

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY Health Sciences  
PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL EVALUATION,  
PROMOTION, AND TENURE 2025-2026**

**[Approved by the WVU Faculty Senate; Accepted with modifications by the President; Modifications to represent BOG Rule 4.2]**

**APPENDICES**

The appendices included in this document are intended to illustrate expectations and are not exhaustive. School guidelines must include more specific examples of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The classification of a particular contribution is determined in accordance with the established criteria and guidelines of the relevant academic unit. Such contributions must only be counted in one mission area.

**APPENDIX A  
TEACHING EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTIONS &  
CONSIDERATIONS**

Teaching at WVU takes a range of forms, and teaching workloads are multifaceted and diverse in their composition. Evaluations of teaching files should be responsive to the unique constellation of teaching contributions of each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement.

**Types of Contributions:** This document enumerates different types of teaching contributions (e.g., course teaching, clinical supervision, advising). The particular composition of an individual teaching workload will be determined by a range of factors (e.g., involvement in a graduate program, assigned advising responsibilities) and should be explicitly laid out in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments or individuals may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all teaching activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count undergraduate advising as teaching and others as service).

**Considerations:** Because teaching takes a range of different forms, not all teaching activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of teaching a course, the course could be assessed on how much students learned, students' assessment of their experience, the course's design, and the instructor's demonstrated commitment to inclusivity and equity. In the context of student advising and/or mentoring, the considerations might include advisor/mentor availability and responsiveness, student success in achieving program benchmarks on time, and advisee load.

Because no two teaching activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the teaching task.

Teaching that helps to enact accessibility for all may occur in many aspects of the teaching endeavor, including but not limited to program or curriculum development related to supporting an accessible student body, learning activities that support accessibility in the classroom, extracurricular activities outside of the classroom related to a field or program of study, and advising students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Faculty who seek credit for this work must document it in their digital evaluation file.

**Examples of Teaching:** By its nature, teaching is difficult to capture and measure. The most successful teaching files will present a range of examples that comprehensively convey each teaching activity and its impact. For example, the activity of teaching a course could be represented by the course syllabus, student feedback instrument or other University approved tool, anonymized student work, pre- and post-course test data, instructor-designed course evaluations, screenshots from the learning management system, peer observation, etc. Different

examples communicate different types of information.

One consideration is the *example author or creator*. In other words, who generated or developed the example? Some examples are created by the instructor themselves. In the case of a course, this might include a syllabus, course assignment descriptions and associated rubrics, and learning management system shells. While the information conveyed by these examples is important, to understand the impact of these examples (on student learning, for example), examples generated by students is essential. These might include anonymized student work, student feedback instrument responses, pre- and post-course assessment data, or a screenshot of an (anonymized) online discussion board. To help triangulate information gleaned from and student-generated examples, the instructor could ask a colleague to observe a class or have a faculty associate from the Teaching and Learning Commons consult on a course. These peer- and expert-generated materials would provide a different perspective on the success of the course.

Another consideration is the *example type*. In other words, what does this example accomplish in the context of the file? Some examples, like peer observation, explicitly evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction and student feedback instrument provides feedback about the student's experience of the instruction. Other examples, like syllabi or student work, help to illustrate what happens in the course. Some materials, like a TLC consultation, are provided to demonstrate the instructors' professional development and learning related to their pedagogy. Finally, some file materials, like the teaching narrative, help to explain the course. Explanatory examples may be less formal, like a note in the digital evaluation file, which could explain that a syllabus revision was completed in response to the previous year's annual review letter or to student feedback on the mid-semester evaluation.

Where *evaluative* examples are included, it is helpful to consider whether those were anonymous (as in the case of student feedback instrument responses or instructor-designed evaluations delivered through Qualtrics) or not (peer observation or student letters of appreciation). It is also helpful to note whether the example was formative (like an early- or mid-semester evaluation intended to inform instruction in progress) or summative (intended to provide feedback about the course and its effectiveness after it is completed).

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or letter of appointment, and – perhaps most importantly – the teaching narrative.

One key to a successful teaching file is that it balances a range of example types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized.

Rather than providing a list of examples that could be associated with each teaching activity, this document provides guiding principles to help faculty and evaluation committee members consider different examples and the types of information they convey. This appendix also lists a range of possible examples. **Again, this list is not meant to be prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.**

**Evaluative Tools:** What follows is a series of tools to help evaluators – those serving on faculty evaluation committees (FEC), as well as chairpersons and deans – assess faculty teaching files. Faculty themselves should also consult these tools when developing their files and their narratives. These tools are meant to be flexible and generative. If an FEC or chairperson recognizes a teaching activity often performed by their faculty but not captured here, they should develop that table and associated metrics. If the considerations or metrics enumerated in a table do not effectively capture that activity for a particular department, the faculty of that department should revise the table to better fit its needs. Included in this document are the following tools:

**Tables** outline each type of teaching contribution and its associated metrics for consideration. *Matrices* could be used by faculty or evaluators as a way to check on the inclusion and balance of different types of evidence. *This appendix* lists examples of evidence types for each teaching activity. Once again, it is important to underscore the flexible nature of these tools.

**COURSE TEACHING\*  
TABLE**

Activity	Considerations (not required to address each of these topics)	(Possible) Associated Evidence <b>Bold Required</b>
	<b>Student Learning</b> (Do students demonstrate knowledge development over the course of the semester?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anonymized student work</li> <li>• Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>• Accreditation and/or Annual assessment reports</li> <li>• Exam pass rates</li> </ul>
	<b>Student Experience</b> (Did students feel positively toward the instructor, the materials, and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University approved student feedback instrument</li> <li>• Early semester assessments</li> <li>• Student emails/correspondence</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all students in this course have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade data (with attention to D/Fs)</li> <li>• <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>• Screenshots of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> <li>• Anonymized modifications for students with individual needs</li> </ul>
	<b>Course Design</b> (Is the course deliberately designed to effectively develop knowledge among students?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>• <b>Screenshots</b> of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions and rubrics</li> <li>• Student work</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, unit specific mission, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program curriculum requirements</li> <li>• GEF descriptions</li> <li>• Credits associated with course</li> <li>• SpeakWrite documentation</li> </ul>



**GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL STUDENT  
ADVISING/MENTORING  
TABLE**

*Note:* Graduate and/or professional student advising takes a range of forms: advising graduate and/or professional students on program requirements, overseeing graduate and/or professional work in a laboratory or other assistantship, scholarly mentoring on a dissertation, capstone, or thesis. Some departments or individuals may count some of these duties towards teaching (e.g., dissertation mentorship, teaching assistantship oversight), others towards service (e.g., program requirement advising), and others towards research (e.g., laboratory assistantship oversight). Such contributions must only be counted in one mission area. The faculty member and their chairperson should agree upon the designation of each type of advising and provide a clear rationale that aligns with the faculty member's workload agreement, MOU, etc. The faculty member should explicate any ambiguous designation in their teaching narrative and/or digital measures. Quality and impact should be emphasized over quantity. Faculty should choose items of evidence that most effectively demonstrate the quality and impact of their teaching. There is no reward for simply increasing the quantity of evidence submitted.

Activity	Considerations *Not required to address each of these topics	(Possible) Associated Evidence <b>*Bold Required</b>
	<b>Student Learning</b> (Do students demonstrate knowledge development?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Student work</li> <li>● Papers, presentations or other scholarly activity produced by student</li> <li>● Participation as committee chair or member of graduate student penultimate paper</li> <li>● Job placement of trainees immediately upon program completion</li> <li>● Awards or recognition received by students or other trainees under the faculty member's direct mentorship.</li> </ul>
	<b>Student Experience</b> (Did students feel positively toward the graduate advisor/mentor and the learning experience?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Student feedback instrument (<b>when appropriate and/or more than five (5) students</b>)</li> <li>● Early semester assessments</li> <li>● Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>● Number of transfers into/out of student mentorship (not via graduation)</li> <li>● Number of students completing program</li> <li>● Nominations of faculty for mentorship awards</li> <li>● Student assessment of mentor</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all advisees/mentees have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>● Fulfillment of Expectations (MOUs), Research Contracts</li> <li>● Completion of grant work</li> <li>● Attendance/organization at specified seminars</li> <li>● Participation in the educational component of research grants</li> </ul>
	<b>Design</b> (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop knowledge among students?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Syllabus</b></li> <li>● Screenshots of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>● Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>● Assignment descriptions</li> <li>● Student work</li> <li>● Attendance/organization at specified seminars</li> <li>● Participation in the educational component of research grants</li> <li>● Structured engagement with students through meetings, lab meetings, journal clubs, etc.</li> <li>● Evidence of incorporation of research data or practice guidelines into mentoring/advising</li> <li>● Development of tools and guidelines that promote effectiveness; expectations agreements, lab contracts, etc.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Program/University Needs</b>  (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>● Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>● Organization of departmental/unit/college seminar for graduate students</li> <li>● Service as graduate student advisor</li> </ul>
--	---	--

**UNDERGRADUATE  
ADVISING/MENTORING  
TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ADVISING/ MENTORING	Student Experience (Did students feel positively toward the advisor, the mentor, the advice given, and the experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Feedback on the advisor/mentor with a survey</li> <li>● Number of transfers from/to advisor</li> <li>● Average wait time between the requested appointment time and appointment</li> <li>● Student emails/correspondence</li> <li>● Letters of recommendations including, but not limited to applications for internal/external awards, internship placements, graduate applications, nominations for mentoring awards</li> <li>● Independent study or advanced research/service project including Honors Excel program, SURE, McNair Scholars, internships supported through grants, lab experiences, etc.</li> <li>● Postgraduate job placement or acceptance into graduate or professional programs</li> <li>● General assessment of advisor</li> </ul>
	Accessibility for All (Do all students have equal opportunity and access to advising and/or mentoring?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of students advised</li> <li>● Successful retention rate in the program</li> <li>● Successful retention rate in the University</li> <li>● Universal design in class materials</li> <li>● Attendance of training and certification (badges) to support accessibility for all</li> </ul>
	Design (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop students?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development of specialized mentorship tools for retention</li> <li>● Development of mentorship tools for retention of first-generation students</li> <li>● Expectation agreements and guidelines</li> <li>● Structured engagement or meeting schedule, lab meetings, etc.</li> </ul>
	Program/University Needs (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, GEF requirements, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Metrics for advisement being met (# of times per academic year, etc.)</li> <li>● Timely progress towards benchmarks</li> <li>● Time to degree completion</li> </ul>



**COMMUNITY-ENGAGED TEACHING  
TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
	<b>Participant Experience</b> (Did participants feel positively toward the instructor, the materials, and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program assessments (minute papers, etc.)</li> <li>• Participant emails/correspondence</li> <li>• Periodic check-ins with all parties involved</li> <li>• Reflection exercise from participants</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all participants in this course have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Participants</li> <li>• Scope of the training (local, state, national, international)</li> <li>• Design of alternate means of dissemination (hybrid, podcast, etc.)</li> </ul>
	<b>Design</b> (Is the experience deliberately designed to effectively develop participants?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of work as facilitator (e.g., slideshow, handouts)</li> <li>• Evidence of work as a mentor to the program development (not a facilitator)</li> <li>• Syllabus or overview of the program</li> <li>• New program development (e.g., program materials)</li> <li>• Substantial revision of program (e.g. revised program materials)</li> <li>• Screenshots of learning management system pages (e.g., welcome page, anonymized discussion boards, learning modules)</li> <li>• Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>• Assignment descriptions</li> <li>• Reflection exercise from all participants</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University/Stakeholder/Community Needs</b> (Does the course successfully meet the needs of associated accreditation, certificate, or continuing education unit/CEU programs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>• Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>• GEF descriptions</li> <li>• Community Request for additional engagement</li> <li>• Stakeholder Request for Training</li> <li>• External Certification Requirements (new and renewals)</li> </ul>

**TRAINEE CLINICAL SUPERVISION  
TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
	<b>Trainee/Supervisee Learning</b> (Do students demonstrate development over the course of the placement/rotation?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trainee/supervisee work</li> <li>● Pre- and post-course assessments</li> <li>● Mentor/On-site supervisor evaluation</li> </ul>
	<b>Trainee/Supervisee Experience</b> (Did trainees feel positively toward the supervisor and the learning experience more broadly?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trainee/Supervisee evaluations</li> <li>● Trainee presentations/publications/awards under mentorship of supervisor</li> <li>● Peer evaluations and/or observations</li> <li>● Awards for supervision</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility for All</b> (Do all students in this experience have equal opportunity to be successful?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade data</li> <li>● Explication/annotation of design</li> <li>● Assignment descriptions</li> </ul>
	<b>Design of Supervision/Innovation of methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teaching tools</li> <li>● Evaluation tools</li> <li>● Supervisee work</li> <li>● Evidence of integration of scholarship of supervision methods into design</li> <li>● Evidence of design to support supervisee learning in diverse settings.</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/Accreditation Needs</b> (Does the supervision meet the needs of associated accreditation programs, degree programs, or other extra-course needs?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program/Accreditation standards</li> <li>● Program Curriculum Requirements</li> <li>● Credits associated with supervision</li> <li>● National survey program (ACGME, LCME, etc.)</li> <li>● Board pass rates</li> </ul>
	<b>Trainee/Supervisee Preparation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trainee/Supervisee satisfaction/efficacy</li> <li>● Completion of degree</li> </ul>
	<b>Alumni success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Job Placement data (short-term success)</li> <li>● Career trajectory (long-term success)</li> <li>● Letters of appreciation</li> </ul>

**SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING & LEARNING (SoTL)  
TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
SoTL	<b>Dissemination of professional knowledge on teaching and learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference presentations (peer reviewed, invited, not peer-reviewed)</li> <li>• Research paper (peer reviewed, invited, not peer-reviewed)</li> <li>• Podcast production</li> <li>• Interview on podcast</li> <li>• News media production</li> <li>• Interview on news media</li> <li>• Video of lesson study/workshop</li> <li>• Book or workbook</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University Needs</b> (Dissemination of scholarship at the behest of the department/unit/University)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSC Faculty Development (Grand Rounds, Educational Morbidity and Mortality (M&amp;Ms))</li> <li>• HSC Teaching Scholars</li> <li>• Simulation Certificate Program</li> </ul>

**PROFESSIONAL LEARNING/DEVELOPMENT  
TABLE**

Activity	Considerations	(Possible) Associated Evidence
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (as a participant)	<b>Increased professional knowledge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of completion of graduate courses</li> <li>● Evidence of completion of graduate degree</li> <li>● Evidence of completion of other trainings or continuing education or workshops</li> <li>● Evidence of completion of certifications through testing or alternate means (non-classroom)</li> <li>● Evidence of completion of badging or certification</li> <li>● Conference attendance</li> <li>● Internal development opportunities</li> </ul>
	<b>Program/University Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of required professional development for certifications</li> <li>● Internal/external awards</li> </ul>

# **TYPOLOGY OF TEACHING EXAMPLES EVIDENCE MATRIX**

Activity	Example	Required	Anon.*	Solicited*	Author/Creator					Type				Purpose*	
					Self	Student	Peer	Expert	Admin.	Evaluative	Illustrative	Explanatory	Develop- mental	Formative	Summative

\*If evaluative

## TEACHING EXAMPLES

### COURSE TEACHING

#### Evaluation

- University approved student feedback instrument Early Semester Feedback Tool
- HSC Faculty Development peer evaluation
- Department Colleague Class Observation
- Department Chairperson Class Observation
- Department Colleague Course Material Review
- Teaching Awards
- Evaluations by GTAs, GAs, RAs, or other instructional personnel

#### Design

- Syllabus
- Screenshots of learning management system
- Model Assignments Description/Rubrics
- Lesson Plans
- Class Activities (descriptions, notes, slides)
- Handouts
- Lecture/Seminar Notes
- Lecture/Seminar Slides
- Digital Learning Objects
- Simulation Case Scenarios

#### Trainee Learning

- Trainee Letter of Appreciation
- Anonymized Trainee Work
- Trainee Pre-/Post-Course Assessments
- Screenshot of Discussion Board
- Trainee external publications related to course work
- External awards for trainee course work

#### Other

- Sample anonymized feedback on trainee work
- Invitations to consult on teaching, provide workshops on teaching, etc.
- Self-reflection/teaching narrative
- Grants or funding for pedagogical innovations or teaching projects
- Formative feedback from external content experts
- External evaluations (if pursued, must be sought through the standard procedure outlined in Section XII of this document)

## APPENDIX B

### EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY PRODUCTION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Research at WVU takes a range of forms, and research workloads are diverse and multifaceted in their composition. Evaluations of research/scholarship files should be responsive to the specific nature of research/scholarly contributions by each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement.

**Types of Contributions:** This document enumerates different types of research/scholarly contributions (e.g., publishing, grant activity, performance, presentation). The nature of an individual research/scholarship workload will be determined by a range of factors and should be described in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all research/scholarly activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count graduate student mentorship in a laboratory or on a research project as research and others count it as teaching).

**Considerations:** Because research/scholarship takes a range of different forms, not all research/scholarly activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of procuring a major grant, the grant could be assessed on the prestige of the funding agency, the amount of funding awarded, the selectivity of the award, and the faculty member's role on the project (e.g., PI, Co-I, etc.). In the context of publishing an article, the considerations might include the selectivity and prestige of the journal, the authors' role (e.g., sole author, first author, etc.), the time dedicated to research represented in the article (e.g., multiyear ethnography vs. secondary data analysis), and if graduate students or mentored junior scholars were included as authors.

Research/scholarship that helps to enact accessibility for all may occur in many aspects of the research/scholarly endeavor, including but not limited to direct research about disadvantaged populations and engaging diverse perspectives in the research team and research design. Faculty who seek credit for this work must document it in their digital evaluation file.

Because no two research/scholarly activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the research/scholarship.

**Evidence:** While some products of research/scholarly activity are obvious – like publications, posters, and submitted grant proposals – not all research/scholarly activity is easily communicated within a research/scholarship file. The faculty member should present a range of evidence types that help to convey the full scope of the research/scholarly activity.

One consideration is the *evidence type*. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like posters or published manuscripts, are explicit illustrations of research/scholarly findings. Other evidence, like unfunded grant reviews, IRB protocols, or agendas of grant writing workshops, help to show a research project or researcher's development. Finally, some file materials, like the research narrative, performance review, serving as PI/Co-I for a clinical trial, or a scholar's research index or impact factor, provide some context for the research activity. One key to a successful research file is that it balances a range of evidence types.

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or letter of appointment, and – perhaps most importantly – the research narrative.

Rather than providing a complete list of evidence that could be associated with each research/scholarly activity, this document provides a few illustrations to guide faculty and FECs in how to consider different evidence and the types of information they convey. Again, this list is not meant to be exhaustive or prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.

**T TYPOLOGY OF RESEARCH  
ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE**

Activity	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Journal article	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Peer review</li> <li>● Authorship order</li> <li>● Co-author, sole-author or corresponding author</li> <li>● Prestige, impact, and selectivity of outlet</li> <li>● Manuscript length</li> <li>● Inclusion of students or mentored junior faculty</li> <li>● Scale of research being presented (e.g., longitudinal ethnography vs. secondary analysis)</li> <li>● Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>● Originality/novelty in the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published manuscript</li> <li>● Acceptance letter</li> <li>● Reviews</li> <li>● Evidence of citations</li> </ul>
Invited article		
Book Chapter		
Book		
Book Editor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prestige, impact, and selectivity of publisher</li> <li>● Editor order (if more than one)</li> <li>● Prestige/diversity/importance of authors in volume</li> <li>● Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> <li>● Originality/novelty in the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published manuscript</li> <li>● Acceptance letter</li> <li>● Reviews</li> <li>● Evidence of citations</li> </ul>
Book Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prestige, impact, and selectivity of publisher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published manuscript</li> </ul>
Conference Proceedings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Peer review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Abstracts</li> </ul>
Translations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Literary and non-literary works as a noteworthy contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Faculty members submitting translations for evaluation should include a statement clarifying how that work is appropriate to their research program and their field of study. The Department considers other types of translation, e. g., legal and commercial documents, as service.</li> </ul>
Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Success of submission (funded or unfunded)</li> <li>● Amount of award</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grant/contract proposal</li> <li>● Reviews</li> </ul>
Contract		



Foundation-supported funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Selectivity of award</li> <li>● Prestige of granting agency</li> <li>● Role on grant/contract (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-I, etc.)</li> <li>● Internal vs. external</li> <li>● New vs. renewal</li> <li>● Competitive vs. non-competitive</li> <li>● Nature of the grant vs. Contract</li> <li>● Research, Teaching or Service related grant</li> <li>● Clinical trials (investigator initiated or industry sponsored)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Acceptance letter</li> </ul>
Scholarly Presentations, Workshops, Public lecture about Expertise, Media Publication/Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reach of lecture (attendance, recording views)</li> <li>● Level of expertise used in presentation</li> <li>● Scope of exposure (regional/national/international)</li> <li>● Audience (scholars, general public)</li> <li>● Invited, keynote or plenary</li> <li>● Presentation submission</li> <li>● Workshop (invited, reach, federal agency)</li> <li>● Peer review</li> <li>● Co-author, sole-author, corresponding author</li> <li>● Feedback from a session about teaching practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Link to recording</li> <li>● Slides/Lecture transcript or notes</li> <li>● Notes of appreciation</li> <li>● Link to publication</li> </ul>
Composition, Performance, Exhibit, Design for Juried Competitions, Exhibitions and Collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scope</li> <li>● Venue/Location</li> <li>● Invitation/Commission</li> <li>● Sponsor</li> <li>● Collaborators/Ensemble</li> <li>● Creative/Artistic Innovations</li> <li>● Acceptance rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Recordings, Videos, Images</li> <li>● Scores</li> <li>● Multimedia/Digital Examples</li> <li>● Contracts</li> </ul>
Extension publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Peer review</li> <li>● Authorship order</li> <li>● Co-author, sole-author or corresponding author</li> <li>● Prestige, impact, and selectivity of outlet</li> <li>● Manuscript length</li> <li>● Inclusion of students or mentored junior faculty</li> <li>● Scale of research being presented (e.g., longitudinal ethnography vs. secondary analysis)</li> <li>● Originality/novelty in the scholar's oeuvre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published manuscript</li> <li>● Acceptance letter</li> <li>● Reviews</li> <li>● Evidence of citations</li> <li>● Fact Sheets</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Originality/novelty in the field</li> <li>● Internal publications</li> </ul>	
Patents/Licensing Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Invention disclosure</li> <li>● Patent filed</li> <li>● Published patents</li> <li>● Licensing agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Record of Invention</li> <li>● Diagram(s)</li> <li>● Patent</li> </ul>
Innovation and Entrepreneurship Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● University managed or supported business ventures (business parks or incubators)</li> <li>● New business ventures and start-ups</li> <li>● Social entrepreneurship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Business plan</li> <li>● Proposal</li> </ul>
Non-disclosure Agreements with Industry Partners (Outside University)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Licensing agreements</li> <li>● Non-disclosure Agreements</li> <li>● In-kind support</li> </ul>	

Community-engaged Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> <li>• Participatory Design</li> <li>• Training and Technical Assistance Activities</li> <li>• Community Presentations</li> <li>• Governmental Agency/Legislature Presentations</li> <li>• Publications for Community Engagement and Outreach</li> <li>• Description</li> <li>• Measures of Impact</li> <li>• Community Plan</li> <li>• Awards</li> <li>• External Reviews</li> <li>• Audience/Scope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Preparation</li> <li>• In Process of Engagement and Implementation</li> <li>• Submitted for Community Review</li> <li>• Revised and Final Submission</li> <li>• Published/Completed</li> </ul>
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Evidence listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>
Multi/Inter/Trans Disciplinary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Activity listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any Evidence listed above and/or considerations</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX C

### SERVICE EVALUATION: CONTRIBUTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Service is a core value at WVU, and faculty engage in service in a broad range of ways. Evaluation of service activity should be responsive to the unique service contributions of each faculty member. At the same time, differentiated evaluation should be mediated by some shared expectations of rigor and achievement in the area of service.

**Types of Contributions:** This document describes three areas of service contributions: *university*, *community*, and *profession*. The appropriate distribution of an individual's service contributions will be determined by a range of factors and should be explicitly laid out in the annual workload document in line with the letter of hire and/or MOU.

Importantly, this document is not exhaustive. Departments may add to the types of contributions appropriate for their specific programs. Similarly, this document is not prescriptive. Not all service activities will be undertaken by the same faculty member, nor will the same activity be categorized by all units in the same way (e.g., some departments count advising as service and others as teaching).

**Considerations:** Because service takes a range of different forms, not all service activities will be evaluated according to the same metrics. For example, in the context of service to the profession, the activity may be evaluated according to the prestige of the professional organization, the type of expertise leveraged for the activity, and the scope of the organization's reach, along with the more standard assessments of how much time was devoted to the activity and if it entailed a leadership role.

Service that helps to enact accessibility may occur in many aspects of the service endeavor, including but not limited to recruiting trainees from disadvantaged groups and speaking engagements about lived experience. Faculty who seek credit for this work must document it in their digital evaluation file.

Because no two service activities will ever be exactly the same, the metrics cannot be universally applied in prescribed ways. Evaluations should consider the range of factors that contribute to the demands of the service task.

An important consideration, especially for those who have service as outstanding or significant contributions in their workload, is the **leadership** involved in the service activity. For example, if someone serves as a committee chair or an editor of journal, these are important demonstrations of leadership in service. Another consideration is the way in which the faculty member became involved – or their **entry** – into the service activity. If they were nominated by other committee members, voted on by their peers, or nominated by their chairperson or Dean, that suggests that the faculty member has earned prestige among their peers, which should be recognized. Additionally, the **scope** of the service should be noted. For university service, is the service being performed at the departmental, college, or university level? For community service, are they working in the local town or county, contributing to state-wide or regional efforts? For professional service, is the scope regional, national, or international?

Faculty with clinical service are expected to deliver high-quality, evidence-based care, maintain licensure, and uphold professional and ethical standards. They serve as role models for trainees, integrate clinical work with teaching and research/scholarship, and participate in quality improvement and team-based care.

Evaluators are advised to consider the faculty member's developmental trajectory of service contribution according to scope, entry, and leadership. For example, a new assistant professor will not have extensive opportunities for college or university service, nor would they be expected to take on leadership roles or be nominated or voted into important service positions. Once faculty have established themselves and begin to work towards promotion, then they should be supported and encouraged to take on service-related leadership roles across the institution, the community, and the profession, as appropriate for their unit, position, and expertise.

**Evidence of Service:** Evidence that represent service activity are not always obvious. The most successful service files will present a range of evidence that comprehensively convey each service activity and its impact. For example, the activity of serving on a university committee could be represented by meeting agendas, a

subcommittee project, and a year-end report. The activity of serving on a journal's editorial board might include sample article reviews, a tally of the number of reviews assigned to colleagues, and a thank you letter from the journal editor. Different evidence communicate different types of information.

One consideration is the ***author or creator of the evidence***. In other words, who generated or developed the artifact? Some evidence are created by the faculty themselves. In the case of a community outreach project, this might include agendas of community workshops, handouts provided at those workshops, and a copy of the community-service grant proposal that funded the project. While the information conveyed by self-generated evidence is important, to understand the full impact of these evidence, evidence generated by those benefiting from the service (i.e., the participants) is essential. These might include workshop participant evaluations and thank you notes from community organization staff. To help triangulate information gleaned from and participant- generated evidence, the faculty member could ask a project collaborator to describe the faculty's contributions to the project.

Another consideration is the ***evidence type***. In other words, what does this evidence accomplish in the context of the file? Some evidence, like workshop evaluations or peer assessment, explicitly evaluate the effectiveness of the service. Other evidence, like an article review, help to illustrate the service. Some materials demonstrate the faculty member's development and learning related to their service activity. Finally, some file materials, like the service narrative, help to explain the activity. Explanatory evidence may be less formal, like a note in Digital Measures.

Where ***evaluative*** evidence is included, it is helpful to consider whether those were anonymous (e.g., evaluations delivered through Qualtrics) or not (peer observation or letters of appreciation). It is also helpful to note whether the artifact was formative (like a mid-project evaluation intended to inform the project in progress) or summative (intended to provide feedback about the project and its effectiveness after completion).

All of these considerations should be contextualized by the workload agreement, the instructor's MOU or letter of appointment, and – perhaps most importantly – the service narrative. One key to a successful service file is that it balances a range of evidence types, developed by different creators, and is well-contextualized.

Rather than providing a list of evidence that could be associated with each service activity, this document provides guiding principles to help faculty and evaluation committee members consider different evidence and the types of information they convey. Again, this list is not meant to be prescriptive, but to generate ideas amongst faculty.

**Evaluative Tools:** What follows is a series of tools to help evaluators – those serving on faculty evaluation committees, as well as chairpersons and deans – assess faculty service files. The tables are populated with examples, but contents should be erased and re-entered for each faculty member. Faculty themselves should consult these tools when developing their files and their narratives. These tools are meant to be flexible and generative. If an FEC or chairperson recognizes a category of service activity often performed by their faculty but not captured here, they should develop that table and associated metrics. If the considerations or metrics listed in a table do not effectively capture that activity for a particular department, the faculty of that department should revise the table to better fit its needs.

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE - INSTITUTIONAL					
Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Departmental Committee - Member	Dept.	Elected		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Committee chair letter
					Sample work/agendas
					Description
College Wide Committee - Chair	College	Invited	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Dean letter
					Sample work/agendas
University Committee – Member; Faculty Senate service	Univ.	Appointed			
Advisor to Student Club	Univ.	Invited	x		
Advising Trainees	Dept.	MOU			
Service Learning Courses	Univ.	Volunteered			
Oversight of Trainees					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internships</li> </ul>	Dept.	Volunteered			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Learning</li> </ul>	Univ.	Volunteered			Anonymized Trainee Service Work Projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global Service Learning</li> </ul>	Univ.	Invited			
Meeting	Univ.				
Event	Univ.				
Special Event (e.g., art show, lab setup, software support)	Univ.				
Leader on trainee trips	Univ.				
Interprofessional Education (IPE) Facilitator	Univ.	Volunteered			Workshop materials
					Participant evaluations
Meeting	Univ.	Invited	x		
Coordinator/Director of Centers	Dept.	Volunteered	x		Not an administrative appointment.
Recruitment and Retention	Dept.				
Representing University Externally	Dept.				
Advisor to Prestigious	Univ.				

Scholarships					
Writing Trainee Recommendations	Dept./College	Requested		Number of Letters	Listing of Trainees and recommendations written Thank you notes from trainee
Faculty Mentoring	Dept./College	Appointed or Volunteer ?			

# **TPOLOGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE - *COMMUNITY***

Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Outreach Project Coordinator	Comm	Appointed		If not included in teaching	
Service on Committee	Comm	Invited	x		Attendance, contributions
Attendance at Events	Comm	MOU			
Professional Service to Community	Comm	Volunteered			
Advisory/Nonprofit Board Member	Comm	Invited	x		
Event Development	Comm	Initiator	x		Agenda, program, website, press releases, social media posts, YouTube and other links
Capacity building activities with organizations and communities	Comm	Facilitator	x		



# **TPOLOGY OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES & EVIDENCE – *PROFESSIONAL SERVICE***

Activity	Scope	Entry	Leadership	Considerations	Associated Evidence
Committee	Prof.	Elected		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Committee chair letter
					Sample work/agendas
					Description
Event/ Workshop	Prof.	Invited	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time devoted</li> <li>• Expertise leveraged</li> <li>• Reach of service</li> </ul>	Dean letter
					Sample work/agendas
Grant Reviewer	Prof.	Appointed			
Advisor to Trainee Club	Prof.	Invited	x		
Advising Trainees	Prof.	MOU			
Student Mentoring	Prof.				
Panel Member	Prof.	Volunteered			
Invited talk	Prof.				
Media Interviews	Prof.	Volunteered			
External Evaluator	Prof.	Volunteered			Accreditation team participation; Anonymized Trainee Service Work Projects; Program Evaluation Report
Journal Editor	Prof.	Invited	x		
Journal Reviewer	Prof.	Invited			
Conference Organizer	Prof.	Appointed	x		
Paper Reviewer	Prof.				
Conference Panel Member	Prof.				
Conference Panel Organizer	Prof.	Appointed/ elected			
Conference Panel MC	Prof.				

Profession al Organizati on Officer	Pr of.	Elected	x		
--	-----------	---------	---	--	--

## GENERIC EVIDENCE MATRIX

TYPOLOGY OF SERVICE EVIDENCE															
Activity	Artifact	Required	Anon.*	Solicited *	Author/Creator					Type				Purpose*	
					Self	Student	Peer	Expert	Admin.	Evaluative	Illustrative	Explanatory	Develop- mental	Formative	Summative

\*If evaluative