Amendment to Promotion and Tenure Policy

The Department of English voted to amend its policy for tenure and promotion for those individuals whose significant area of contribution is "Research and Publication." Two changes should be made to the current department evaluation guidelines, both on page 32.

Current language:

Persons in Critical Year. To be considered for promotion and tenure in the critical year, the candidate must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) by a reputable press or at least four scholarly articles or essays that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

A candidate seeking promotion and tenure in the critical year on the basis of creative writing must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) or at least four stories, four essays, or sixteen poems that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation. If a book, it must contain at least four stories or essays or sixteen poems not previously published.

Persons seeking Discretionary Promotions. To be considered for a discretionary promotion, the candidate must present a book published by a reputable press or at least five scholarly articles or essays that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

A candidate seeking promotion on the basis of creative writing must present a book or at least five stories, five essays, or twenty poems that have appeared in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation. If a book, it must contain at least five stories or essays or twenty poems not previously published.

Revised language (with changes in boldface):

Persons in Critical Year. To be considered for promotion and tenure in the critical year, the candidate must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) by a reputable press or at least six scholarly articles or essays that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

A candidate seeking promotion and tenure in the critical year on the basis of creative writing must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) or at least six stories, six essays, or twenty four poems that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation. If a book, it must contain at least six stories or essays or twenty four poems not previously published.

Persons seeking Discretionary Promotions. To be considered for a discretionary promotion, the candidate must present a book published by a reputable press or at least six scholarly articles or essays that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.
A candidate seeking promotion on the basis of creative writing must present a book or at least six stories, six essays, or twenty four poems that have appeared in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation. If a book, it must contain at least six stories or essays or twenty four poems not previously published.

Endorsements:
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Approved by the Dean’s Office, Eberly College of Arts & Sciences: February 1, 2011
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ENGLISH DEPARTMENT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION MANUAL
Approved by the Department on March 31, 2009.
Approved by the Office of the Provost on September 25, 2009.

Effective Date: These guidelines will go into effect for the first time for the 2009-10 review cycle and will
guide the Faculty Evaluation Committee elected in Spring 2010 for the 2010-11 academic year. Faculty
members should thus consult these guidelines for the work they complete after August 16, 2009, and for
evaluations they receive in Spring 2011 and later.

The Department of English Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements
the West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and
Tenure and the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation,
Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty
takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the
criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary
increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform
to those of the Board of Governors, 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 English 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.

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, 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 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 a maximum of .80FTE, 100% of which is teaching.

Annual Assignment

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. (Please see Appendix 1 for a chart of full-time positions in English.) 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>30-40%</td>
<td>40-50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>30-48%</td>
<td>5-10% max</td>
<td>50+%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 English department is five courses per year. “Research active” in this context is defined as maintaining 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.

**Assignment Adjustments for Leave Periods**

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.

**The Faculty File**

Faculty must annually update personnel files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On the department-specified deadline date, 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 be organized following the sample format in Appendix 2. 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. 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.

Every member of the Faculty is represented by two folders, which constitute the personnel file for the year. (The complete personnel file is, in fact, taken to be the sum of all the folders for all of an individual’s years at WVU.)

1. **Administrative Folder.** The "Administrative Folder" (generally known as the "green folder") may not be removed from the administrative suite in Colson Hall for any reason, except by members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This administrative file contains:
• The letter of appointment and any other documents that describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g., position description, workload plans, memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement, etc.)

• A copy of past annual evaluations and any written responses

• A copy of the faculty member's annual narratives for at least three previous years.

• Other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include. Faculty members will be informed when a document is added to the Administrative Folder and will have the right to include written responses to such material; the window for entering any written response is typically five (5) working days. (Please see section below for more on rebuttal or appeal of an annual evaluation.)

While faculty members cannot remove documents from their personnel file, they are entitled to copies of all documents. The inventory of the Administrative Folder is maintained by the Chair (or his designee) annually.

2. **Annual Update Folder.** The "Annual Update Folder," (generally known as the "yellow folder") may be removed from the Chair’s office on a short term basis only by the faculty member whose records it contains or by members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, but it must never be taken from Colson Hall. This folder should contain a description of work during the review period with relevant documentation. Once an item is entered into the personnel file, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained.

Specifically, every Annual Update Folder must contain:

• A complete inventory prepared by the faculty person where each item is identified by:
  o the period under review (e.g., 2007/08)
  o the number of the item in the inventory
  o the number of pages in the item (e.g., 14 [3pp])

• A Productivity Report that follows the department template

• A current curriculum vitae

• An annual faculty workload plan for the year under review

• A reflective narrative for the academic year under review

• Documentation of relevant research, teaching, and service that will help to support and illustrate the narrative

The Chair must check and sign all inventories before an update is considered complete. Please see the rest of this document for additional details.

**Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation**

According to university guidelines [http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf](http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf) Section XIII.A.4 faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the FEC and/or the Department Chair; the rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the chair. If decisions have been made that are construed as arbitrary or capricious, or in violation of a rule, then a grievance might be appropriate. In such cases, to be prudent, faculty should work informally with the chair while
simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the fifteen-day window for filing a grievance will be met.

Appeal of a departmental descriptor (i.e., seeking action to have a descriptor changed) could be treated as described in the previous paragraph, and, if simultaneously grieved, must follow the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at pegboard.state.wv.us/ or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 293-9203.

Prior to such action, the English 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 concern, 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. Procedurally, the original evaluation letter must remain in the file, but a second evaluation letter will be written and added to the file to correct the error(s).

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 Mentor. The Department chair will assign a faculty evaluation mentor to each new full-time faculty member to assist each person in the preparation of their annual review file for the first two years. As far as possible, the Mentor should be in the same sub-discipline as the candidate and should have at least three years of experience on the faculty. Faculty members actively serving on the Faculty Evaluation Committee may not serve as mentors. New faculty members are welcome to confer with the Department Chair if they want to request a particular person be assigned to them, but the final appointment resides with the Chair to help balance this mentoring work. After two years of work with a Mentor, the new faculty members may continue to seek advice, but they will be assumed to understand the annual review process. While the mentor advises and may offer examples, the mentor cannot act as an advocate to the FEC nor share responsibility for the final file. Each individual faculty member remains responsible for the content and submission of his or her own annual file.

Promotion Mentor. Likewise, each candidate seeking promotion will have the option to elect (or ask the chair to assign) a Promotion Mentor. As far as possible, the Promotion Mentor should be in the same sub-discipline as the candidate and should already hold the rank being sought. Faculty members actively serving on the Faculty Evaluation Committee may not serve as mentors. New faculty members are welcome to confer with the Department Chair if they want to request a particular person be assigned to them, but the final appointment resides with the Chair to help balance this mentoring work. The Promotion Mentor advises the candidate on the entire promotion process (from the nomination of external reviewers through the submission of the promotion file) to make sure that the candidate's materials are in the best possible order for review at all levels of promotion process. While the mentor advises and may offer examples, the mentor cannot act as an advocate to the FEC nor share responsibility for the final file. Each individual faculty member remains responsible for the content and submission of his or her own annual file.

The role of Faculty Evaluation Mentor or Promotion Mentor would be considered as service to the department.

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.

According to ECAS guidelines, the department/division FEC will normally include a minimum of five members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his personnel file. A majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty. The committee composition should be inclusive of categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g., Teaching faculty, Clinical faculty, Tenure track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases.

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.** Because English is a large department with roughly 45 files that we now review each year, the committee should represent roughly 20% of the faculty to distribute the workload and to involve a representative sampling of the entire department. The nine-person annual evaluation committee will include representation from each faculty category as follows:

- **One member:** Full-time, non-tenure-track (this category includes Teaching Faculty, FEAP, and Clinical Faculty)
- **Two members:** Full-time, tenure-track faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor
- **Three members:** Full-time, tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor
- **Three members:** Full-time, tenured faculty at the rank of Professor

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

Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating a family member or partner. When this proviso affects the committee chair, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation.

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

**Promotion and Tenure Sub-Committee:** Cases of promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated by a sub-committee consisting of the six tenured members of Faculty Evaluation Committee.

**Elections:** All full-time members of the department are eligible for election to the FEC, except the Department Chair or colleagues who already serve on College or University-level faculty evaluation committees. Individuals who are seeking promotion are ineligible to serve on the committee during that review year; likewise, individuals who hold full-time administrative positions in the university are ineligible. No faculty member should serve during their first year at WVU.

Elections to the FEC are by ballot. The candidates with the highest totals for each position are elected.

Elections to the FEC are normally held on or before April 15, and elected members normally assume office immediately and serve through May 1 of the year in which their term ends.

**Terms:** Terms of the elected members are two years each at all ranks, staggered so that there is a mix of continuing and new members each year. If an elected member is unable to serve, another member
is elected to serve the unexpired portion of the term. Members of the FEC are eligible for re-election after two years off the committee.

In the unusual circumstance where all of the members of the committee are unable to continue due to a combination of terms ending, elective promotions, sabbatical leaves, retirements, and so forth, the chair will ask at least one member of the existing committee to serve for an additional (third) year. That person would then be guaranteed at least three years off the FEC before being eligible to serve again.

The Committee meets as it deems necessary to transact Committee business and to comply with the schedule for annual review of faculty at West Virginia University. The Faculty Evaluation Guidelines of the Department of English regulate Committee recommendations on promotion. Majority votes decide other questions of policy and procedure.

**Responsibilities:** The Faculty Evaluation Committee makes a positive or negative recommendation for promotion and/or tenure on the basis of its evaluation of the faculty member's record in research and publication, teaching, and service in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines of the Department of English.

**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.

Ratings affect annual salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. Both "excellent" and "good" are meritorious ratings. If there is not enough information in the file to warrant a meritorious rating, an independent judgment leading to "satisfactory" or lower is appropriate.

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

It is incumbent upon faculty to provide for the file evidence (1) that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the 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."

To assist faculty members in assembling annual file materials and to assist the Faculty Evaluation Committee in making informed and consistent evaluations, the College suggests the following framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes in the areas of teaching, research, or service. One, some, or all of the following criteria may apply:

1. **Significance or Impact:** To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) benefit or affect students, our department, our college, our university, our profession, or other communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect originality and development within a body of work?
2. **Engagement**: To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *generate, apply, and/or use knowledge* and insight consistent with current directions in our field of study? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate *thoroughness, reliability, and availability*?

3. **Context**: To what degree are the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *consistent with goals* important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on *knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations*? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or *keep current* with changes?

Appendix 3 outlines general expectations for teaching, research, and service.
EVALUATION OF TEACHING

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 personnel file.

Teaching faculty assignments (80% teaching, 20% service) normally do not include a research component. However, all faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. For Teaching faculty, this is defined as ongoing engagement in assessment-based advancement of instructional processes. 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.

Faculty should submit evidence of teaching effectiveness that includes, but goes beyond, the results of student evaluations.

Teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to create a profile that demonstrates a coordinated approach to teaching and reflects the multiple aspects of a faculty member's overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. Since there are a variety of teaching assignments and workloads in the English department, there will be a variety of possible profiles in any given academic year. Reassignments from teaching into other duties need to be explained briefly in the faculty member's narrative. Unless a faculty member negotiates a permanent change in their annual workload distribution (which may be done after tenure only), reassignments from teaching into other duties will be counted as a part of the 40% teaching-designated workload. Temporary reassignments (as in the case of pre-tenure teaching releases) will not affect the permanent workload distribution. In such cases, the faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the one term taught that year under review. (See note under Scholarship.)

Professional Development Leaves. Faculty members approved for a professional development leave related to teaching or service should reflect that leave in their annual workload forms. The FEC should take these leaves into account during the annual evaluation.

- Faculty on a full year's professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as 100% teaching; faculty on a full year's professional development leave related to service would normally be evaluated as 100% service.
- For a single semester's leave, tenure-line faculty members would typically be evaluated as 60%-70% teaching, 20-30% research, and 10% service; if the semester's leave focused on service, the annual percentages might be 60-70% service, 10-20% research, and 10-205 teaching.
- For a single semester's leave, teaching faculty would typically be evaluated as 90% teaching and 10% service.

In other words, the total must add up to 100% and average in the faculty member's regular appointment during the semester not on leave.

Documentation for Evaluation of Teaching

The "profile" is the summative record of the documentation for evaluation of teaching included in the annual file and should characterize features of the faculty member's teaching for the academic year. Such a profile might reflect course and class planning and conceptualization, teaching methods and
materials, modes of assessment, and academic assistance or mentoring for students and peers, as well as extra-class activities that reflect a faculty member's professional development as a teacher and/or contribution to the teaching mission of the department, college, or university. For consistency across files, faculty members should always include the following three items:

1. a reflective statement in the annual narrative,
2. syllabi, and
3. course evaluations.

1. Reflective Statement. While narrative self-reflection in itself cannot constitute evidence of excellence in teaching, it can serve to highlight those aspects of the teaching profile that are particularly meritorious. It should also provide some context for the FEC.

The previously defined broad categories of significance, engagement, and context may provide a general framework for discussing different aspects of teaching. The reflective statement might address:

- Teaching roles and responsibilities (e.g., 4/4 teaching assignment? Advising? Helping with curriculum or staff development?)
- Work as chair or member of an internship, thesis, or dissertation committee
- Committee work directly related to the teaching mission of the department, college, or university
- Professional work related to curriculum and teaching
- Anomalous student evaluations or comments
- Specific aspects of teaching: new strategies, new courses, new technologies, etc.

2. Syllabi and schedules of work due for all courses taught during the review period.

- Syllabi should include course goals, required texts, policies, brief descriptions of all major assignments, and grading scale.
- Schedules of Work Due should include all deadlines for graded work.

3. Student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period. Types of evaluations include:

- Undergraduate Courses. Senate Evaluations of Instruction (SEI) forms or electronic SEI forms must be included for each undergraduate class taught during the review period. Student evaluations must be included in packets clearly marked with the course and semester in which it was taught. A complete packet contains the SEI summary sheet and all of the SEI scantron forms. For electronic SEIs, include the eSEI summary sheet (the statistical report, which includes the compiled student responses to the final questions that invite students to comment on any aspects they rated excellent or low) and a print copy of all survey responses. Both of these are available online at https://esei.wvu.edu

- Honors Courses. As long as the Honors Program generates its own evaluation forms, these forms must be used for Honors courses. These may be supplemented with SEI or eSEI forms.

- Graduate Courses. Departmental evaluations of all graduate courses taught during the review period must also be included in the annual update.

Additional documentation is strongly encouraged. See the next section for suggestions.
Additional Documentation for Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty members are encouraged to collect multiple sources of evidence to document teaching goals and their success. Any additional documentation should represent a cross-section of work in teaching. Since the list of suggested materials is lengthy, it might be tempting to try to include everything, but that is not the point of the list. Instead, note that the list suggests a broad range of categories to help faculty members identify and describe their major strengths and contributions to teaching.

Faculty members should be selective and deliberate in choosing additional items to represent the scope of their teaching work. For example, a total of 10-12 items might be appropriate to document a 40% teaching appointment while those faculty with a 20% appointment may have the same or fewer documents and those with an 80% appointment may have the same or more. In other words, the number of additional items will depend on the profile being illustrated, while also keeping the readers in mind.

Representative Teaching Materials
- Assignments
- Exams and quizzes
- Handouts, lecture notes or outlines, etc.
- Descriptions of uses of computer or other technologies in teaching
- Descriptions of special projects, such as independent study projects

Representative Student Learning Materials
- Students' papers, essays, or creative works, etc.
- Instructors' written feedback on student work

Representative Graduate or Undergraduate Advising Materials
- Lists or descriptions of undergraduate advising work
- Lists or description of graduate advising work
- Descriptions of recruitment/placement activities (or related materials)

Representative Professional Development Materials
- Participation in seminars or professional meetings on teaching
- Design of a new course or redesign of an existing course
- Design of interdisciplinary or collaborative courses or teaching projects
- Use of new methods of teaching, including new technologies, new ways of assessing learning, etc.
- Preparation of a textbook, courseware, teaching guides or essays (that are not counted under publications), etc.
- Description of instructional improvement projects developed or carried out

Representative Materials to Demonstrate Teaching Leadership, Administration, or Innovation
- Documents related to work as program administrator who is primarily responsible for curriculum or professional development (especially where this work is a significant portion of the faculty member’s teaching assignment)
- Service on committees directly related to the teaching mission of the department, college, or university
- Supervision of student interns
• Supervision of MA or MFA thesis or Ph.D. dissertation
• Membership on active thesis or dissertation committees
• Assistance to colleagues on teaching
• Review of textbooks, etc.
• Work on curriculum revision or development
• Successful funding of any competitive external grant (typically $10,000 or more—only if funding not already counted in another category for this year)
• Teacher development workshops

**Representative Evaluations of Teaching (beyond SEI forms)**

• Results of students' exit interviews
• Letters from students, preferably unsolicited
• Comments from a peer observer or colleague

**Representative Teaching Honors or Recognitions**

• Teaching awards from department, college, university, or profession
• Invitations based on teaching reputation to consult, guest lecture, give workshops, etc.

**EVALUATIVE DESCRIPTORS FOR TEACHING**

As the FEC reviews files, they will keep in mind that documentation in the file should work in conjunction with the "Reflection" section of the annual narrative. While narrative self-reflection in itself cannot constitute evidence of excellence in teaching, it can serve to highlight those aspects of the teaching profile that are particularly meritorious.

Ideally, materials in each faculty member's file should work in concert to create a profile that demonstrates a coordinated approach to teaching.

**NOTE:** The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who contribute **40% of their effort to teaching** since that is the most common allocation.

Faculty members who devote a larger or smaller portion of their time to teaching and whose annual workload forms thus reflect a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 80%, 50%, or 20% teaching), should note that percentage in their narrative. The narrative, in combination with documentation, should help other colleagues in the department understand the significance and impact of efforts in relation to their other work.

For instance, colleagues who have one or more courses reassigned to advising or administrative duties related to teaching can use their narratives to describe the type of work they do and the hours and activities typically involved. Faculty members with these appointments are expected to show evidence of their ability to create and maintain programs or activities that meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, or University. Such evidence may include assessment of program growth and/or impact, and/or examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and/or explanation of how program coordination or other service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, and University. A descriptor of good or excellent will usually depend on examples of work related to the person's appointment in addition to other teaching.

Similarly, Teaching faculty are the members of the English Department who have teaching as their significant area of contribution (80% of their work), although this category might also apply to tenured faculty members who have had a permanent workload adjustment approved. To earn a Satisfactory
descriptor, teaching faculty are expected to show evidence of their ability to maintain an instructional environment that fosters student learning. Descriptors of Good or Excellent will normally depend on varied evidence to illustrate commitment, significance, impact, and/or professional engagement (such as efforts to enhance course and program effectiveness or illustrations of how teaching contributions address specific Department, College, and University needs, etc.)

Each descriptor is described below.

Excellent. There is evidence that teaching has been performed that significantly and consistently exceeds departmental expectations for satisfactory teaching. The quality of teaching and other work related to instruction are of a consistently exceptional quality and deserve recognition with the highest level of annual merit.

- **Teaching materials** as evidenced by documents such as original and innovative assignments; well-organized and accessible lecture notes or lesson plans; web pages; a range of exams that reflect course goals and lessons; and so forth.

- **Student learning** as evidenced by materials such as sample student work (including those that have been recognized by awards or publication); newly designed advising materials; descriptions of work on several thesis or dissertation committees; samples of comments on student work; data related to student retention or progress; and so forth.

- **Responses to Teaching** as evidenced by materials such as SEIs, unsolicited student letters, letters in support of teaching awards, and teaching observation letters.

- **Commitment to ongoing professional development** as evidenced by activities such as attending regional or national pedagogy workshops or professional teaching conferences; contributing to teacher training; organizing local teaching conferences or workshops; inviting peer observation of teaching; and so forth.

- **Demonstration of leadership in curriculum development or teaching** as evidenced by achievements such as new course development or new program development; innovations in methodology including new technologies; presentations at national professional conferences related to teaching; published descriptions of teaching practices; funded grant proposals related to teaching; and so forth.

- **Teaching Honors or Recognitions** as evidenced by teaching awards from department, college, university, or profession; invitations based on teaching reputation to consult, guest lecture, give workshops; and so forth.

Documentation of extensive and successful commitment to teaching normally includes a combination of evidence from a range of categories above. Documentation for a descriptor of Excellent will typically include evidence of activities from three or more categories, but it is the range and quality of these teaching activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, reflective practice, innovation, effectiveness, etc.) and not the quantity of activities alone that will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award an Excellent for teaching.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of teaching work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 20% or 80% teaching).

**Note:** Although the Faculty Evaluation Committee cannot recommend additional merit beyond the descriptor of excellent, the FEC can recognize extraordinary effort or achievement in a single year by adding a special note to the descriptor paragraph. This note will provide helpful context for the subsequent year's committee.
Good. There is evidence that teaching consistently exceeds departmental expectations for satisfactory teaching. The quality of teaching and other work related to instruction reflects a level of commitment and effort that deserve recognition and annual merit.

- **Teaching materials** as evidenced by documents such as detailed assignments; detailed lecture notes or lesson plans; web pages; a range of exams; and so forth.

- **Student learning** as evidenced by materials such as sample student work; samples of comments on student work; summaries of advising responsibilities; summaries of thesis or dissertation work; data related to student retention or progress; unsolicited student letters; and so forth.

- **Responses to Teaching** as evidenced by materials such as SEIs, unsolicited student letters, letters in support of teaching awards, and teaching observation letters.

- **Commitment to ongoing professional development** as evidenced by activities such as attending local, regional, or national pedagogy workshops; attending professional teaching conferences; contributing to teacher training; inviting peer observations of teaching; and so forth.

- **Demonstration of curriculum development or innovation efforts** as evidenced by achievements such as new course development; reflections on new or expanded teaching methods (including new technologies); presentations at professional conferences related to teaching; grant proposal submissions related to teaching; and so forth.

Documentation for a descriptor of Good will typically include a combination of evidence from at least two categories, but it is the range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, reflective practice, effectiveness, etc.) and not the quantity of activities alone that will be the deciding factor in the FEC’s decision to award a Good for teaching.

For professional development leaves: the FEC will normally assume significant "work in progress" for a semester or year when someone is on professional development leave related to teaching and will normally count the year’s teaching as "good" on the basis of a competitively awarded professional development proposal. Additional credit would depend on evidence of other teaching during the year under review.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of teaching work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 20% or 80% teaching).

Satisfactory. There is evidence that teaching meets departmental expectations and the supporting materials provide evidence of both responsibility and effort. Despite these strengths, teaching effectiveness is limited in comparison with a level expected for merit.

- **Teaching materials** by documents such as assignments; notes or lesson plans; web pages; exams; and so forth.

- **Student learning** as evidenced by materials such as sample student papers; samples of comments on student work; data related to student retention or progress; and so forth.

- **Responses to Teaching** as evidenced by materials such as SEIs, unsolicited student letters, letters in support of teaching awards, and teaching observation letters.
• Commitment to ongoing professional development as evidenced by activities such as attending workshops or professional teaching conferences; inviting peer observation of teaching; and so forth.

Documentation of satisfactory teaching *normally* includes the required elements (syllabi, SEIs, and annual narrative) and may include additional evidence from one or more of the above categories. Documentation for a descriptor of Satisfactory will typically include evidence of activities in at least one category, but it is the range and quality of the teaching activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, reflective practice, effectiveness, etc.), and not the quality of activities alone that will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Satisfactory for teaching.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of teaching work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 20% or 80% teaching).

**Unsatisfactory.** There is little or no evidence that acceptable teaching has been performed. The required documentation of satisfactory teaching (syllabi, SEI’s, and annual narrative) may be missing or incomplete. These materials show a teaching process that is not yet developed. The quality of teaching and related areas is consistently unacceptable as evidenced by problems in at least one—and frequently several—areas:

• *Teaching materials* included in the file provide little or no evidence of teaching methods.

• *Student Learning* materials included in the file show little or no evidence of the faculty member's positive engagement with or positive effect on students.

• *Professional development* materials provide little or no evidence of active engagement in activities related to teaching or the improvement of teaching.
EVALUATION OF RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Activities related to research, scholarship, or creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the research/scholarship mission of the department. It is expected that faculty will include in the file print copies of all publications to be counted for the review period. The unit may accept manuscript copies with letters of unequivocal acceptance.

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.

Faculty should submit evidence of research or scholarly or creative activity evidence that includes, but goes beyond, publications.

Scholarly and creative work should be documented in a variety of ways to create a profile that reflects the multiple aspects of a faculty member's contribution to the intellectual work of the department, the college, the university, the profession, and/or community. Since there are a variety of annual workload agreements in the English department, there will be a variety of possible scholarly profiles in any given academic year. Faculty members should remind the evaluation committee of any reassignments, including sabbatical.

Sabbaticals and Pre-Tenure Leaves. Faculty members approved for a research sabbatical or for a pre-tenure research leave should reflect that leave in their annual workload forms. The FEC should take these leaves into account during the annual evaluation.

Sabbatical Leaves
- Faculty on a full year's research sabbatical would normally be evaluated as 100%.
- For a year in which there is a single semester's leave, tenure-line faculty members would typically be evaluated as 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

Pre-Tenure Leaves
- For a pre-tenure faculty member who is granted a single semester's leave from teaching, such reassignments to research that would result in 60% research and 20% teaching for that year; service would remain constant at 20%.

In other words, the total must add up to 100% and average in the faculty member's regular appointment during the semester not on leave.

Scholarly and creative work submitted for annual review should be relevant to the faculty member's letter of appointment, subsequent administrative agreements, and/or departmental responsibilities. The faculty member's annual narrative should put scholarly work in context by explaining the significance and impact of the work.

For consistency across files, faculty members should always include:

1. a reflective statement on research and scholarship in the annual narrative
2. print copies of publications (or ms. copies and letters of acceptance) for any item that should be counted for the review period
ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION FOR EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty members are encouraged to collect multiple sources of evidence to document their scholarly or creative work.

Since the list of suggested materials is lengthy, it might be tempting to try to include everything, but that is not the point of the list. Instead, note that the list suggests a broad range of categories to help faculty members identify and describe their major strengths and contributions to scholarship.

Faculty members should be selective and deliberate in choosing additional items to represent the scope of their scholarship. The number of additional items will depend on the profile you are illustrating, while also keeping your readers in mind.

Note about Collaborative Work. 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; if the work is not easily quantified, there should be a letter of support from the other collaborator(s) that speak to the process and the WVU English faculty member’s contributions.

Note about New Media: We recognize that our scholarly and creative work is increasingly produced in new media. We acknowledge all forms of new media that are peer reviewed and that have a national or international scope.\(^1\) Faculty members working in new media should use their narrative to explain its process of peer review, the importance of the work in terms of the venue, its audience, its scope, etc.

I. Books

A. Books related to your area of expertise, written for a scholarly audience and published by a press with a national or international academic reputation

B. Books related to your area of expertise, written for a general audience and published by a press with a national or international reputation

C. Books of fiction, poetry, or creative nonfiction published by a press with a national or international reputation in the creative community

D. Textbooks related to your area of expertise that present an extended rationale, an original and coherent focus, and published by a press with a national or international reputation

II. Articles, Chapters, and Grants

A. Articles in scholarly or critical publications with a national or international scope where acceptance depends on peer-review

B. Chapters in books where acceptance depends on editorial review

C. Substantial review essays in scholarly or critical publications with a national or international scope (extended discussion of two or more works; typically 5,000 words or more in manuscript; often solicited by an editor based on the reviewer’s area of expertise)\(^2\)

D. Articles in scholarly or critical publications with a national or international scope where acceptance depends upon the recommendation of the editors alone

\(^1\) The MLA Task Force Report on Evaluating Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure (Profession 2007) includes the recommendation that “departments and institutions should recognize the legitimacy of scholarship produced in new media” (page 70; recommendation #3).

\(^2\) The MLA Task Force Report on Evaluating Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure (Profession 2007) includes the recommendation that “The profession as a whole should encourage scholars at all levels to write substantive book reviews” (page 71; recommendation #13).
E. Successful funding of any competitive external grant (typically $10,000 or more—only if funding not already counted in another category for this year)

III. Creative Works

Note: For purposes of evaluation, one short story, one creative essay, or four poems is typically considered equivalent to one scholarly essay

A. Poems, stories, and works of creative nonfiction where acceptance depends on peer-review or its equivalent; must be of national or international scope
B. Works in anthologies where acceptance depends upon an editor or an editorial review board; must be of national or international scope
C. Poems, stories, and works of creative nonfiction where acceptance depends on the recommendation of editors alone; must be of national or international scope

IV. Editorial Work

A. Editor of collections of solicited or reprinted scholarly or creative work, with substantial contributions by the editor; must be of national or international scope
B. Editor of a journal (be responsible for the entire content; maintain the focus of the journal over multiple volumes; oversee the development and review of articles; recruit editorial board members and readers; vet the currency and relevance of the scholarship; etc.); must be of national or international scope
C. Translator of work with substantial interpretation, analysis, or other scholarly contributions by the translator; must be of national or international scope
D. Editor of a critical textual edition (an edition that involves the analytical and critical skills associated with establishing and disseminating significant texts, accompanied by appropriate apparatus and introduction, e.g., those in the EETS series, Marlowe Society Publications, etc.)
E. Editor of a special issue of a journal (special issue editors typically work closely with the journal editor to focus on aspects of emerging issues and write an introductory essay that identifies the special issue’s purpose and describes how the articles in the issue fit the theme); must be of national or international scope

V. Other Scholarly Activity

A. Honors or awards related to scholarly or creative work
B. Keynote speech
C. Brief book reviews in professional journals in one’s area of expertise (generally around 8-10 pages in manuscript and typically focusing on just one work)
D. Entries in reference books.
E. Reviews of manuscripts for professional journals and/or academic presses.
F. Work in progress (including books, articles, and other scholarly papers, clearly documented in the file with ms. pages and explained in the narrative.) This includes work undertaken during a sabbatical leave or pre-tenure leave and documented by at least the proposal for that leave.

---

3 This section on Editorial Work is new—and also in keeping with the MLA Task Force recommendation for a “more capacious conception of scholarship” (p. 70; rec #3)
G. Preparation or significant assistance in preparation of large grant applications (under review or not funded).

H. Presenting a paper or reading at a professional conference or academic setting, or at another setting appropriate to one’s area of specialization

I. Being the subject of a published interview (as an expert in one’s field)

J. Organizing a panel or serve as a respondent at a professional conference

K. Attending a seminar, workshop, or program for advanced scholarly training

L. Other scholarly or creative activity produced in digital media and resulting in a public product, amenable to peer review (but not clearly fitting under one of the categories above)

EVALUATIVE DESCRIPTORS FOR SCHOLARSHIP

As noted above, scholarly and creative work submitted for annual review should be relevant to the faculty member’s letter of appointment, subsequent administrative agreements, or departmental responsibilities.

As the FEC reviews files, they will keep in mind that documentation in the file should work in conjunction with the “Reflection” section of the annual narrative. While narrative self-reflection in itself cannot constitute evidence of excellence in scholarship, it can highlight those aspects of the scholarly profile that are particularly meritorious.

NOTE: The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who contribute 40% of their effort to research since that is the most common allocation for scholarly or creative work. Faculty members who devote a different portion of their time to scholarship and whose annual workload forms thus reflect a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 20%, 30%, or 60% research), should note that percentage in their narrative. The narrative, in combination with documentation, should help other colleagues in the department understand the significance and impact of efforts in relation to their other work.

For instance, a Clinical faculty appointment must be a majority service (50% or more), with classroom instruction or other assignment secondary. When research is part of the appointment, it typically represents 10% of the regular workload. Thus, expectations for Clinical faculty and others for whom research constitutes only 10-20% of the workload should demonstrate reasonable contributions in research. Within the English department, the criterion of “reasonable research contribution” for an annual descriptor of satisfactory for Clinical faculty would normally be one example of ongoing productivity, such as one of those items listed in the departmental guidelines under “other scholarly activities” (e.g., book reviews, grant applications, articles or papers in progress, professional conference participation, etc.). For those with reduced (or reassigned) workloads of 10-20% research, one example of “other scholarly activity” would normally earn a descriptor of Good; multiple examples of “other scholarly activity” (or any relevant item from sections I, II, III, IV above) would normally earn a descriptor of Excellent.

Because scholarly activity is rarely confined to a single year, the FEC and Department Chair will also review each faculty member’s activity over a longer period than just the current year to evaluate the trajectory of the faculty member’s efforts. To do this, the FEC and Department Chair will look to at least one prior year’s faculty narrative and annual evaluations.

Each descriptor is described below.

Excellent

“Excellent” research is typically characterized by at least one of the following items plus additional evidence of other scholarly or creative activity:

- Acceptance or publication of any one item from Section I (“Books”)
- Acceptance or publication of any one item from Section II (“Articles, Chapters and Grants”)
• Acceptance or publication of items from Section III ("Creative Work") in a quantity equivalent to at least one scholarly essay
• Any one item from Section IV ("Editorial Work")
• A significant instance of Section V, Item L ("Honors or awards related to scholarly or creative work")

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

Articles. A rating of "Excellent" for a national, peer-reviewed journal article or creative work(s) may be given either in the year in which it is accepted for publication or in the year in which the article appears in print. In their annual narratives, faculty members must indicate in which year they wish credit to be awarded for their accepted articles or creative works. To gain credit upon acceptance, faculty members must provide evidence of professional peer reviews and editorial decisions to publish, and the manuscript copy.

Documentation for a descriptor of Excellent will depend not only on quantity (an acceptance or publication of a substantial work of research or creative writing and other scholarly or creative activity) but on the quality and significance of the scholarship or creative work and its relevance to the faculty member’s area(s) of expertise. For instance, if there is already evidence of other activities that would normally amount to an annual descriptor of good and the progress is towards a book, then an ongoing and upward trajectory may lead to an excellent rating.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of research work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 20%, 30%, or 60% research).

Note: Although the Faculty Evaluation Committee cannot recommend additional merit beyond the descriptor of excellent, the FEC can recognize extraordinary effort or achievement in a single year by adding a special note to the descriptor paragraph. This note will provide helpful context for the subsequent year’s committee.

Good

In the absence of an acceptance or publication of a substantial work of research or creative writing, “good” research is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits:
• Two or more items from Section V ("Other Scholarly Activity")
• Two or more examples of work that requires extensive knowledge of profession while significantly benefiting our department, college, university, or profession (such as extended reports, institutional grant applications, and some instances of service to the profession)
• For sabbaticals and other research leaves: the FEC will normally assume significant "work in progress" for a sabbatical semester or year (or for a pre-tenure leave) and will normally count the year’s research as "good" on the basis of a competitively awarded proposal for a sabbatical or other research leave. Additional credit would depend on evidence of publication during the year under review.

Documentation for a descriptor of Good will depend not only on the quantities just described but also on the quality and significance of the scholarship or creative work and its relevance to the faculty member’s area(s) of expertise. For instance, significant work in progress might normally earn a good, but if the same work is listed as "in progress" with little or no demonstrable change to or circulation of the work since the previous year, then the descriptor is likely to remain satisfactory (assuming there are other scholarly activities such as conference papers or book reviews to merit the satisfactory rating).
The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of research work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 20%, 30%, or 60% research).

**Satisfactory**

There is evidence of active and ongoing engagement with scholarly or creative activities relevant to one's area(s) of expertise, even if there are no publications. For faculty with 40% of their workload assigned to research, "Satisfactory" is typically characterized by:

- A single item from Section IV ("Other Scholarly Activity")

For faculty where 10-20% of their workload is assigned to research, "Satisfactory" is typically characterized by activities that directly relate to staying current with scholarship in the field, such as attending professional conferences, institutional grant applications, and some instances of service to the profession.

As with the other descriptors, the **quality** of the activity and the professional, scholarly commitment it represents will be the deciding factor in the FEC's decision to award a Satisfactory for research.

As with the other descriptors, the annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of research work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 20%, 30%, or 60% research).

**Unsatisfactory**

There is little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of scholarly or creative work. The required documentation of satisfactory research may be missing, incomplete, or consistently unacceptable in terms of quality or relevance to the faculty member's letter of appointment, subsequent administrative agreements, or departmental responsibilities.
EVALUATION OF 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. These activities should be reviewed by OSP in the form of a contract to the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

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.

Faculty should submit evidence of service that aligns with the expectations of their appointment and their annual assignment.

A meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution normally includes evidence of leadership in and/or outcomes of assigned service responsibilities.

Service should be documented in a variety of ways to create a profile that reflects the multiple aspects of a faculty member’s contribution to the department, the college, the university, the profession, and/or community. Since there are a variety of annual workload agreements in the English department, there will be a variety of possible service profiles in any given academic year. To make a faculty member’s service responsibilities clear to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, faculty members must document the workload distribution agreements they make in consultation with Chair and Dean.

As WVU’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines state, “service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person’s professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one’s university affiliation identified. The definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of promotion and tenure should be identified in the unit’s evaluation guidelines.”

For the sake of this document, “service” is defined as:

activities in which faculty members offer professional knowledge, skills, and advice to their communities (University, profession, and public). Service activities, whether compensated or not, draw on professional expertise, relate to the teaching and research missions of the University, and, typically, imply a connection to the University. Sharing professional expertise with those outside the academy is both an educational experience and a test of the results of research. It follows that not all “services” faculty members perform will be relevant to the University’s judgment of their work. Activities in which faculty engage that do not involve their professional expertise—activities centered on the family, neighborhood, church, or political party—are commendable as being the normal commitments of citizenship, but are not components of the workload of a member of the faculty. When involved in those activities, faculty members do not typically present themselves as representatives of the University.\(^4\)

\(^4\) The language in this paragraph is largely taken from the service definition provided in the University of Tennessee’s promotion and tenure guidelines.
The faculty member's annual narrative should put academic service work in context by explaining the significance and impact of the work. For instance, the narrative might address committee accomplishments (policies, reports, changes); evaluations or responses from committee colleagues or chairs or from affected groups (students, colleagues, administrators, conference participants, etc.); service awards; etc.

For consistency across files, faculty members should always include:

1. A reflective statement on service in the annual narrative, and
2. Documentation that provides representative evidence of efforts and their significance.

Temporary reassignments (as in the case of professional development leaves) will not affect the permanent workload distribution.

**Professional Development Leaves.** Faculty members approved for a professional development leave related to service should reflect that leave in their annual workload forms. The FEC should take these leaves into account during the annual evaluation.

- Faculty on a full year's professional development leave related to service would normally be evaluated as 100% service.
- For a single semester's leave focused on service, the annual percentages for tenure-track faculty might be 60-70% service, 10-20% research, and 10-20% teaching.
- For a single semester's leave focused on service, clinical faculty would typically be evaluated as 100% service.

In other words, the total must add up to 100% and average in the faculty member's regular appointment during the semester not on leave.

**ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE**

Faculty members are encouraged to collect multiple sources of evidence to document their service and the effect of that service.

Since the list of suggested materials is lengthy, it might be tempting to try to include everything, but that is not the point of the list. Instead, note that the list suggests a broad range of categories to help faculty members identify and describe their major strengths and contributions to service.

Faculty members should be *selective and deliberate* in choosing additional items to represent the scope of their service. For example, a total of 10-12 documented activities might be appropriate to document a 50% service appointment while those faculty with a 20% appointment may have the same or fewer documents. In other words, the number of additional items will depend on the profile you are illustrating, while also keeping your readers in mind.

**Representative Service to the Profession**

- Documents related to service on an editorial board
- Reviews of book manuscripts or invitation to serve as a judge for a major contest or prize within the profession
- Reviews of shorter mss., grant or fellowship applications; an invitation to write a "blurb" for book jackets
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• Documents related to the organization of a professional conference
• Appointment of office or committee membership in professional organization within the discipline
• Invitation to conduct external reviews of departments or programs (or the review itself)
• Invitation to serve as external reviewer for promotion and tenure case at another university
• Documentation related to administration of an electronic listserv
• Other work that benefits the profession

Representative Service Related to Department, College, or University

• Documents related to work as department chair or department administrator (especially where this work is a significant portion of the faculty member’s assignment).
• Leadership on a university, college, or department committee or task force that requires significant time, effort, and responsibility
• Appointment to or recognition of work on university, college, or department committees that require significant time and/or effort (e.g., faculty evaluation, strategic planning, curriculum development or revisions, assessment, a special task force, a search committee, etc.)
• Appointment to or recognition of work on other university, college, or department committees
• Recognition of work mentoring other colleagues (e.g., Faculty Evaluation Mentor, Promotion Mentor, Teaching Mentor, etc.)
• Documents related to new curriculum or major curriculum revisions (unless already listed under teaching)
• Documents related to a new faculty development program (unless already listed under teaching)
• Documents related to a new assessment plan (unless already listed under teaching)
• Documents related to a new advising system (unless already listed under teaching)
• Documents related to new or revised promotional materials (brochures, fliers, handbooks, posters, etc.)
• Recognition of work as faculty advisor for student groups
• Recognition of fundraising efforts for department, college, or university
• Recognition of participation in alumni activities
• Other work that benefits the department, college, or university

Representative Service to the Community

• Community honors or awards related to service as expert in field
• Recognition of work as a consultant or expert advisor (related to specialization)
• Recognition of participation in public school-university partnerships (related to specialization)
• Delivery of a community lecture or reading related to specialization
• Appointment to or recognition of service on community board as expert in field
• Documents or recognitions related to action projects in the community that are related to the faculty member’s specialization
• Other work related to a faculty member’s professional expertise that benefits the community

Other Service Related Work

• Honors or awards related to service work

• Successful funding of any competitive external grant (typically $10,000 or more—only if funding not already counted in another category for this year)

EVALUATIVE DESCRIPTORS FOR SERVICE

As the FEC reviews files, they will keep in mind that documentation in the file should work in conjunction with the “Reflection” section of the annual narrative. While narrative self-reflection in itself cannot constitute evidence of excellence in service, it can highlight those aspects of the service profile that are particularly meritorious.

As important as service is to the department, college, university, profession, and community, we note that service cannot substitute for a solid record of research and teaching for probationary tenure-track faculty, or for a solid record of teaching for teaching faculty.

NOTE: The descriptors below establish expectations for those faculty members who contribute 20% of their effort to service since that is the most common allocation for service.

Faculty members who devote a larger portion of their time to service and whose annual workload forms thus reflect a greater percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 30%, 40%, or 50% service), should note that percentage in their narrative. The narrative, in combination with documentation, should help other colleagues in the department understand the significance and impact of their greater efforts.

For instance, Clinical faculty appointments must be a majority service (50% or more). Similarly, some other members of the department may have a majority of their workload assigned to service on either a temporary or permanent basis. For Clinical faculty and others for whom service is an area of significant contribution, the annual file is expected to show evidence of successful program coordination, administration, or other sustained service to earn a Satisfactory or above. Such evidence may include assessment of program growth and/or impact, and/or examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and/or explanation of how program coordination or other service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, and University. A descriptor of good will usually depend on multiple examples of sustained service related to the person’s appointment (or a significant accomplishment with a major impact in a single year). A descriptor of excellent will usually depend on multiple examples of sustained service related to the person’s appointment in addition to other work in the department, such as service on committees, service to the profession, or outreach work that goes beyond the faculty member’s initial appointment.

Descriptors are detailed below.
Excellent

There is evidence that service has been performed that is well above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Excellent service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits:

- Extensive and continuing time and/or effort in activities that directly address department, college, university, or professional goals
- Extensive knowledge of (or willingness to learn about) the department, college, institution, or profession
- Extensive and continuing responsibilities in terms of organization, leadership or administration, documentation, etc.
- Work that clearly benefits our department, college, university, or profession.

Documentation for a descriptor of Excellent will typically include evidence of activities from multiple categories. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not simply the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC’s decision to award an Excellent for service.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of service work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 30%, or 50% service).

Note: Although the Faculty Evaluation Committee cannot recommend additional merit beyond the descriptor of excellent, the FEC can recognize extraordinary effort or achievement in a single year by adding a special note to the descriptor paragraph. This note will provide helpful context for the subsequent year’s committee.

Good

There is evidence that service has been performed that is above the level expected of faculty in terms of the contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Good service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits:

- Significant time and/or effort in activities that directly address department, college, university, or professional goals
- Knowledge of (or willingness to learn about) the department, college, institution, or profession
- Significant responsibilities in terms of organization, documentation, etc. (but more often as a contributing member).
- Work that significantly benefits our department, college, university, or profession.

Documentation for a descriptor of Good will typically include evidence of activities from multiple categories or evidence of various activities from a single category. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not simply the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC’s decision to award a Good for service.

For professional development leaves: the FEC will normally assume significant “work in progress” for a semester or year when someone is on professional development leave related to service and will normally count the year’s service as “good” on the basis of a competitively awarded professional
development proposal. Additional credit would depend on evidence of other service during the year under review.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of service work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 30%, or 50% service).

**Satisfactory**

There is evidence that service has been performed that is at the level expected of faculty in terms of professional contribution to the profession, university, college, department, or application of professional expertise to the community. Opportunities to provide service have been pursued. Activities may not require a continuing level of time and effort over the academic year. Satisfactory service is typically characterized by at least one of the following traits:

- A modest time investment or effort in activities that directly address department, college, university, or professional goals
- Responsibilities may require little beyond attending and responding
- Support of a single event or activity that benefits our department, college, university, or profession.

Documentation for a descriptor of Satisfactory will typically include evidence of activities in at least one of the categories listed earlier in this section. The range and quality of these activities and the commitment they entail (in terms of time, workload, expertise, etc.) and not the quantity of activities will be the deciding factor in the FEC’s decision to award a Satisfactory for service.

The annual narrative provides opportunity to explain the quality, significance, and relevance of service work to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as a chance to remind the committee if the annual workload form reflects a different percentage of effort in this area (e.g., 10%, 30%, or 50% service).

**Unsatisfactory**

There is little or no evidence that the faculty member has contributed any time or effort in terms of service. The faculty member interacts minimally with the department, college, university, or profession.
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.

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based pay recommendations.

The **English department formula** translates ratings descriptors to points as follows:

- "Excellent" = 4.0
- "Good" = 3.0
- "Satisfactory" = 1.0

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.

A total score is calculated by multiplying workload percentage times the numeric rating.

**EXAMPLE:**

\[
\begin{align*}
40\% \text{ teaching} \times 3.0 \text{ (rating of "Good")} & = 1.2 \\
+ 40\% \text{ research} \times 4.0 \text{ (rating of "Excellent")} & = 1.6 \\
+ 20\% \text{ service} \times 1.0 \text{ (rating of "Satisfactory")} & = 0.2 \\
\hline
3.0 \text{ = Merit Score}
\end{align*}
\]

If the Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors, the department score is an average of the two evaluations.

**NOMINATION FOR AWARDS**

After all faculty members have been rated in a given year, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will provide the Department Chair with a list of recommended nominees for teaching, research, or service awards. For any awards outside of the Department, the Department Chair will invite individuals to let their names go forward and will coordinate formal nominations as appropriate. The Department Chair also maintains a list of the Department's nominees, alternates, and award winners, and makes this list available to the FEC as needed. Nominations by the FEC do not preclude other nominations.

**FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW**

Tenure track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation that 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 peer research universities. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Department/Division committee and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. For Tenure track faculty at the fourth year point, the Dean reviews the set of
annual evaluations to date. Where concern arises regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the Dean will follow up with a request that the entire file be forwarded for assessment by the college committee.

PROMOTION REVIEW

In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual’s sixth year on the faculty, the “critical year,” as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment. Tenure track faculty with qualifying experience may in the appointment letter be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

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

Eligibility for Promotion

To be eligible for consideration for promotion, faculty members are expected to present a record of annual reviews evaluating research, teaching, and service. The faculty member’s major area(s) of
contribution (e.g., 40% research and 40% teaching for a tenure-track faculty member), must have a preponderance of good or excellent ratings. The faculty member's minor area of contribution (e.g., 20% service for a tenure-track faculty member or a teaching faculty member) must have a preponderance of satisfactory or better ratings in service.

**Tenure-track Faculty.** An individual's appointment letter will normally identify the sixth year as the "critical year" (the year in which a tenure decision must be made). In the case of persons seeking promotion and tenure in the critical year, the record of good or excellent ratings in teaching and research shall have been established since the faculty member's hiring.

**Clinical Faculty.** Clinical faculty are not subject to the seven year probationary period of the tenure track, and promotion is not a requirement for institutional commitment or career stability. An individual's appointment letter will normally identify the year in which the person is eligible for promotion. If a clinical faculty member seeks promotion, the record of good or excellent ratings in teaching and service shall have been established since the faculty member's hiring.

**Teaching Faculty.** A terminal degree is required for promotion from Teaching Instructor to Teaching Assistant Professor. Teaching faculty are not subject to the seven year probationary period of the tenure track, and promotion is not a requirement for institutional commitment or career stability. An individual's appointment letter will normally identify the year in which the person is eligible for promotion. For these term appointments, the Eberly College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing tenure-track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a Teaching 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.

If a teaching faculty member seeks promotion, the record of good or excellent ratings in teaching shall have been established since the faculty member's hiring.

**Discretionary Promotions.** The University Faculty Evaluation Guidelines establish the interval between promotions ordinarily to be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion.

In the case of persons seeking discretionary promotion, a significant portion of this record shall normally have been established in the five years preceding the request for promotion.

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.

**Preparation of Promotion File**

When seeking promotion, a faculty member must present a file of his or her work drawn from the accumulated series of Annual Updates (contained in the yellow folder). Faculty members are responsible for preparing their files carefully so as to present the case for tenure and/or promotion.

**Promotion Mentor.** Each candidate seeking promotion will have the option to elect (or to ask the chair to assign) a Promotion Mentor. As far as possible, the Promotion Mentor should be in the same sub-discipline as the candidate and should already hold the rank being sought. Faculty members actively serving on the Faculty Evaluation Committee may not serve as mentors. New faculty members are welcome to confer with the Department Chair if they want to request a particular person be assigned to them, but the final appointment resides with the Chair to help balance this mentoring work. The Promotion Mentor advises the candidate on the entire promotion process (from the nomination of external reviewers through the submission of the promotion file) to make sure that the candidate's materials are in the best possible order for review at all levels of promotion process. While the mentor advises and may offer examples, the mentor cannot act as an advocate to the FEC nor share responsibility for the final file.
Each individual faculty member remains responsible for the content and submission of his or her own annual file.

Faculty members requesting promotion and/or tenure may also choose to consult other recently-promoted and/or tenured colleagues in preparing the file.

The file will consist of the following parts:

1. Overview Materials. This part of the file serves as a preface. It includes three items: an inventory of the materials in the file; a narrative where the candidate makes a case for promotion and/or tenure by highlighting contributions to teaching, research, and service; and a complete curriculum vitae.

2. Appointment Letter and Annual Evaluations. This part of the file must contain at a minimum the initial appointment letter and all annual evaluations since appointment or the last promotion. Include any other documents that describe or modify a faculty member’s assignment (e.g., position description, memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement, etc.)

3. Documentation of Teaching, Research, and Service. The candidate seeking promotion uses this part of the file to document activities contributing to the case for promotion/tenure. Detailed narratives of the candidate’s contributions should preface documentation for each of the three areas of evaluation. Responsibility for preparing the narratives and documentation lies solely with the candidate.

4. Additional Documentation. All additional documentation previously placed in the Annual Update files but unnecessary for establishing the promotion/tenure file (e.g., drafts of former works in progress that have been superseded by publication).

Criteria for Evaluation

For Tenure-Line Faculty, the letter of appointment will normally establish teaching and research as the primary areas of significant contribution. For most faculty, a reasonable contribution in the area of Service is also required. If the areas of significant and reasonable contributions vary from the typical 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service, that permanent adjustment will be specified in a letter of agreement that has been approved by the Department Chair, the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost.

For Clinical Faculty, the letter of appointment will normally establish teaching and service as the primary areas of significant contribution. If a reasonable contribution in the area of research and publication is expected, that will also be specified in a letter of agreement between the Chair of the Department and the Candidate and approved by the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences.

For Teaching Faculty, the letter of appointment will normally establish teaching the primary area of significant contribution. For most teaching faculty, a reasonable contribution in the area of Service is also required.

The next section outlines minimum criteria for establishing significant contributions in each area.

Research & Publication as Significant Area of Contribution (40% or more)

The candidate will present high-quality published work as evidence of an on-going research agenda and of continuous production of research. The evaluation of quality in scholarship is a shared decision between the members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair. External reviewers help make such a decision but are not the sole determinant of quality. A positive
recommendation for promotion and/or tenure should be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of research, and by a performance that is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of significant contributions as outlined below.

**Persons in Critical Year.** To be considered for promotion and tenure in the critical year, the candidate must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) by a reputable press or at least four scholarly articles or essays that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

A candidate seeking promotion and tenure in the critical year on the basis of creative writing must present a book published (or firmly contracted to be published) or at least four stories, four essays, or sixteen poems that have appeared (or are firmly contracted to appear) in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation. If a book, it must contain at least four stories or essays or sixteen poems not previously published.

**Persons seeking Discretionary Promotions.** To be considered for a discretionary promotion, the candidate must present a book published by a reputable press or at least five scholarly articles or essays that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

A candidate seeking promotion on the basis of creative writing must present a book or at least five stories, five essays, or twenty poems that have appeared in journals or anthologies of national or international reputation. If a book, it must contain at least five stories or essays or twenty poems not previously published.

It is understood that the above quantities are the minimum qualifications for consideration for promotion, and are not to be construed as necessarily sufficient for promotion. The candidate must give evidence of a pattern of significant scholarly or creative activity. Ordinarily, in the case of promotion to Professor, the candidate should present a book; in the absence of a book at least five scholarly articles should be presented representing a significant and coherent body of work as determined by peers in the field.

**Research as Reasonable Area of Contribution (20% or less of appointment)**

**Clinical Faculty.** Per Board of Governors Policy 2, a Clinical faculty appointment must have service assignments of at least 50%, with classroom instruction or other assignment secondary. When research is part of the appointment, it typically represents 10% of the regular workload. Thus, expectations for Clinical faculty include significant contribution in the areas of service and teaching and reasonable contribution in research. Within the English department, the criterion of "reasonable research contribution" for an annual descriptor of satisfactory for Clinical faculty would normally be one example of ongoing productivity, such as one of those items listed in the departmental guidelines under "other scholarly activities" (e.g., book reviews, grant applications, articles or papers in progress, professional conference participation, etc.). This productivity level should be recorded with a series of annual reviews evaluating research at or above "satisfactory." However, for discretionary promotion, *a record of publication will be expected*. A clinical faculty member will normally present at least two scholarly articles or essays that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (or the equivalent) of national or international reputation.

**Teaching as Significant Area of Contribution (40% or more)**

A positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure should be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of teaching, and by a performance that is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of significant contributions. "Significant contributions" are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently tenured and/or promoted to the same level who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. The evaluation of quality in teaching is a shared decision between the members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair.
Teaching Faculty. Teaching faculty are the members of the English Department who are most likely to have teaching as their sole significant area of contribution (80% of their work), although this category might also apply to tenured faculty members who have had a permanent workload adjustment approved.

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.

Service as Significant Area of Contribution (40% or more)

Clinical faculty members are the members of the English Department who are most likely to have service as a significant area of contribution, although this category might also apply to tenured faculty members who have had a permanent workload adjustment approved. Per Board of Governors Policy 2, a Clinical faculty appointment must have a service assignment of at least 50%, with classroom instruction or other assignment secondary. For Clinical faculty, teaching has been defined as maximum of fourteen (14) credit hours during the nine-month academic year.

For Clinical faculty in who wish to stand for promotion in the Department of English, the file is expected to show evidence of significant contribution to service in the form of successful program coordination and administration. Such evidence will normally include assessment of program growth and/or impact, examples of program innovations and/or program effectiveness, and explanation of how the service work helps meet the needs and priorities of the Department, College, and/or University.

A positive recommendation for promotion should be supported by a preponderance of good or excellent ratings on annual reviews of service and by a performance that is judged to meet the more rigorous standard of significant contributions. “Significant contributions” are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently tenured and/or promoted to the same level who are respected for their contributions in service at West Virginia University. The evaluation of quality in service is a shared decision between the members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair.

Service as Reasonable Area of Contribution (20% or less)

A reasonable contribution in service, unless otherwise stipulated in a letter of agreement between the candidate and the Chair of the Department and approved by the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, will be indicated by a series of annual reviews evaluating service at or above “satisfactory.”

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.

Tenure-line faculty who have research as an area of significant contribution and clinical faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution both require external evaluations of their work as one component of their promotion file. These reviews are maintained in a separate section of the personnel file in the office of the Dean. (Note: teaching faculty do not require external evaluations of teaching.) Outside reviewers should be experts in the relevant research or service area for each candidate. That is, evaluators of research should be able to judge the significance of presses and journals in which candidates have published; evaluators of service should be able to assess the scope and impact of the administrative work for which clinical faculty are being reviewed.
To allow the Department time to contact external reviewers (and to allow those reviewers ample time to read and evaluate materials), the Department begins the process of selecting external reviewers in the Spring semester prior to the candidate's critical year.

- By April 1, candidates seeking promotion notify Chair in writing of desire to be considered for discretionary promotion or of intent to be considered for tenure in the critical year.

- By April 15, candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure should prepare a brief description of their areas of scholarly emphasis and methodologies to aid the Faculty Evaluation Committee in creating a list of external reviewers.

- By May 1, prior to the start of the faculty member's critical year or elective promotion year, the Chair of the Department will ask the Faculty Evaluation Committee to prepare and submit a list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of the applicant's scholarship. At the same time, the applicant will be asked to prepare a similar list of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of his/her scholarship, and to submit the list to the Chair.

- By May 31, the FEC and the candidate seeking promotion will each provide the Department Chair a list of eight names, as detailed below.

- By June 7, the candidate seeking promotion 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.

- By June 15, the Chair will consult with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences to draw up a list of reviewers and gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.

- By July 1, the candidate seeking promotion will have ready a packet of the materials to be sent to external reviewers.

**Qualifications for Reviewers.** The minimum qualifications to serve as an external evaluator require 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 an English Department with a Ph.D. granting program or its equivalent generally recognized to be at least the peer of our doctoral program, or (where creative work is being evaluated) that the individual be a member of a Creative Writing program generally recognized to be at least the peer of our Creative Writing program. Please note: the College supplies a list of approved peer institutions. In special cases, individuals from beyond the list of approved peer institutions, individuals who do not hold an academic appointment, or individuals who are in departments other than English may be consulted if their areas of expertise are widely recognized in the profession and a strong case can be made for their ability to evaluate the work of an applicant for tenure and/or promotion, but these rare cases are always subject to special approval.

**Assembling the Lists of Reviewers.** 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.

By the first week in June, 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 applicant will prepare a packet of materials for review according to instructions below.
By mid June, in consultation with the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, the Chair will draw up a list of reviewers, gain their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.

Packet for External Reviewers. By July 1, candidates seeking promotion should have ready their packet of materials to be sent to external reviewers. The Department will mail these materials to reviewers the same week.

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 or creative writing (e.g., it corrects an earlier study or it follows from the work of another scholar, or it constitutes one of a sequence of short stories, etc.), 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. Such books should be considered gifts to the reviewers and their return should not be anticipated.

Materials for the packet for review must be supplied to the Chair by July 1. In rare circumstances, candidates may be granted additional time up until September 30.

EMERITUS STATUS

When seeking emeritus status, a faculty member must make a formal request to the committee. This request typically consists of a letter addressed to the Department Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee, which outlines the highlights of the faculty member’s career at WVU. This letter is typically accompanied by a current C.V.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee is charged with making recommendations concerning Emeritus Status, an honor awarded selectively to faculty members upon retirement in recognition of their meritorious service to the Department and to West Virginia University.

To be recommended for Emeritus Status, a faculty member must have a distinguished record in teaching, in research and publication, in service, or in administration and must have held a faculty rank at West Virginia University for at least ten years.

After the review, the Committee’s recommendation is forwarded to the Chair, to the Dean, and then to the Provost of West Virginia University for a final decision. The award is usually conferred at the end of the academic or fiscal year in which the faculty member retires, except in cases where plans to retire are not announced until after December 31. In such cases, the review for Emeritus Status will take place during the next annual review cycle.
PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to the Guidelines 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, it will then become part of the Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Merit Determination, and Promotion & Tenure.

The entire document will normally be reviewed by the English Department every five years.

CALENDAR FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

The Faculty Evaluation Committee is elected in April of each academic year to serve starting immediately and continuing until May 1 of the following academic year.

The term of annual review, extends from August 16 of one year to the following August 15. All annual files must be updated and prepared for annual review on or before the Tuesday following the Labor Day Recess.

Promotion Files: Persons being considered for tenure or elective promotion may continue to update their files until the last working day preceding December 31.

Key Dates

- April 1: Candidates seeking discretionary promotion notify Chair in writing
- April 15: Candidates seeking promotion prepare a brief description of their areas of scholarly emphasis and methodologies
- May 1: Department Chair asks candidates seeking promotion and the FEC each to prepare and submit separate lists of at least eight persons to serve as external reviewers of the promotion applicant's scholarship.
- May 31: The FEC and the candidate seeking promotion will each provide the Department Chair a list of eight names.
- June 7: Candidates seeking promotion review the FEC list of proposed reviewers
- June 15: The Chair, in consultation with the ECAS Dean, draws up a list of reviewers and gains their informal consent to undertake a review according to the calendar established by the Eberly College.
- July 1: Candidates seeking promotion will have ready a packet of the materials to be sent to external reviewers.
- August 16: Beginning of Academic Year
- On or before the Tuesday following Labor Day Recess: Final day for updates; file is sealed for academic year ending the previous August 15 except for persons anticipating a critical year review and faculty in first year of employment
- December 1: Date stated in evaluation solicitation letter as latest date to receive external evaluations
- January 1: Final day for updates for those anticipating a critical year review and faculty in first year of employment
• January 15: Deadline for department reviews of faculty in first year of employment to be forwarded to the dean
• February 1: Deadline for department reviews of tenure-track faculty and other faculty for whom action is recommended to be forwarded to the dean
• March 1: Deadline for department reviews of all other faculty to be forwarded to the dean
• March 15-April 15: Departmental election of FEC members
• April 15-May 15: Initial Meeting of FEC
• August 15: End of Academic Year
APPENDIX 1
Chart of Full-Time Faculty Members in English
APPENDIX 1: ENGLISH DEPARTMENT FULL-TIME POSITIONS AT-A-GLANCE

### TENURE-LINE POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE*</th>
<th>Promotable?</th>
<th>Tenurable?</th>
<th>Performance-Based Pay?</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Areas of Primary Contribution</th>
<th>Typical Workload (individuals may vary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Line Faculty (must achieve tenure in the critical year; if not qualified for tenure, cannot be moved to a term appointment, but may apply for a newly-created term position at a lower entry-level salary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Yes—eligible for initial promotion in the sixth year; requires external reviews.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Training &amp; Research</td>
<td>40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Yes—typical interval between subsequent promotions is at least 5 years; requires external reviews.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEMPORARY POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE*</th>
<th>Promotable?</th>
<th>Tenurable?</th>
<th>Performance-Based Pay?</th>
<th>Term Appointment?</th>
<th>Areas of Primary Contribution</th>
<th>Typical Workload (individuals may vary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yearly—up to max of 3 years (by dept. need)</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>80% teaching, 20% service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTE stands for "full-time equivalency." For faculty members, a 1.0 FTE is typically a nine-month; it normally assumes a base of 8 courses per year (.80) plus service; Specific workload percentages depend on the needs, goals, and future of the department. All 1.0 FTE faculty must receive annual reviews and should have annual workload plans.  
NOTE: Full-time (1.0 FTE) faculty may be considered for Faculty development grants and travel grants; graduate faculty membership (if they meet some criteria for review, approval, and continuation); and are eligible to serve on Faculty Senate and as members of the departmental FEC. (College and University P&T committee members must have tenure.)

**Promotion Timeline:** Normally eligible for initial promotion in the 6th year, but may be awarded up to 2 years of credit toward promotion based on profile & criteria.

**Sabbatical and Professional Development Leave.** All research faculty members are eligible for Sabbatical Leave (scholarly research) or Professional Development Leave (non-research activity) subject to the usual rules and conditions. All clinical and teaching faculty appointments are eligible for Professional Development Leave (non-research activity)—subject to the usual rules and conditions. See [http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/faculty.htm](http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/faculty.htm)
### FULL-TIME, RENEWABLE, NON-TENURE LINE POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Promotable?</th>
<th>Tenurable?</th>
<th>Performance-Based Pay?</th>
<th>Term Apptmt?</th>
<th>Areas of Primary Contribution</th>
<th>Typical Workload (individuals may vary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Faculty (may continue at initial rank indefinitely, based on need, performance, and funding)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Yes, but requires terminal degree.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Initial 1 year term</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>80% teaching &amp; 20% service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Normally eligible for initial promotion in the sixth year; typical interval between subsequent promotions is at least 5 years. Does not require external reviews.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1-3 year terms</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>80% teaching &amp; 20% service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Associate Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1-3 year terms</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>80% teaching &amp; 20% service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1-3 year terms</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>80% teaching &amp; 20% service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative/Service Faculty (may continue at initial rank indefinitely, based on need, performance, and funding)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEAP (faculty equivalent administrative position)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Service/Teaching</td>
<td>Per PIQ (Position Information Questionnaire Form)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor (requires terminal degree)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Yes; normally eligible for initial promotion in the sixth year; typical interval between subsequent promotions is at least 5 years. Requires external reviews.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Service/Teaching</td>
<td>40-50% teaching (may include 10% research) &amp; must be at least 50% service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Service/Teaching</td>
<td>40-50% teaching &amp; 50% service (may include 10% research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Service/Teaching</td>
<td>40-50% teaching &amp; 50% service (may include 10% research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FTE** stands for “full-time equivalency.” For faculty members, a 1.0 FTE is typically a nine-month; it normally assumes a base of 8 courses per year (.80) plus service. Specific workload percentages depend on the needs, goals, and future of the department. All 1.0 FTE faculty must receive annual reviews and should have annual workload plans.

**NOTE:** Full-time (1.0 FTE) faculty may be considered for faculty development grants and travel grants; graduate faculty membership (if they meet same criteria for review, approval, and continuation); and are eligible to serve on Faculty Senate and as members of the departmental FEC. (College and University P&T committee members must have tenure.)

**Promotion Timeline:** Normally eligible for initial promotion in the 6th year, but may be awarded up to 2 years of credit toward promotion based on profile & criteria.

**Sabbatical and Professional Development Leave.** All research faculty members are eligible for Sabbatical Leave (scholarly research) or Professional Development Leave (non-research activity) subject to the usual rules and conditions. All clinical and teaching faculty appointments are eligible for Professional Development Leave (non-research activity)—subject to the usual rules and conditions. See [http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/faculty.htm](http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/faculty.htm)
APPENDIX 2

Sample Chronological Inventory of Personnel File Entries
Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory Number</th>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Item Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-01</td>
<td>4/15/08</td>
<td>Offer letter from Dean Sotope</td>
<td>4/12/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-02</td>
<td>10/14/08</td>
<td>Curriculum vitae</td>
<td>10/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-03</td>
<td>12/29/08</td>
<td>Faculty Productivity Report</td>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-04</td>
<td>1/8/09</td>
<td>Annual review letter from Promotion and Tenure Committee</td>
<td>1/8/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-05</td>
<td>1/11/09</td>
<td>Annual review letter from Chair</td>
<td>1/10/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-06</td>
<td>5/18/09</td>
<td>Summary sheet from application for Faculty Development Grant funding to attend ASEA meeting</td>
<td>5/15/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-07</td>
<td>10/20/09</td>
<td>Faculty Productivity Report</td>
<td>10/20/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-08</td>
<td>11/6/09</td>
<td>Annual review letter from Personnel Committee</td>
<td>11/3/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-09</td>
<td>11/6/09</td>
<td>Annual review letter from Chair</td>
<td>11/5/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See search files for this position for letter of application, reference letters, etc.
Sample Chronological Inventory of Entries

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

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

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

Susan A. Smart
Faculty Member

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory Number</th>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Item Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-01</td>
<td>9/15/08</td>
<td>Memo from Chair appointing to Departmental Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>9/10/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University
Expectations for Faculty Members at West Virginia University

[11-08-07]

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.