

Changes to ECAS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines to comply with 2025 University Guidelines, updates to reference BOG Rules instead of BOG Policies, and update unit names (line numbers for comprehensive update document):

Updated 10/30/25

- 1) Line 207: Replace “50” percent with “60” percent
 - a. Context: Default service faculty appointment service percentage
 - b. University document section IX(B)(4): “Normally, a service-track faculty assignment will be at least 60% service.”
- 2) Line 289: Replace “Policy 12” with “Rule 4.6”
- 3) Line 399: Replace “Policy 51” with “Rule 4.5”
- 4) Line 441: Add “A narrative is required for each area of significant contribution.”
 - a. Context: Required items in faculty digital evaluation file
 - b. University document section VII(8): “A narrative is required for areas of significant contribution(s) that summarizes activities and accomplishments in each area during the review period.”
- 5) Lines 448-449: Add “Additionally, at least one peer evaluation of teaching must occur and be documented prior to a pre-promotion review.”
 - a. Context: Professional expectations of faculty members regarding teaching
 - b. University document section III(A): “At a minimum, the supporting documentation in the teaching section of the digital evaluation file must include a syllabus (when appropriate) for each course, University approved student feedback of instruction instrument, at least one peer evaluation prior to the mid-tenure/promotion review, and a teaching narrative that summarizes activities and accomplishments during the review period.”
- 6) Lines 584-588:
 - a. Remove: “(This rule does not preclude restrictions based on rank. For example, the department could restrict membership to Tenure-Track, Teaching, & Service faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor)”
 - b. Add: “and ranks” after “must be inclusive of categories” and “instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor” after “Tenure-Track, Teaching & Service”

- c. Context: The description of faculty eligible for service on unit faculty evaluation committees
 - d. University document section XIII: “Faculty members at the rank of instructor and above can serve on department faculty evaluation committees.”
- 7) Lines 789-792: Add “These standards must specify absolute criteria by which ratings of Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory are assigned, for annual reviews of assigned areas of contributions. These standards must also specify absolute standards for promotion and/or tenure.”
 - a. Context: Requirement in university document to establish absolute criteria
 - b. University document section X
- 8) Lines 842-844:
 - a. Delete “Departments set their own deadlines for receipt of these requests”
 - b. Add “Any such requests must be provided, in writing, at least ninety (90) days in advance of the applicable file closing date.”
 - c. Context: Date by which full professors must opt-into FEC review
 - d. University document section II(A)(4): “For ordinary annual reviews, fully promoted faculty members are evaluated by their chairperson and may also choose to be evaluated by their department committee. The faculty member must inform the department chairperson or equivalent, in writing, 90 days in advance of the faculty member's file closing.”
- 9) Line 913: Add “absolute”
 - a. Context: Requirement in university document to establish absolute criteria
 - b. University document section X
- 10) Lines 938-947: Replace all mentions of “Policy 51” with “Rule 4.5”
- 11) Lines 958-962: Add “As set forth in the University Procedures document, section IV(B)(1), a teaching faculty may, during their fourth year in rank, petition the Dean to bring their promotion forward one year, in which case they would initiate consideration for their first promotion during the fifth year (with promotion effective beginning year six).”
 - a. Context: New option for non-tenure faculty to advance year of first discretionary promotion by notifying in their fourth year; parallels option already in guidelines for tenure-track faculty to advance critical year by notifying in their fourth year.

- b. University document section IV(B)(1): “An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful promotion, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the first year a faculty member may seek promotion. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the promotion year forward by one year (to year five).”

12) Lines 992-993: Add “Note that while external evaluations of teaching are an option to demonstrate this criterion, they are not required.”

- a. Context: New university document statement that external evaluations of teaching and service faculty are no longer required
- b. University document section XII: “Teaching, service, clinical and library track faculty seeking promotion to any rank are not required to seek external reviews. Faculty with teaching as their sole significant area of contribution who are seeking promotion to any rank are not required to seek external reviews.”

13) Lines 998-1002: Add “As set forth in the University Procedures document, section IV(B)(1), a research faculty may, during their fourth year in rank, petition the Dean to bring their promotion forward one year, in which case they would initiate consideration for their first promotion during the fifth year (with promotion effective beginning year six).”

- a. Context: New option for non-tenure faculty to advance year of first discretionary promotion by notifying in their fourth year; parallels option already in guidelines for tenure-track faculty to advance critical year by notifying in their fourth year.
- b. University document section IV(B)(1): “An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful promotion, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the first year a faculty member may seek promotion. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the promotion year forward by one year (to year five).”

14) Lines 1014-1018: Add “As set forth in the University Procedures document, section IV(B)(1), a service faculty may, during their fourth year in rank, petition the Dean to bring their promotion forward one year, in which case they would initiate consideration for their first promotion during the fifth year (with promotion effective beginning year six).”

- a. Context: New option for non-tenure faculty to advance year of first discretionary promotion by notifying in their fourth year; parallels option already in guidelines for tenure-track faculty to advance critical year by notifying in their fourth year.
- b. University document section IV(B)(1): “An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful promotion, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the first year a faculty member may seek promotion. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the Dean to bring the promotion year forward by one year (to year five).”

15) Lines 1028-1031:

- a. Remove: “In a year when a faculty member who has service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for promotion, the Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's service from persons external to the University, as described in Section XII (“External Evaluations”) of the WVU Procedures document and Section IX of these Guidelines.”
- b. Context: New university document statement that external evaluations of teaching and service faculty are no longer required
- c. University document section XII: “Teaching, service, clinical and library track faculty seeking promotion to any rank are not required to seek external reviews. Faculty with teaching as their sole significant area of contribution who are seeking promotion to any rank are not required to seek external reviews.”

16) Lines 1073-1074: Change “at any time” to “within 10 working days of receipt of the evaluation.”

- a. Context: Previously, responses to annual reviews were permissible to submit “at any time.” This is now limited to 10 working days after receipt of the evaluation.
- b. University document section XIII(A)(7): “Responses to annual reviews must be forwarded to the chairperson and/or Dean within ten (10) working days of receipt of the evaluation(s).”

17) Lines 1081-1088:

- a. Remove “some aspects of” and two bullet points regarding external evaluations for teaching and service faculty:

- i. Teaching faculty member seeks promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor and exercises this option for documenting national or international recognition of their achievements (external evaluations of programmatic contributions in teaching are required), or
 - ii. Service faculty member seeks promotion (external evaluations of service are required).
- b. Context: New university document statement that external evaluations of teaching and service faculty are no longer required
- c. University document section XII: “Teaching, service, clinical and library track faculty seeking promotion to any rank are not required to seek external reviews. Faculty with teaching as their sole significant area of contribution who are seeking promotion to any rank are not required to seek external reviews.”

18) Line 1154: Change “Policy 51” to “Rule 4.5”

19) Line 1156: Change “policy” to “rule”