

DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK  
SCHOOL APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES  
EBERLY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION,  
TENURE, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY**

Approved by the Division of Social Work May 14, 2010

Approved by the Office of the Provost June 14, 2010

The Division of Social Work 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 Division 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 West Virginia University Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University, and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, and Division.

The Division of Social Work'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 personnel file, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenured, Tenure-track, and promotion-eligible Clinical, Teaching, and Research faculty positions include provision for promotion review. By Eberly College policies, Tenure-track faculty are subject to a fourth-year review (i.e., an additional review, only at the College level) to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations of one's letter of appointment, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenure-track faculty during their probationary period, unless otherwise noted. "Tenured faculty" are those faculty who have earned tenure. Reference to "Non-tenure Track" faculty will include all other faculty ranks (e.g., Lecturer, Visiting, Clinical, Research, or Teaching faculty).

As a transitional measure growing out of "devolution" of SASS policy to the Division level in 2010, SASS Policy and Procedures regarding Faculty Evaluation in effect on January 1, 2010 will remain in effect for the Division of Social Work until specifically superseded by provisions of this document and future amendments to it.

## **The Appointment Letter**

Each faculty member shall have an appointment letter that defines broad, ongoing and multi-year expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service.

For Tenured and Tenure track faculty, the appointment letter normally defines the position as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Under standard college guidelines, designated research-intensive Tenured or Tenure track 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. Research faculty may teach. However, the primary focus of the appointment is their engagement as principal investigator in externally funded research. Per BOG Policy 2, classroom instruction or other assignments must be secondary. Teaching must be supported separately on internal funding and restricted to the extent allowable by funding agencies. There may be a timeline for becoming self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

Faculty with titles that include the term “teaching” are referred to as “teaching faculty.” For Teaching faculty, responsibilities are normally defined as 80% teaching and 20% service; evaluation of this assignment will be based on the same breakdown. Normally, no research will be assigned.

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. Teaching assignments for Clinical faculty are normally a maximum of 14 credit hours during the nine-month academic year.

## **Annual Assignment**

Annual faculty assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and Chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenured, Tenure track, and promotion-eligible and/or performance-based salary-eligible non-Tenure Track faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The normal allocation of a faculty member’s teaching, research, and service expectations is stipulated in the appointment letter. Appointments in the Eberly College are shown in the following table:

**Normal Assignment Distributions  
For Social Work Faculty**

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Clinical Faculty <sup>1</sup>	30-48%	5-10% max	50+%
Teaching Faculty	80%	---- <sup>2</sup>	20%
Research Faculty		100%	
Senior Lecturer	100%		
Lecturer	100%		

<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>2</sup> Per WVU P&T document, "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 Tenured and Tenure track faculty with 40% teaching appointments in the Division of Social Work is currently five 3-credit courses or their equivalent (including, direction of independent studies, field liaison instruction, direction of graduate thesis research, etc.). "Research active" in this context is defined as engaged in ongoing scholarly work that leads to regular publication in peer-reviewed outlets. Tenured faculty who are not research active by the preceding definition will normally have their teaching assignments adjusted to include more teaching. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the faculty member's expectations for promotion. (See Section XI of the West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.)

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.

For various types of leave certain standard allocation percentages will ordinarily apply:

- 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 Tenured or 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 sabbatical leave would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

- A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

Copies of the approved leave application and plan (or Memorandum of Understanding) and follow-up report are to be included in the personnel file and taken into account during the annual evaluation.

## **The Faculty File**

Faculty must annually update personnel files with representative documentation of activities completed during the academic year under review. On a deadline date specified by the department, the file shall be closed for the review period. After the deadline date only materials generated by the faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file for that year.

Each faculty member's 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 a format that maintains four separate inventories for (1) the administrative file, and for documentation of (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service. File materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

1. The administrative file includes: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement); (c) annual evaluations and any written responses; (d) annual CVs and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the chairperson may wish to include.
2. The teaching, research, and service files include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify which file each piece of documentation is submitted to. The inclusion of a narrative placing materials in context is highly recommended.

Each document should be tagged with its inventory number.

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

1. **Faculty Responsibility for Information:** Faculty members are responsible for providing the information required for assessment of their own performance.
  - a. **Annual Report Template:** Faculty must provide an annual report using the template established by the Division of Social Work. The full reporting of information and its presentation and discussion are important to the faculty evaluation process.
  - b. **Personnel File Updates:** Faculty may keep the personnel file updated throughout the year using established WVU processes. Where there is uncertainty or established procedures do not apply, the Chair of the Division shall be consulted. Chairs may also include items in the personnel file and advise faculty of these additions.
  - c. **Faculty Responsibility for Information:** The burden is on the faculty member to provide adequate information for a full and fair assessment by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and

its subcommittees. Under University policy, the committee and subcommittees will limit their review to information in the annual report and personnel file. Where there is missing information and documentation, the Committee and Subcommittee cannot provide recognition or credit for work done. Normally, the absence of student evaluations will result in an unsatisfactory rating in teaching, because adequate evidence of effective teaching has not been provided.

- d. **Copies of Annual Report:** The faculty member should submit one complete copy of their annual productivity report prior to December 31 each year. In addition, faculty members are advised to retain a copy for their own use and files.
2. **Personnel File Documentation:** The only two sources of information for review of a faculty member's performance are the annual report and the personnel file. Items may be added to the personnel file at any time during the year. The annual report will cover all important activities and accomplishments during the year and may refer to items already part of the personnel file. Additional items and documentation may be placed in the personnel file but not included in the annual report.
  - a. **Division Personnel Record:** Personnel files will be maintained at the Division level with responsibility to log items in the personnel file and to maintain secure records delegated to appropriate personnel. This secretarial support may be utilized to set up meetings, receive and distribute draft letters, make personnel files and annual reports available, count and record votes, collect signatures, make copies and perform other duties as assigned. Secretarial support will maintain confidentiality.
  - b. **Personnel File Access:** The Division Faculty Evaluation Committee members shall have access to the faculty personnel files through the assigned Division personnel. Access to the file by members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is limited to the annual review process.

### **Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback**

The annual review process spelled out in this document shall also serve as a tool for faculty development at all ranks.

All faculty who are subject to performance-based salary increases are to be reviewed and receive annual evaluations by a committee of faculty and the Chair of the Division. All full-time or promotable non-Tenure track, Tenure track, and Tenured faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Senior Lecturers will also participate in this process unless stated otherwise in their letter of appointment.

For all faculty, feedback may include observations, advice or suggestions from the committee related to the faculty member's performance, prospects for promotion, or other relevant issues.

**Faculty Evaluation Committee.** The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) serves as the designated committee of faculty for annual reviews, and for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and, when necessary, termination. The committee will ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based only on the contents of a faculty member's file, as indicated above. The committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the faculty files.

The Division of Social Work's FEC will normally include a minimum of five members, with a ratio of 4 to 1 Tenured/Tenure-track faculty and non-Tenure track faculty respectively. The committee composition

should be inclusive of categories of full-time faculty in the unit (e.g., non-Tenure track, Tenured or Tenure-track faculty) who qualify for performance-based salary increases. A faculty member who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his personnel file. For annual reviews, a majority of those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured faculty. For critical year reviews, all those voting on tenure recommendations must be tenured.

All members of the FEC must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even when a member abstains from voting. One or more FEC members may also write a dissenting opinion that may be included as part of the regular letter, or in a separate letter signed only by the dissenter(s).

### **Organization of the Social Work Faculty Evaluation Committee**

1. The Committee shall consist of four Tenured/Tenure-track and one non-Tenure track faculty members selected from the faculty of the Division of Social Work. The Committee will be formed by September 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. The representatives shall be selected by vote of all the full-time Tenured, Tenure-track, and non-Tenure faculty in the Division. For their protection, Tenure-track faculty will not ordinarily be eligible to serve on the FEC in their first year, the year before their critical year, or during their critical year at WVU. A majority of the faculty elected to the Faculty Evaluation Committee must be tenured. Exceptions to this requirement may, from time to time, be approved by the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences when a sufficient number of tenured faculty are not available.
2. At the first meeting the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) shall elect a Chair. The Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair shall be responsible for assigning committee members to annual reviews. The Chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have a least one year of recent prior experience on the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Possible conflicts of interest in evaluating specific faculty members will be discussed so that members of the Committee can be recused.
3. The committee shall be responsible for carefully reviewing each faculty member's personnel file and writing a review letter that will be signed by the full Committee. Annual review letters for Tenure track and Tenured faculty in non-critical years and non-Tenure track faculty shall be drafted by working procedures established by each committee. For each letter, a majority vote of the full committee will be necessary to recommend retention, promotion, the award of tenure and assignment of the descriptors (excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) used to determine performance-based pay.
4. In promotion and/or tenure decisions, a preponderance of committee members must be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought. Changing the recommendation of the subcommittee with regard to retention, promotion, the award of tenure and the descriptors (excellent, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) used to determine merit pay will require a majority vote of the full committee. The 1<sup>st</sup> reader shall draft a final letter reflecting the views of the Committee (and the subcommittee, if its view differs from those of the Committee) and all members of the Committee shall sign with the total vote of the Committee noted.
5. If additional members are needed for the FEC, they will be selected by elected members of the FEC in order to assure appropriate representation during the process of promotion and tenure reviews.
6. Members must recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating a partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso affects the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation. Faculty members who serve on the College committee may not serve on departmental evaluation committees in the same year.

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

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

The annual review normally covers performance only for the year under review. However, evaluative statements from previous years may 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.

Peer review by the committee should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are made.

A faculty member's work should be adequately documented. If, for example, 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."

In cases where faculty members disagree with the findings, conclusions or suggestions of the committee or the Chair, but do not wish to engage the formal grievance process, memoranda to the committee and/or Chair, with a copy to the faculty member's file are appropriate.

## **EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

It is expected that a faculty member's teaching should be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate their overall contribution to the teaching mission of the department. It is expected that the summary of 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 faculty member's personnel file as part of their annual productivity report.

Faculty should submit evidence of teaching effectiveness including the results of student evaluations and also additional evidence as defined below:

### **1. Teaching Priorities:**

a. ***Priority One***: competence in basic and elective courses. Competence encompasses all areas of pedagogy, including conceptualizing, designing, and implementing basic and elective courses, quality of teaching in such courses, and external funding of teaching-related activities.

b. ***Priority Two***: competence in other teaching endeavors: Academic and field advisement, including management of internship experiences; thesis direction; mentoring other faculty in teaching skills; workshops and seminars to lay and peer audiences, including continuing education

courses; non-credit seminars provided to student groups; serving on dissertation and thesis committees; preparing teaching materials including the development of web-based courses, televised courses, etc.; submitting and/or having accepted and/or implementing grant funded activities to support teaching; and other official activities that are of an essentially pedagogical nature.

**2. Broader Assessment of Instruction:** Faculty members are encouraged to utilize a teaching portfolio approach.

**a. Qualitative and Quantitative Measures:** Competence may be demonstrated through qualitative and quantitative measures of pedagogy. Faculty may go beyond the quantitative numbers from the course evaluation system to provide fuller information, and the Committee should go beyond quantitative data in assessing teaching competence.

**b. Options:** Further documentation may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. Instructional materials (handouts, study guides, in class visual tools, etc.)
- ii. Sample examinations/assignments
- iii. Course development
- iv. Other evaluation instruments
- v. Correspondence from current/former students
- vi. Review of course syllabi and organization. Syllabi should be clear, reflect current literature in the field, and apprise the student of all relevant expectations and requirements pertinent to the course.
- vii. Citing of student field practice and research projects.
- viii. Student products, such as group presentations and research projects, especially those involving public
- ix. Evidence of reaching audiences beyond the classroom.
- x. Peer reviews of teaching
- xi. Participation in teaching-related workshops/seminars
- xii. Teaching awards/recognition
- xiii. External funding related to teaching
- xiv. Honors and awards related to teaching

**3. Required Course Evaluations:** It is the policy of Social Work that all regular courses will be evaluated every semester. All credit-bearing activities (including internship/field placement and internship analysis) are to be evaluated using a format that insures objectivity and uniformity across the curriculum, where possible and feasible. Summaries of all social work course evaluations must be included in the annual report.

**a. Exceptions Justified:** Exceptions for courses which are not regular courses should be noted and justified; exceptions might include independent study, courses taught outside the Division of Social Work, staff listings or orientation courses

**b. SEI Requirement:** Generally, the Senate Evaluation Instrument (SEI) must be used to evaluate all courses and the SEI summary report submitted to the file. Exceptions and other formats must be justified based on the nature of the course, its delivery format, its size, or other pertinent factors.

**4. Course Evaluation Period Covered:** The annual report should include the course evaluations for the Spring semester and Summer courses taught during the evaluation year and for the Fall semester courses if they are available prior to the close of the file. Evaluations for Fall term courses taught during the previous evaluation year but received too late to include in the annual report for that year will be included

in and assessed as a part of the next year's file. In spite of this lag to a previous review year, faculty should submit all course evaluations as listed here so that the record is complete. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will make assessments for the modified time period rather than limit evaluation strictly to the calendar year in this regard.

**5. Evaluation Data to Submit:** The summary sheet of course evaluation statistics is required. A typed formatted copy of student comments for each course is also encouraged. It is recognized that preparation of student comments may not be feasible in the annual report for large introductory and some other courses, but faculty are encouraged to review comments for personal use and course improvement. When student comments are included, they must be complete and not edited (except for inappropriate language or off topic comments). The individual rating sheets should not be included in the annual report or the personnel file, but should be retained in the faculty member's personal file until the next annual report in the event there are questions or the Chair or committee wishes to verify written student comments.

**6. Course Syllabi Required:** Course syllabi for all courses taught during the review year must be included in the annual report. Syllabi are an important indication of course organization, teaching practices and standards, currency of information and literature, student expectations and learning designs.

**a. Syllabus Copies:** To constrain duplication and file space, only one copy of the syllabus for a specific course should be included, even though the course may have been taught multiple times during the year. If there were major changes, the faculty may include either the latest syllabus or both the new and old versions.

**b. Syllabus Filing:** Since the annual report is filed in the personnel file, the syllabi will be included in the personnel file. The faculty member may submit syllabi not included in the annual report for inclusion in the personnel file if desired. The Division will maintain separate files of syllabi for all sections of all courses.

### **Meritorious (Good or Excellent)Teaching**

Meritorious (good or excellent) teaching will include evidence of achievement in Priority One and Priority Two areas described in the faculty member's teaching portfolio and annual assignment plan.

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, as defined in the letter of appointment. 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.

### **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.

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

**1. Research Priorities:**

a. ***Priority One:*** professional books and refereed journal articles

- i. Refereed journal articles. This element normally requires blind peer review by anonymous reviewers.
- ii. A book that is published or under contract to be published (unequivocally accepted for publication) and is already completed. Its quality will be judged by (1) the identity and reputation of the publisher, (2) professional external review and opinion (in published form such as a book review, or in letter form solicited from external peer evaluators with recognized stature in the subject matter of the work), and (3) the judgment of the committee based on the complexity and skill demonstrated in the undertaking, and the significance of the work in the field. Some edited books may be included depending on the significance of the contributions of the editor. A book judged applicable according to these methods can be the equivalent of multiple journal publications or book chapters.
- iii. Book chapters, monographs, edited series and research notes (of a substantial length) that have undergone some type of systematic professional peer review.
- iv. External funding as defined in item 3.

b. ***Priority Two:*** other publications and scholarly work:

- i. Applied research such as consulting studies, reports, and other professional applications for governmental, nonprofit, or other public or community users resulting in publications or written research products may be given weight to the extent that they represent a valuable contribution to public service or governance and a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in professional theory and practice.
- ii. Peer reviewed conference and professional society papers and published proceedings. In exceptional circumstances, such publications may be appropriate as a Priority One publication.
- iii. Teaching or Clinical notes in a journal (i.e., short pieces about teaching pedagogy, etc. that are not peer-reviewed)
- iv. Internal or non-competitive funding for research projects as evaluated (judged) by the FEC.

**2. Review of Research:**

a. **Standards:** The minimum number of publications for tenure and promotion for faculty is generally six (6).

b. **Larger Research Publications:** Priority One publications include refereed journal articles and books. Books judged according to the criteria listed can be the equivalent of multiple journal publications and book chapters. As assessed by the Committee, a book may be considered for scholarly work beyond the year in which it is published. Generally books will be given credit for up to three years for the purposes of performance-based pay, depending on the complexity, length and significance of the work; that is, an annual rating of Excellent may be given for a peer-reviewed book when the manuscript has been accepted for publication, again when the book is actually

published, and a third time in the following year. (However, such a publication will only be counted once for purposes of promotion or tenure.). Less credit may be provided if the book is edited and/or a revised edition of the original work depending on the original work involved. Similarly, if multiple articles appear in a single year, a faculty member may hold one or more articles back for credit in the subsequent year. Some publications (such as a well evaluated book) may make acceptable fewer publications than the six normally required for promotion.

**3. Review of Grants:** Research grants will be reviewed in terms of the overall role, impact, innovation, inclusion of blind peer-review, grantors (e.g., NIH, NSF), or importance. External research grants may count as a Priority 1 publication, but are not intended to replace scholarship required for promotion or tenure. The intent is to give credit to those who choose to pursue external funding; it is not to be interpreted as a requirement that faculty obtain external funding to be eligible for tenure or promotion unless specified in the letter of appointment. Current activity associated with the ongoing implementation of a grant should be included in a faculty member's Annual Productivity Report and taken into account by the FEC and Chair in their review. Funding as a PI and Co-PI is of value, therefore, either status is eligible for the above.

**4. Book Reviews:** Books reviews will generally be assessed as Priority Two publications.

**5. Collaborative and Individual Scholarship:** Faculty collaboration is encouraged. Collaboration may be within the field or cross-disciplinary. However, a research portfolio is strengthened when it includes some research work and some research products/publications that show the competence and ability of the individual faculty member and her/his separate contributions as a scholar. While both single- and multiple-authored work can be evaluated for promotion and tenure, it is wise counsel, particularly to Assistant Professors, that their body of work include single-authored research.

**6. Research Credit in Individual Year:** A research publication should normally be credited only once. The faculty member has the right to determine the year an article will count for acceptance or when it appears in print. In their annual evaluation/activities reports, faculty members must indicate in which year they wish credit to be awarded for accepted journal articles. If credit is assigned for acceptance, unequivocal documentation of acceptance must be provided. The annual report template supplies information to the Faculty Evaluation Committee about work in progress, acceptance and publication lag. If the research publication is presented towards research accomplishment during the annual report but has not appeared during that period, the report should include a full explanation. In any event, if a work is listed for credit during a particular year, it may not be listed for credit in an ensuing year even if it appears in print during that year. It may be listed for information, but not toward the research expectation.

**7. Research Honors:** Appropriate information regarding awards, prizes and recognitions from state, regional, national or international awards, prizes or other honors bestowed on the faculty member may be noted by the faculty member in their annual review and should be appropriately acknowledged by the committee.

Clinical faculty assignments (a minimum of 50% service) may include a 5-10% research component. In a clinical faculty appointment that asks for only a reasonable contribution in research, 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.

### **Meritorious (Good or Excellent) Research**

A rating of “excellent” may be given for a peer-reviewed manuscript that appears in print or has been accepted for publication. In their annual evaluation/activities reports, faculty members must indicate in which year they wish credit to be awarded for accepted journal articles. In general, documentation related to research publications will be evaluated on the basis of the following stages in the process of research and publication

Stage	Normal Rating
Research in progress, reflected in a partial or complete manuscript	Satisfactory
Conference paper presented and discussed	Good
One or more Priority 2 publications	Good
Book chapters or article submitted to publisher for peer review	Good
Priority One publication; book chapter published or accepted	Excellent
Book published	Excellent

### **EVALUATION OF SERVICE**

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member’s professional expertise, which have some relation to the Division, 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 Division, College, University, or profession.

Private consulting apart from the University should normally not be considered as part of a productivity dossier. Consulting by faculty members is normally limited to one working day per week. Such consulting should not prevent a faculty member from fulfilling responsibilities to the institution. Consulting work must be reported to the Chairperson, who reports to the Dean regarding the extent of consulting by the faculty members in the Division. University stationery and other resources may not be used for correspondence or for reports that are related to the consulting work. Outside employment and consulting activities must be consistent with the provisions of Series 9 and 31.

While service is an area of expected reasonable contribution for most faculty, service is regarded as an area of importance for all faculty in the Division of Social Work in keeping with the public and social service ethos which underlies both the practice and study of the disciplines and the mission of the University.

The evaluation of service should include an assessment of the degree to which the service cited yields important benefits to the university, society, or the profession. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person’s professional expertise as a faculty member and are performed with one’s university affiliation identified. Annual reports should include not only a list of activities in which the faculty member has engaged, but also an elaboration of one’s involvement, including time (e.g., met once a week), productivity (i.e., actual tasks carried out), and other pertinent information which would enable the Committee to determine the level and quality of involvement.

A routine expectation of all faculty members is that they provide service to their Division, the School of Applied Social Sciences, Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, and/or the larger University. Such service is one of the ways in which faculty members contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Division.

Evidence of service includes but is not limited to:

**1. Service to the Community**

- a. Participation in a professional capacity in a community or other public organization
- b. Membership on committees and commissions at national, state, and local levels in a professional capacity
- c. Participation in University-sponsored off-campus programs, workshops, and conferences
- d. Consultancies to public and private agencies and individuals
- e. Development and direction of special educational programs for the public
- f. Professional presentations to community groups.
- g. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the community.
- h. Other external service activity
- i. External funding that supports community service work
- j. Honors and awards for community service

**2. Service to University and College**

- a. Committee work.
- b. Participating in creating, developing and operating joint degree programs and sharing arrangements with academic and service units within the University.
- c. Contributing to the improvement of management and operation processes of the University or any of its academic or administrative units.
- d. Faculty advisor to professional associations, honorary organizations and other student organizations.
- e. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the University and/or College.
- f. Other service activity
- g. External funding that supports University or College service work
- i. Honors and awards for University or College service

**3. Service to the Division and School**

- a. Service in departmental assignments.
- b. Providing administrative services to the Division or School.
- c. Development of special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, and catalogs.
- d. Involvement in program and curriculum development.
- e. Academic advising, other than on instructional matters.
- f. Organizing colloquia and other division or school programs.
- g. Development of cooperative arrangements with other academic and external units, leading to enrichment of our respective degree programs.
- h. Faculty advisor to professional associations, honorary organizations and other student organizations.
- i. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the Division and/or School.
- j. Other division or school service.
- k. External funding that supports Division service work
- l. Honors and awards for Division or School service

#### **4. Service to the Profession**

- a. Holding offices and committee memberships in professional organizations.
- b. Referee for professional journal.
- c. Editorial work associated with journal (including position of editor or editorial board member).
- d. Consultancies for the profession, including but not limited to pre-publication review of manuscripts, and accreditation and peer review functions.
- e. Presenting speeches or workshops at professional conferences.
- f. Chairing or appearing as a panel discussant or reactor at professional conferences, or otherwise helping to facilitate a professional meeting or conference.
- g. Serving as reviewer or developer within a Federal, state, or foundation grant program.
- h. Submission and/or acceptance and/or implementation of funded grants to support service to the profession.
- i. Other professional service.
- j. External funding that supports service work to the profession
- k. Honors and awards for service to the profession

#### **Meritorious (Good or Excellent) Service**

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.”

In the Division of Social Work, service expectations for faculty with service as an area of “significant contribution” will reference expectations defined in the letter of appointment and in annual assignment documents. Faculty will normally include in their annual report a narrative, in combination with documentation, to help the FEC and other colleagues in the department understand the significance and impact of their greater efforts. 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 “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.

For faculty with a service expectation of “reasonable contribution,” “Excellent” service goes substantially beyond what is expected of a faculty member in the ordinary course of duty and should be represented by an array of activities such as those listed above. “Good” service goes beyond what is expected of a faculty member in the ordinary course of duty. “Satisfactory” service constitutes the minimum amount of service activities expected of a faculty member in the ordinary course of duty. A faculty member’s teaching and/or administrative assignment should be taken into account in this evaluation. A faculty member with service as an area of significant contribution will be expected to document his or her contributions more extensively.

#### **Grants in Annual Review**

Teaching, research and service grants on which a faculty member is named as a principal investigator, co-investigator, awardee or which are received through the efforts of that faculty member are to be included

in the faculty member's Annual Productivity Report and taken into account by the Faculty Evaluation Committee in their review. Grants may be included under either Priority One or Priority Two teaching, research or service activity, as deemed appropriate and explained by the faculty member. In all cases, the committee will be free to disagree and consider the activity more appropriate under some other heading. For purposes of this policy, "grants" refers to many different forms of programmatic financial inflows typically resulting from the initiative of individual faculty members. This may include grants, contracts, large donations and all other forms of financial award.

### **Rebuttal or Appeal of Annual Evaluation**

According to University guidelines [<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf>] Section XIII.A.4] faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the 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/](http://pegboard.state.wv.us/) or by contacting the office of the university's Chief Grievance Administrator at 293-9203.

### **Performance-Based Salary Policy**

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations. Evaluations of Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

The Division uses the College's descriptor values. College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating; e.g.

40% teaching =  $40 \times 2.5$  (rating of "Good") = 100  
40% research =  $40 \times 4.0$  (rating of "Excellent") = 160  
20% service =  $20 \times 1.0$  (rating of "Satisfactory") = 20  
Merit Score = 280

80% teaching =  $80 \times 2.5$  (rating of "Good") = 200  
20% service =  $20 \times 2.5$  (rating of "Good") = 50  
Merit Score = 250

If the Evaluation Committee and the second evaluator (usually the Chair) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is weighted 1:1 for the FEC and second evaluator respectively.

## **Fourth-Year Review**

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

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 and/or Dean.

## **Promotion and/or Tenure Review**

In a Tenure track appointment, tenure must have been awarded by the end of the individual’s sixth year on the faculty, the “critical year,” as identified in the letter of appointment. If tenure is not awarded, a one year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year.

Tenure track faculty with qualifying work experience as identified in the letter of appointment may request a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the new critical 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. 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.

Tenure track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may do so during the fourth year of employment (by May 15<sup>th</sup> 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 non-Tenure track faculty appointments. For these appointments, the Eberly College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing Tenure track positions; that is, subject to reappointment, a promotion-eligible non-Tenure track 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.

Per WVU policy, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered 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.

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, weight is generally 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.

Except as otherwise provided in "Criteria for Tenure" section below, in order to be recommended for promotion, a Tenured or Tenure-track faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and teaching, and reasonable contributions in the area of service. The areas of significant contribution in which each faculty member is expected to perform will be identified in the letter of appointment, or modified in a subsequent document. Inasmuch as successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty who are assigned to teach, significant contributions will have been made in teaching. For faculty who have service as an area of significant contribution, service activities provided for the benefit of the citizens of the State will receive primary emphasis when reviewed for promotion purposes.

#### **Criteria for Tenure (& promotion to the rank of Associate Professor)**

At the rank of Assistant Professor, it is normally expected that faculty will have completed a doctorate in the appropriate field. In addition, they shall show promise of development into productive scholars, as evidenced by a research agenda or other plan for scholarly activity.

Ordinarily, the recommendation to tenure a faculty member will be coupled with a recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Thus, faculty members applying for tenure will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research and in teaching and reasonable contributions in service. Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty members who are assigned to teach. As a criterion for tenure, significant contributions will have been made in teaching.

The term "significant contributions" in research means performance which meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at WVU and at peer research universities. In the teaching context "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving promotion who are respected for their contributions in teaching at West Virginia University. In service a candidate for tenure normally will be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions.

Faculty members under review for the award of tenure (essentially, the same as review for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor) will be expected to have made a substantial beginning toward establishing their professional standing as productive scholars. This will be reflected in a cumulative body of published work during the course of their probationary period totaling, at a minimum, six (6) Priority I publications. Normally this is a minimum number with which it may be possible for a faculty member to be considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The publications need to be

quality products of importance for this minimum to be sufficient. In exceptional instances, a lesser number of publications (e.g., a book) may be acceptable. In such instances, the file needs to clearly support the case for significant contribution and for the significant importance of the publications. There must be clear indication that the faculty member will continue to be a productive scholar, as evidenced by an ongoing research agenda and work in progress, possibly in association with the acquisition of grant funds related to his or her interests.

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.

### ***Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor***

To achieve the rank of Professor, the expectation is that the faculty member will attain a distinguished record of research and publication. "Distinguished record" means a body of work of quality receiving professional and peer recognition on a regional or national basis in a particular field of specialization. There must also be a continued record of distinguished teaching. The faculty member should also have at least a reasonable record of service.

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

### ***Promotion without Tenure (Non-Tenure Track)***

For Division faculty who have a title with the prefix “Clinical,” service will normally be one area in which significant contributions are expected.

For faculty who have service designated as an area of significant contribution in their letters of appointment, a criterion for promotion and/or tenure shall be demonstrating significant contribution in service. While service to the university and/or to the profession is worthy of consideration in this context, normally a faculty member must demonstrate significant service to the public at large (i.e, beyond the university or core professional communities). An example would include the creation and direction of service-learning projects directed to the citizens of West Virginia. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the university or to the profession on a national or international level. Such expectations should be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

Teaching faculty assignments 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.

Research faculty members under review for a promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be expected to have made a substantial beginning toward establishing their professional standing as productive scholars in such ways as scholarship is defined in the particular appointment. To be promoted,

Research faculty must be self-supporting, and there is expectation that the position is contingent upon retaining external funding.

To achieve the rank of Professor, the expectation is that a Research faculty member has established himself or herself as an outstanding and recognized scholar in her/his respective discipline and has a distinguished record of research and publication. "Distinguished record" means a body of work receiving professional and peer recognition on a regional or national basis in a particular field of specialization. There must be evidence of continuous and ongoing scholarly publication in peer-reviewed outlets of high quality, influential manuscripts in the field of expertise, and dissemination of research at professional meetings. For Clinical and Teaching faculty, to achieve the rank of Professor there is equivalent expectation for professional and peer recognition in service or teaching, as defined by the appointment.

For all faculty with teaching responsibility, a continuing record of distinguished teaching is expected.

### **Administrative Assignment**

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the one in which the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or tenure, should have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the department in which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost.

### **Review of Instructors**

Faculty under review for appointment or renewal at the Instructor rank, at minimum, will be expected to have an MSW.

### **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 promotion, the personnel file must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University. Procedures for soliciting external reviews are as described in the College and University guidelines.

In any year that external reviews are part of the faculty member's file, the review committee will take those reviews into account as part of its overall review of the faculty member's performance.

### **Procedure for Modification of This Document**

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

Modification of this policies and procedures for annual faculty evaluation, promotion, tenure, and merit, Division of Social Work requires a simple majority vote of the full social work faculty, tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track.

**Deadline for Annual Review Documentation**

The faculty member should submit one complete copy of their annual productivity report prior to December 31 each year.

<<< end >>