professors are evaluated by the full professors on the committee. Full professors are evaluated by the full professors on the committee.

All members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting.

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

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.

Both “excellent” and “good” are meritorious ratings. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to “satisfactory” or lower is appropriate.

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

Faculty should document their own efforts and successes to the extent possible in the annual productivity reports and in the faculty evaluation file. It is incumbent upon faculty to provide evidence in the file that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and that informs the committee of the quality of their work.

Private consulting outside the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Faculty are encouraged to work with the Office of Sponsored Programs to structure consulting work as a contract to the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in the annual assignment document.

Evaluation of Teaching. Teaching in the Department of Physics includes lecture courses, laboratory courses, computer-based courses, distance learning courses, and research supervision of undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral students. The significance of a particular teaching activity is not determined by the number of students served. It is recognized that research supervision and mentoring of individual students is particularly time-consuming in physics.

Consistent with the Eberly College Guidelines, the Department of Physics avoids sole or excessive reliance upon the student evaluation forms provided by the Faculty Senate. This is particularly important in the Department of Physics because physics courses challenge students to a level to which they may not be accustomed. Both clarity of presentation and maintaining the necessary standard for each course are equally essential. Peer review by faculty in the Department of Physics will be given significant weight by the Department in the evaluation of teaching. Peer review of assistant professors will be done each year. Peer review of others 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. It is expected that syllabi for all courses taught during the review period will be submitted to the evaluation file.

Research faculty assignments (100% research) normally include only teaching directly related to their research program: i.e. guiding those graduate, post-doctoral and undergraduate students who are directly involved in the research faculty’s research program. If the research faculty member performs other teaching activities (e.g. classroom teaching), these will not normally be considered when evaluating their record.

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 priorities of the Department, College, or University. Teaching faculty that do not meet these expectations, as determined by the annual review process, will be given a one-year terminal contract.

Evaluation of Research. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to establish and maintain an active research program in physics consistent with the terms of their letter of appointment. An active research program is one that regularly reports scientific results in refereed journals. Other evidence of an active research program may include, but is not limited to: pursuing, and ultimately obtaining, adequate financial support from external sources to carry out research; developing research projects for students and postdocs that result in publications; filing patents, patent applications, and intellectual property disclosures; being invited to give external talks about one's current research; presenting research results in scientific conferences; receiving professional recognition for recent scientific accomplishments; and receiving positive citations in the scientific literature.

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the department. It is expected that faculty will include in the file print copies of all publications and patent-related materials (included commercial licenses) to be counted for the review period. For critical year review, the unit may accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance of the publication.

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 in order to meet the "reasonable contribution" standard.

Research faculty (100% research) are expected to establish and maintain an active, externally funded research program in physics consistent with the terms of their letter of appointment. An active research program is one that regularly reports scientific results in refereed journals. Other evidence of an active research program should include, but is not limited to: pursuit and ultimate attainment of adequate financial support of their research and of their position; development of research projects for students and postdocs resulting in publications; invitations to give external talks about their current research; presentation of research results at scientific conferences; citations in the scientific literature; and professional recognition of scientific accomplishments. Research faculty that do not meet these expectations, as determined by the annual review process, will normally be given a one-year terminal appointment.

Evaluation of Service. The Department of Physics values service to the Department, the College, and the University; service to the physics profession (e.g., refereeing papers, reviewing proposals, organizing conferences); and service in representing the profession and the University in the broader community. A meritorious (i.e. beyond satisfactory) service contribution normally requires evidence of leadership in assigned service responsibilities.

When evaluating Research Faculty, the Department of Physics values service to the physics profession such as refereeing papers, reviewing proposals, and organizing conferences.

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 Committee

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.

The Performance-Based Salary Committee is an elected committee of tenured and tenure-track faculty and the membership is therefore different than the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Input from the faculty is provided to the Chair of the Department by this process and is forwarded to the Dean of the Eberly College along with the Chair's recommendations.

1. The Performance-Based Salary Committee consists of seven faculty. Three are elected from the Professor rank. Another three are elected from the tenure-track Assistant Professors and the tenured Associate Professors. One is elected from among the Teaching Assistant Professors, Teaching Associate Professors, Teaching Professors, Research Assistant Professors, Research Associate Professors, and Research Professors. These seven committee members are to be chosen by ballot. All faculty members who are eligible for performance pay, with the exception of the Chair of the Department, are eligible to participate in the balloting.
2. The committee members will base their decisions on the faculty productivity reports, and any additional appropriate information in the faculty files. Since the objective of the performance pay process is to reward exceptional performance in research, teaching, and/or service, it is important to account for faculty achievements in these areas in years with zero or minimal performance pay allocations (a minimal performance pay allocation is defined as an allocation that, if spread equally among the tenure-track faculty, would result in an average raise of less than 1%). Therefore, in years following periods with zero or minimal performance pay allocations, the committee members will calculate average rankings in research, teaching, and service (as described below) for all the years since the last performance pay allocation exceeding the 1% threshold described above.
3. The committee members will individually assign a rating A, B, C, or D in each of three mission areas (teaching, research, and service) to each of the other faculty members eligible for performance pay, except the Chair of the Department. The committee members will enter their ratings on a form provided

to them by the Department Senior Administrative Secretary. They will sign their respective forms and return them to the Secretary, who will then tabulate the results and forward them to the Chair. The Chair will calculate an overall rating for each faculty member in teaching, research, and service. The ratings, in combination with the workload description for each faculty member (typically stated in the letter of appointment as a ratio of 40/40/20 for teaching/research/service), will be provided to the Dean for determination of the salary increase. The ratings translate to points as follows: A=3, B=2, C=1, D=0. The total score is calculated by multiplying the appointment distribution by the rating as the following examples illustrate.

40% teaching = 40 x 2 (rating of B) = 80
 40% research = 40 x 3 (rating of A) = 120
20% service = 20 x 1 (rating of C) = 20
 Merit Score = 220

30% teaching= 30 x 2 (rating of B) = 60
 50% research= 50 x 3 (rating of A)=150
20% service = 20 x 1 (rating of C) = 20
 Merit score = 230

80% teaching = 80 x 2 (rating of B) = 160
20% service = 20 x 2 (rating of B) = 40
 Merit Score = 200

A faculty member receiving the highest possible rating in all categories would receive a merit score of 300 in the Department of Physics.

4. The committee members will provide a separate recommendation directly to the Dean of the Eberly College regarding performance pay for the Chair of the Department.

Fourth-Year Review

Tenure track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. "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. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent externally funded research program as defined in the letter of appointment. "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.

Reviews by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair 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.

Reviews for Tenure and/or Promotion

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 terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience may in the appointment letter be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new

critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

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

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

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

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.

External Review. In accordance with University policy, when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the evaluation file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Promotion to associate professor with tenure normally requires significant contributions in both teaching and research and reasonable contributions in service. An exception occurs when prior approval has been received to change the areas requiring significant contributions, as prescribed in the University guidelines. The term "significant contributions" in teaching means performance in classroom teaching, in academic and research advising, or in other settings which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure in the Physics Department. The term "significant contributions" in research means performance in quality and quantity which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure in this Department and in physics departments at peer universities. The quality of the research, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the mere quantity.

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.

2. Promotion to Professor. Promotion to full professor is based on accomplishments while an associate professor and is not granted merely for years of service. It requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. While not all faculty may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide faculty toward that achievement.

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

To be recommended for promotion to full professor, an associate professor is normally expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research, significant contributions in teaching in the classroom or in other settings, and reasonable contributions in service. An exception occurs when prior approval has been received to change the areas requiring significant contributions, as prescribed in the University guidelines.

The Eberly College Guidelines state that the criteria for promotion to full professor must be different from those for promotion to associate professor. An important aspect of a Ph.D.-granting department is its research and the associated graduate program. In a physics department, graduate education necessarily implies an important research component. For this and other reasons, there is added emphasis placed on research for promotion to full professor in the Department of Physics. Research accomplishments are externally reviewed in an objective fashion by scholars of national standing.

Because graduate instruction is so essential in maintaining a Ph.D.-level physics program, promotion to full professor in the Department of Physics also requires one of the following since the previous promotion: Either demonstrated success in teaching at least one physics graduate course at the 600 or 700 level (not counting 797) or the supervision of at least one Ph.D. student to completion.

3. Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor. For teaching faculty, promotion to teaching associate professor requires significant contributions in teaching. The term “significant contributions” in teaching means performance in classroom teaching, academic advising, or in other settings which meets or exceeds that of tenure-track faculty recently achieving tenure in the Physics Department. 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 priorities of the department, college, or university.

4. Promotion to Teaching Professor. Promotion to full teaching professor is based on teaching accomplishments while a teaching associate professor and is not granted merely for years of service. It requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. While not all teaching faculty may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide teaching faculty toward that achievement. To be recommended for promotion to full teaching professor, a teaching associate professor is normally expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching. The term “significant contributions” in teaching means performance which meets or exceeds that of tenured associate professors recently promoted to full professor in the Physics Department.

5. Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For research faculty, promotion to research associate professor requires significant contributions in research. The term “significant contributions” in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of research faculty and regular faculty recently promoted in this Department and in physics departments at peer universities, as evidenced by external reviews. The quality of the research, as measured by its impact on the field, is more important than the mere quantity.

6. Promotion to Research Professor. Promotion to full research professor is based on research accomplishments while a research associate professor and is not granted merely for years of service. It requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. While not all research faculty may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide research faculty toward that achievement. To be recommended for promotion to full research professor, a research associate professor is normally expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research. The term “significant contributions” in research means performance which

meets or exceeds that of research faculty and regular faculty recently promoted in this Department and in physics departments at peer universities, as evidenced by external reviews.

PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

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