

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,]
Will need provost approval and not sure what else will go where

I. INTRODUCTION

The ability of a university academic health sciences center to function, progress, develop excellence, and serve society depends on both the individual performance of each faculty member and the collective performance of the faculty. Thus, the success and reputation of a university academic health sciences center are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among its faculty and how effectively those talents are marshaled to accomplish the institutional mission. To achieve and maintain high quality, a comprehensive faculty evaluation system is essential. Properly administered, this system encourages professional growth of individual faculty members, assures retention of those faculty members who demonstrate meritorious academic performance including teaching, clinical practice, service, and scholarship, and permits appropriate recognition of achievement.

The work of faculty members as independent professionals is not easily categorized or measured. Faculty evaluation must be guided by principles and procedures designed to protect academic freedom and to ensure accuracy, fairness, and equity. This document outlines these broad principles and establishes the rigorous and common procedures necessary to maintain these qualities in the faculty evaluation process.

West Virginia University (WVU) Health Sciences Center (HSC) with campuses at Morgantown, Beckley, Keyser, Bridgeport, Charleston, and the Eastern Division, as well as experiential clinical sites participates in the University's tripartite mission of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Accomplishing this mission in an environment of respect for diversity requires a creative, collective intermingling of individual faculty talents. Annual evaluation, promotion in rank, and the granting of tenure are acts of critical importance both to members of the academic community and for the welfare of WVU. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members and WVU and is both evaluative and developmental. Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions reward individual achievement; they also shape WVU for decades.

Consistent with this document, schools and divisions within the HSC shall supplement these guidelines with more detailed descriptions and interpretations of the criteria and standards that, when approved by the Chancellor for Health Sciences followed by the Provost, will apply to faculty members in the particular school. The school guidelines may be more specific to expectations of individual disciplines, and they may be more rigorous than the WVU HSC guidelines but not less so.

II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCESS, CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

A. The Faculty Evaluation Process

The faculty evaluation process at the WVU HSC is designed to assist the institution in attracting promising faculty members, helping them reach their potential, rewarding their proficiency, continuing their productivity and professional development throughout their careers, and retaining only those who are outstanding. The process is both evaluative and developmental and has three distinct components:

Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the WVU HSC community. Primary responsibility for evidence of the quality and presentation of an individual's work in the evaluation file rests with the particular faculty member. Faculty colleagues participate in annual evaluation and review for promotion and/or tenure through membership on department and school, committees and on the WVU HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Independent reviews at the school and institutional levels assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among departments and schools. The legal authority and responsibility of chairpersons, deans, and the Chancellor for Health Sciences also enter into the determination of academic personnel decisions, as do the needs and circumstances of the department, school, and Health Sciences Center.¹

1. Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives; it forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises and other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that will encourage professional growth and provide support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. An important aspect of the annual evaluation is an assessment of one's progress toward tenure and/or the next promotion, as appropriate. Once tenure is awarded, post-tenure review occurs as part of the annual review process. These reviews can support subsequent promotion in rank and the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. They might also lead to a more rigorous review process which could result in a remediation plan, as determined by the school.

2. Evaluation for Promotion in Rank

Promotion in rank recognizes exemplary performance of a faculty member. The evaluation for promotion in rank provides the opportunity to assess a faculty member's growth and performance since the initial appointment or since the last promotion.

3. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty for Tenure

For an award of tenure, tenure-track faculty undergo a particularly rigorous evaluation involving an assessment of accumulated accomplishments and the likelihood that the faculty member's level of performance will be maintained. A more comprehensive assessment of one's progress toward tenure will normally begin no later than mid-way through the tenure-track period.

B. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of specific departments, schools, or other academic units and their work is to be evaluated in that context. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution. Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles, which may change over time; such changes normally are identified in an annual workload document or memorandum of understanding.

Collectively, members of the faculty teach, advise, mentor, engage in research/scholarship and creative activity, publish and disseminate their research findings and new knowledge, and provide public, professional, and institutional service and outreach. The extent to which a faculty member's responsibilities emphasize the areas of WVU's mission will vary. All faculty members have an obligation to foster the

¹The term "department" refers throughout this document to departments, divisions or other discrete units in schools. The term "chairperson" refers to department or division chairpersons, Directors, or other unit heads who report to deans. The term "unit guidelines" applies to guidelines at either the department or school level.

quality, viability, and necessity of their programs. The financial stability of a program and recruitment of an adequate number of students depend in part on the faculty.²

In the faculty member's approved letter of appointment, a university official (usually the dean, or Chancellor for Health Sciences) responsible for hiring shall define the general terms of the faculty member's major responsibilities and identify the year by which tenure must be awarded, if applicable. Significant changes must be reflected in writing by amendment to the letter of appointment.

Each department, school, and division shall refine these broad criteria in areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service in ways that reflect the unit's discipline and mission. The criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways that equitably reflect the responsibilities and assignments of each. How the unit criteria apply to a faculty member's own set of duties should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed in the annual evaluation.

Adjustments in the expectations for faculty members may occur in keeping with changing institutional and unit priorities and professional interests. All faculty members in every track must do scholarly, creative, or professional work that informs their teaching and/or service, as defined by the approved unit guidelines.

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Teaching (learning), research³/scholarship/creative activity (discovery), and service (engagement) constitute the heart of the mission of WVU HSC. Faculty responsibilities are defined in terms of activities undertaken in each of the three areas; faculty evaluation is based primarily upon a review of performance in these areas. Scholarship is an important indication of activity in each of the three areas; it occurs in a variety of forms and is not restricted to the research area. The extent to which scholarship is recognized depends upon one's areas of expected significant contribution. Depending upon one's discipline and the unit's guidelines, publication of scholarly findings could be appropriate in any or all areas. Faculty members are expected to keep current in their fields.

A. Teaching (Learning)

Teaching stimulates critical thinking, dissemination of knowledge, and/or development of artistic expression. Teaching includes but is not limited to: traditional modes of instruction such as the in-person classroom lecture, other classroom activities, and modes such as clinical, laboratory, online, and practicum instruction, distance learning, thesis and dissertation direction, evaluation and critique of student performance, various forms of continuing education and non-traditional instruction, and advising/mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. Advising/mentoring is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process. It should be noted that the advising/mentoring of students may include elements of teaching, research, or service. The goals of the teaching-learning endeavor are to equip students with professional expertise, life skills, and a general appreciation of intellectual pursuits that should culminate in degree completion.

The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer

² WVU Board of Governors' Rule 4.1, Section 3.2.

³ The term "research" is used in this document to include appropriate professional activities such as research, scholarly writing, artistic performance, and creative activities. These activities result in products that may be evaluated and compared with those of peers at other institutions of higher learning.

knowledge, a commitment to deepen student learning, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. Supporting documentation for the evaluation of effective performance in teaching might include evidence drawn from such sources as the assessment of student learning outcomes, the collective learner perceptions of teaching, advising, and/or mentoring, and of peer and chair evaluations of instructional performance.⁴ It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching such as textbooks or multi-media materials, the development or use of instructional technology, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and college. Regardless of the activities defined as “teaching” assigned to a faculty member, faculty who teach are expected to be effective in their explicit teaching assignments. Criteria for the evaluation of teaching should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of only evidence provided in the file by the deadline established by the unit.

B. Research/Scholarship

WVU values academic research/scholarly activities that increase fundamental knowledge within the discipline, creative activities that reach out and serve humankind, and applied research/scholarly activities that yield tangible benefits to society. Therefore, the impact of an activity is part of the measure of its quality. Historically, the measure of academic research/scholarly activities and creative activities has been well-defined by each discipline, often through peer-reviewed publications and performances and exhibitions. The significance of translational or applied research/scholarly activities that results in public-private partnerships, patents, licensing, and/or other forms of commercialization and entrepreneurial activity should also be part of the evaluation of research/scholarly activity.

Research/scholarly activity is discipline-focused, and may be individual, interdisciplinary, and/or collaborative. Interdisciplinary and collaborative assignments should be identified in the appointment letter when possible, or in annual letters as assignments change. Unit guidelines should address the evaluative process for these activities. It should be noted that the advising of health professional learners has elements of both teaching and research/scholarly activities.

In most disciplines, refereed high-quality publications are expected as evidence of scholarly productivity. In some disciplines, the strongest such evidence may appear in published refereed proceedings rather than archival journals; such cases must be recognized in the school guidelines. In certain disciplines, an original contribution of a creative nature relevant to one or more disciplines may be as valuable as the publication of a scholarly book or article. The ability to secure funding may be necessary for the realization of scholarly output in some tracks. Depending upon the discipline, entrepreneurial and commercialization activities related to intellectual property and patents, which benefit the institution also demonstrate scholarly output. Output must be sufficient to demonstrate an active and peer-recognized presence in the discipline and quality of research/scholarly activity is clearly of great value in determining the level of performance. Important evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance or a series of smaller, high-quality products such as refereed journal articles constituting a program of worthwhile research/scholarly activities. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, scholarship, or creative works. Criteria for the evaluation of research/scholarly activities should be clearly stated in the unit guidelines. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of only evidence provided in the file by the deadline established by the unit.

C. Service (Engagement)

⁴ WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2 requires student evaluations as part of the faculty evaluation process.

Service activities involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research/scholarly activities, and/or patient care to address the needs of society and the profession. These activities include service to the institution, state, region, and at national and international levels. Service to the institution includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and school.

In keeping with its tradition as a land-grant institution, the WVU HSC is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities on the part of its faculty as essential components of its mission. Enlightened perspectives, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable resources in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Service by faculty members to West Virginia and beyond is of special importance to WVU's mission.

The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to WVU, society, and the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients/patients, induces positive change, improves health and wellbeing, and/or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. One important benefit of service to WVU is faculty participation in the governance system. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with one's university affiliation identified. The definition of the nature and extent of acceptable service for purposes of promotion and tenure should be identified in the unit's clearly stated criteria for evaluation. Performance evaluations should be based on a holistic assessment of only evidence provided in the file by the deadline established by the unit.

IV. CONTEXTS OF APPOINTMENT FOR TENURED OR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A faculty member is appointed without tenure; however, appointment with tenure is possible. To be appointed with tenure, or to the ranks of associate professor or professor, the individual may be interviewed by an official in the Office of the Chancellor for Health Sciences; the individual's curriculum vitae must be reviewed in that office. A recommendation for tenure must be submitted by the department and school to the HSC Chancellor's Office. Appointments can be made without or with credit toward tenure for previous experience.

A. Without Credit

An individual's appointment letter contains expectations that, when met, should lead to successful candidacy for promotion and tenure, and will normally identify the sixth year of employment as the "critical year," that is, the year in which a tenure decision must be made. During the fourth year such a faculty member may petition the dean to bring the critical year forward by one year (to year five).

B. With Credit

It is not uncommon for a new appointee to have had full-time experience at another institution of higher learning where he or she was engaged in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Depending upon the amount of successful experience in these mission areas at the intended rank or the equivalent, up to three years credit toward tenure may be allowed, unless the candidate does not wish such credit. The maximum amount of credit that could be allowed, and a tentative critical year, shall be identified in the letter of appointment. In such a circumstance, by the end of the second academic year the faculty member could accept the identified critical year, or all or part of the possible allowable credit to be applied in their instance, at which point the critical year would be confirmed by the dean. If credit is awarded, evidence supporting such credit should be added to the evaluation file. If no credit is accepted, during the fourth year the faculty member may petition the dean to bring the critical year forward by one year (to year five).

If a faculty member's start date is after the beginning of the designated year, each school's guidelines will delineate the minimum number of months that may be applied toward credit for the first year (which cannot be less than six months or one semester).

If, by the end of the second year, the faculty member does not request modification of the tentative critical year identified in the letter of appointment, that year will become the recognized critical year. Action on tenure earlier than the thus-defined critical year will not be considered except as defined previously.

Exceptions may be made to recognize truly exceptional situations.

V. REQUIRED PERSONNEL ACTIONS/TIMELY NOTICE FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A personnel action is required each year for each faculty member. Such personnel actions include but may not be limited to reappointment, promotion, tenure, or non-renewal.

A tenure-track faculty member in the sixth year, or in the year determined to be the "critical" year, must be reviewed for tenure and must either be awarded tenure or given notice of termination of appointment and a one-year terminal contract. If a faculty member petitions successfully to bring the critical year forward and tenure is not awarded in that year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Such notice of non-retention shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested", first class mail and electronic mail. Under certain circumstances the critical year may be extended. See WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.5.⁵

In the case of a tenure-track (not yet tenured) full-time faculty member, the Chancellor for Health Sciences shall give written notice concerning retention or non-retention for the ensuing year by letter post-marked and mailed no later than March 1.

Time spent on a leave of absence or in an assignment less than 1.00 FTE shall not normally count when calculating years of service toward tenure for a tenure-track faculty member. The faculty member may request that such time spent on scholarly activities apply toward years of service. The faculty member's dean shall determine in advance of the leave whether such time will apply and will make a recommendation to the Chancellor for Health Sciences. Written notification of the decision to modify the critical year will be forwarded both to the faculty member and to the chairperson and will be added to the faculty member's evaluation file.

VI. DISCRETIONARY PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Discretionary personnel actions are those which are not required to be taken at specific times, and may include the following (See also Section IV, above):

- Promotion in rank when the critical year does not apply
- Renewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member
- Nonrenewal of appointment for a non-tenure-track faculty member
- Termination of the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member prior to the critical year
- Termination of the appointment of a faculty member for cause, reduction or discontinuance of an existing program, or financial exigency (as defined in WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.7).

A tenure-track faculty member will be reviewed automatically in the critical year, unless the faculty member requests no review, in which case a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Otherwise, the faculty member must initiate consideration for a discretionary promotion. A faculty member whose application for

⁵ See also: <http://faculty.wvu.edu/policies-and-procedures/work-life-integration>, "Work-Life Integration."

promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least two full years after the decision is rendered before submitting another application, unless a critical-year decision is required.

Evaluations and recommendations for the first promotion and/or tenure will be primarily based on contributions since appointment at WVU. Consideration of credit for work completed elsewhere must be identified in the letter of appointment. In the latter case, evidence of performance during the established years of credit should be included in the evaluation file.

Ordinarily, the interval between promotions at WVU will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion. However, for discretionary promotion to professor, special weight will normally be placed on work completed in the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term associate professor will not be penalized for an extended period of limited productivity, if more recent quantitative and qualitative productivity has been regularly achieved and maintained in an appropriate disciplinary area. Holding the rank of professor designates that the faculty member's academic achievement merits recognition as a distinguished authority in their field. Professional colleagues, both within WVU and nationally and/or internationally, recognize the professor for their contributions to the discipline. Tenure and research-track faculty must have external reviews for all promotion and tenure decisions. Units may elect to require external reviews for other non-tenure-track promotion decisions. A professor sustains high levels of performance in their assignments and responsibilities in all mission areas. The record of a successful candidate for professor must have shown evidence of high-quality productivity over an extended period of time.

While tenure and promotion are separate actions, persons may only be granted tenure if they are already at or above the rank of associate professor or being concurrently promoted to the rank of associate professor. It is university policy that the granting of promotion does not guarantee the award of tenure in a subsequent year. Neither promotion nor tenure shall be granted automatically or merely for years of service.

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

Evaluations and recommendations are to be based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The primary evidence to be weighed must be contained in the faculty member's electronic evaluation file (Digital Measures). Also included are the professional judgments at each level of review as to the quality and impact of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service, as applicable.

An official faculty evaluation file shall be established and maintained for each faculty member in Digital Measures. The record in the evaluation file should be sufficient to document and to support all personnel decisions. Each unit may utilize an annual reporting form ("Productivity Report") appropriate to the work assignments in that unit for use by all members of the unit, including the chairperson. The Productivity Report without supporting documentation is not sufficient for evaluation purposes. Evaluation file materials will be in electronic form adhering to the deadline established by the unit.

In the case of schools without departmental/division structure, the faculty evaluation file shall be maintained in Digital Measures.

The faculty member's evaluation file should contain, at the minimum, the following items:

1. The letter of appointment and other documents which describe, elaborate upon or modify one's assignment, including position description, work plans, memoranda of understanding, annual reviews, and subsequent letters of agreement.

2. An up-to-date curriculum vitae containing a) critical dates relative to education, employment, change in status, promotion, leave of absence, etc.; b) a list of publications (or the equivalent) with complete citations, grants and contracts, and/or other evidence of research, scholarship, and/or creative work; c) a list of service activities.

3. For each semester or term since appointment or last promotion, a record of classes taught and enrollments in each, graduate students supervised, clinical assignments, committee assignments, and/or other aspects of the faculty member's plan of work.

4. For tenure-track faculty and jointly compensated non-tenure-track faculty with multiple reporting lines, each supervisor will provide an evaluation of the individual's performance to the home department. In such cases the home department's evaluation should reflect the relative proportion of each dimension of the total assignment. All other faculty with uncompensated joint appointments may request an annual review from the nonprimary unit; however, this is not required.

5. A copy of current and past annual evaluations, including any written responses.

6. Other information and records that the chairperson and/or dean may wish to add.

7. Faculty members must be notified of additions to their file and have up to ten (10) working days to respond, as this period may extend beyond the closing date.

8. All other information that bears upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in all pertinent areas. This information may include, but need not be limited to, teaching evaluations, professional presentations, published materials, grant applications and awards, research in progress and the preparation of unpublished materials, other creative scholarship, and service to WVU, the citizens of West Virginia, and the profession. A reflective summary by the faculty member that supports the evidence in the file is mandatory in the promotion year and strongly recommended otherwise.

9. A continuing chronological inventory of entries to assure the integrity of the file.

The faculty member is responsible for assuring completion of Items 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8. The chairperson shares responsibility for Items 3 and 4 and has responsibility for Items 1, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

VIII. COMPLETION OF AND ACCESS TO THE FILE

The faculty evaluation file shall be updated in a timely manner according to the calendar that is circulated annually by the appropriate unit. On the appropriate deadline date, the file shall be closed for the annual review period. Only materials submitted before the deadline will be considered for evaluation. If the appropriate unit annual review deadline is prior to December 31, faculty seeking promotion will have until December 31 of that year to add information to their file for their promotion review. Only materials generated because of the annual faculty evaluation process shall be added to the file after the deadline date.

Faculty members have the right of access to their digital evaluation files at any time without giving reasons. Faculty leaving the institution will have the opportunity to save information and materials from the digital evaluation file. All others shall have access to the file only based on a need-to-know. Members of a faculty evaluation committee or administrative officers responsible for personnel recommendations are assumed to have a need to know. Unauthorized access to or use of personnel files for purposes unrelated to faculty evaluation is prohibited and will be sanctioned up to and including termination of employment/appointment. When otherwise necessary, the appropriate administrative officer or the dean shall determine whether an individual has a need to know and what material is necessary to fulfill the need

to know. All persons will treat the material from the file as confidential. The security of all evaluation files is to be assured. The confidentiality of each file is to be respected. Disclosure of file materials to those outside the evaluation process shall occur only under valid legal process or order of a competent court of jurisdiction.

IX. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

A. General Description

The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at WVU. These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time and benefits-eligible part-time faculty members,⁶ provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and documents that support recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. The primary purpose of these annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the role and mission of WVU. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary, however, in accord with the type of appointment, rank, and tenure status.

The evaluation procedures may be found in Section XIII, below. Annual evaluation for all faculty, whether tenure-track, tenured, teaching-track, research-track, service-track, clinical-track, or not eligible for tenure (including lecturers), will be conducted at the departmental level by the chair and the faculty evaluation committee or at the school level, if appropriate, based on documentation in the evaluation file (see Section VIII). Evaluations will be placed in the digital evaluation file and notification will be sent to each faculty member and to the dean who may provide an evaluative statement.

A fully promoted faculty member (e.g., Professor or the equivalent) may be evaluated annually only by the department chair or equivalent unless the faculty member petitions the faculty evaluation committee to also conduct an annual review. The faculty member must inform the department chair or equivalent, in writing, in advance of the faculty member's file closing.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance and should be both formative and summative. All levels of review should strive to provide statements that are developmental and are goal oriented. The review is not limited to events of the most recent one-year period; it is also a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed.

The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, paying particular attention to one's cumulative progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion and, if positive, as a basis for merit salary adjustments and Salary Enhancements for Continued Academic Achievement, if appropriate. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity to develop changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of WVU.

B. Faculty Categories

⁶ Less than benefits-eligible part-time faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment.

Faculty members in all categories have full citizenship in the institution and have the rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility. This responsibility includes attendance at and participation in faculty meetings and in other dimensions of the concept of shared governance. They are eligible for appointment to any administrative office if they meet the requirements for the position as stated in the position announcement.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members are those who are in a tenure-track appointment but are not yet tenured. For these persons, the annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance should be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion and tenure.

In one's first review, limited evidence of the faculty member's progress will be available. For that review, material in the file such as reports by colleagues on one's teaching and information on one's activities in research and service are useful to assess progress.

As one moves through the tenure-track period, annual evaluations will focus increasingly on the successful outcomes of one's activities rather than simply on the activities themselves.

The absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure. A negative evaluation is defined as satisfactory in an area of significant contribution after the first year or any unsatisfactory ratings. Annual evaluations should apprise tenure-track faculty members of performance deficiencies and should call attention to expectations for subsequent consideration for promotion and/or tenure and the extent to which they must enhance their productivity. Occasionally, the evaluations will result in termination of the individual's appointment, sometimes prior to the critical year, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts; in these cases, notice shall be given in accord with WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2.

2. Tenured Faculty, Not Fully Promoted

The annual evaluation of faculty members who are tenured but not fully promoted will generally emphasize both quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the rank of professor. While not all faculty members may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide them toward that achievement.

3. Tenured Faculty, Fully Promoted

Faculty at the highest rank are expected to maintain a consistent record of achievement including good and/or excellent ratings in areas of significant contribution and satisfactory or higher in the other areas. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating faculty members at these ranks is to describe their performance in the context of appropriate expectations, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments and reappointment. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels.

4. Teaching-track Faculty

Renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is teaching, are designated with the prefix "teaching," accompanying a traditional rank. Teaching-track faculty members are hired to respond to program needs. These positions focus on education in all its manifestations, including but not limited to teaching, advising, or educational program development.

Normally, a teaching-track faculty assignment will be at least 80% teaching; the balance might address needs of the unit and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission. As noted

elsewhere in this document, "Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, scholarship, or creative works." For teaching-track 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.

Teaching-track appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. No number of appointments at any term faculty rank/title shall create presumption of any contractual rights, nor the right of continued appointment or transition to another type of position.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a teaching-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a teaching-track faculty member and their chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion according to the timeline defined by the individual school and/or letter of appointment. For teaching-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, in addition to a sustained record of teaching excellence, the evaluation file is expected to show evidence of significant curricular and/or programmatic development and important contributions to WVU'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 unit-defined needs, priorities, and initiatives.

Promotion to the rank of teaching professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues within WVU recognize the professor for their instructional contributions to the discipline. At the dean's discretion, a panel of teaching-track appointees in similar disciplines who have achieved promotion may contribute to the review at the department level.

5. Service-track Faculty

Renewable term appointments, in which the principal assignment is service, are designated with the prefix "service," accompanying a traditional rank. Service-track faculty members are hired to respond to program needs. These positions focus on service in all its manifestations.

Normally, a service-track faculty assignment will be at least 60% service; the balance might address needs of the unit and/or interests of the faculty member, as they relate to the institutional mission. Percent effort allocation will determine the other area of significant contribution, if appropriate. As noted elsewhere in this document, "Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of studies, scholarship, or creative works." For service-track faculty, this will be defined as the expectation that the annual file includes systematic assessment of effectiveness and/or quality service contributions to the program, department, school, institution, state, region, and/or global community.

Service-track appointments may be continued indefinitely, contingent upon need, performance, and funding. No number of appointments at any term faculty rank/title shall create presumption of any contractual rights, nor the right of continued appointment or transition to another type of position.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in a service-track faculty appointment. However, subject to reappointment, a service-track faculty member and their Chairperson may choose to initiate consideration for the first promotion according to the timeline defined by the individual school and/or letter of appointment. For service-track faculty who wish to stand for promotion, the evaluation file is expected to show evidence of significant contributions. Such evidence will normally include evidence of significant contribution to solving problems and addressing defined needs, priorities, and initiatives to the program, department, school, institution, state, region, and/or global community.

Promotion to the rank of service professor designates that the faculty member's achievement merits recognition in their field. Professional colleagues within WVU recognize the professor for their service contributions to the discipline. At the dean's discretion, a panel of service-track appointees in similar disciplines who have achieved promotion may contribute to the review at the department level.

6. Clinical-Track Faculty

Faculty who are appointed to the clinical non-tenure-track must be heavily committed to clinical service and teaching. Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability.

Annual evaluation of clinical-track faculty members will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and in subsequent annual documents that identify departmental responsibilities in teaching, service, and/or scholarship. The annual evaluation will focus on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. The annual evaluation of a faculty member will emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next rank or continuation of appointment.

7. Research Specialty-Track Faculty

Evaluation of research-track faculty members who are not eligible for tenure may emphasize different criteria from those applied to other faculty. Annual evaluations will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's individual strengths to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. If the faculty member is promotable, the annual evaluation will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative expectations and progress toward the next appropriate rank. Academic units shall set criteria for promotion to full professor that are more rigorous than the criteria set for promotion to associate professor. These evaluations may lead to adjustment of duties and occasionally will lead to notices of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. Non-renewal of grants or other external funds may result in non-renewal of appointments despite positive evaluations. These faculty members hold appointments that are not subject to consideration for tenure, regardless of the number of, nature of, or time accumulated in such appointments. Such appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment.

8. Part-Time Faculty

Evaluation of continuing part-time (less than 1.00 FTE) faculty will be based on assignments as described in the letter of appointment and subsequent documents and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of one's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Occasional or part-time clinical-track faculty members should receive reviews that are appropriate to their assignments.

C. Descriptors for Annual Review

The annual review of one's performance in each of the mission areas to which one is assigned must be assessed as Excellent [characterizing performance of high merit], Good [characterizing performance of merit], Satisfactory [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, when applied to an area in which significant contributions are required, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure], or Unsatisfactory [characterizing insufficient performance]. Units are responsible for determining and publishing criteria that detail minimum expectations for each rating. Criteria developed must be approved by the Chancellor of Health Sciences. Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "satisfactory" ratings in an area in which a significant contribution is required would not qualify for promotion nor tenure. A faculty member with a preponderance (as defined by the unit) of "unsatisfactory" ratings in any area would not qualify for promotion or tenure and may result in non-continuation.

The assessments provided by annual reviews may be a basis for performance-based salary adjustments in years when such adjustments are available. They are also a basis for those periodic recommendations which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action that are forwarded to the Chancellor for Health Sciences. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be supported both (a) by a series of annual reviews above the "satisfactory" level, and (b) beyond those reviews, by performance and output which are judged to meet expectations identified in the appointment letter and subsequent documents, as well as the more rigorous standard of "significant contributions" (see below).

X. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE

WVU criteria for the awarding of promotion and the granting of tenure described below are general expectations; they should be elaborated by school or departmental criteria which take account of the distinctive character of the faculty member's discipline. Copies of departmental and/or unit criteria shall be available to all participants in the review process.

The faculty of an outstanding university is a community of scholars whose productivity is manifest in a variety of ways. These manifestations are commonly grouped into teaching, research, and service (including clinical service).

In order to be recommended for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions in the area(s) defined in their letter of appointment or subsequent memorandum of understanding.

The term "significant contributions" are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in the HSC and/or school promotion and tenure guidelines. Tenure-track, tenured, research-track faculty, and service-track faculty with research as an area of significant contribution, must also receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their research (or other area of significance per Section XI) by external evaluators at peer or aspirational peer research universities, as defined by each school.

The department, subject to approval by the dean, determines peer or aspirational peer research universities. Candidates for tenure who are expected to make significant contributions in teaching, research, or service are expected to demonstrate at least reasonable contributions in the other area(s) defined in their letter of appointment or subsequent memorandum of understanding. Absolute criteria as developed by each school must be evaluated every five (5) years and approved by the Office of the Chancellor for Health Sciences. Changes to promotion and tenure guidelines will take effect July 1 of the academic year following approval. For changes in school level guidelines, probationary faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure may choose to follow the guidelines that were in effect when they were hired. Faculty seeking a discretionary promotion within two years of the institution of new school guidelines may choose to be evaluated using previous guidelines.

Successful teaching is an expectation for faculty who are assigned to teach. If teaching is an area of significant contribution for either tenure and/or promotion, significant contributions must be demonstrated in teaching.

In order to be recommended or considered for promotion, faculty members who are not eligible for tenure but who are eligible for promotion normally will be expected to make significant contributions in the area(s) of their assignment as outlined in the letter of appointment or as modified in a subsequent memorandum of understanding. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "Research," research will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "service," service will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. For faculty who have a title with the prefix "teaching," teaching will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. For clinical-track

637 faculty, clinical service will be the area in which significant contributions are expected. Based on the offer
638 letter, some specialty tracks may have two areas of significant contributions.

639
640 Service activities may include service to WVU, and service to individuals, groups, and/or organizations at
641 the state, national, and/or international levels that utilize disciplinary expertise and are assigned and
642 approved by the unit leader. A significant contribution in service may include the successful development,
643 implementation, and participation in impactful programs. Such programs may include planned efforts or
644 participation in activities to meet the needs of constituents, induce positive change in behavior or practice,
645 impact societal problems and issues, effect policies or systems change, or lead to economic, civic, social,
646 and/or environmental improvements. Programs may be on-going and carried out over a few years, or
647 relatively short-term programs carried out over a few weeks or months. Service should not be measured
648 just by the number of service roles and activities in which a faculty member is involved. The impact and
649 innovation, replication, and/or dissemination of the service activity are keys to demonstrating significance
650 and merit. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and
651 extended service to WVU, the HSC, the profession, or on a national or international level. Such exceptions
652 shall be identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents.

653
654 The decision by the Chancellor for Health Sciences to accept a recommendation for or against retention or
655 the awarding of tenure shall rest on both the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the
656 department and the HSC, and on the strengths and limitations of the faculty member as established in the
657 annual evaluation process.

658
659 A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the one in which
660 the faculty member holds or seeks tenure does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for
661 promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks promotion or
662 tenure, shall have a written agreement concerning both status and expectations within the department in
663 which the locus of tenure resides. Such an agreement must be approved by the dean and Chancellor for
664 Health Sciences. An administrative assignment will be evaluated by the immediate supervisor rather than
665 by the unit committee.

666 **XI. CHANGING AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION**

667
668
669 When a faculty member achieves tenure, the faculty or the chairperson may request that the criteria
670 requiring significant contributions in teaching, research, and/or service may be modified on an individual
671 basis to require significant contributions in a different pair of these mission areas, with reasonable
672 contributions required in the third.

673
674 While such a modification may be initiated to reflect the faculty member's current areas of interest, the
675 modification should also assist the department or the college in achieving its mission and goals, as it
676 addresses the three areas of university concern. The faculty member must work under the modified mission
677 area for a minimum of five (5) years after the approval of the request before the individual could be
678 considered for promotion using the modified mission areas. Such a modification must be agreed to by the
679 faculty member, chairperson of the department, in consultation with the appropriate departmental
680 committee, and the dean of the college, and must be stipulated in subsequent letters of agreement. The
681 modification also must be approved by the HSC Chancellor.

682
683 A request for a change in areas of significant contribution(s) will be accompanied by a document which
684 identifies both the types and quantity of the areas of significant contribution expected in the new context
685 and the ways in which the quality of that significant contribution will be measured. Reasonable
686 contributions must also be defined in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

A. Pathways to Professor Via Administrative Service

An Associate Professor of any track can presently achieve promotion to Professor using service as one of the two areas of significant contribution, although such an assignment has typically been focused on service provided externally, beyond WVU proper. However, the possibility to achieve such a promotion presently exists, via “extraordinary and extended service to WVU.” In rare instances, such opportunity may be available to individuals who are or have been willing to serve in an administrative role and who may intend to have an administrative career. Academic administrative service as department chairperson or associate dean (or the equivalent) for a normal term and executed at a high qualitative level may be interpreted as “extraordinary and extended service to WVU” for purposes of promotion from associate professor to professor, with the support of the school’s dean.

For clarification of the more specific conditions for such consideration under the presently approved process, the opportunity to seek this path for promotion would need to be approved by the dean at a time that would allow at least three years in the administrative position. Thus, for example, the candidate could receive approval during the second year of a five-year term, with the first two years being considered retroactively. Under these circumstances, significant contributions would be required in (administrative) service and one other mission area, with at least reasonable contributions required in the third. Achievement in teaching, research, and service must be demonstrated during the period under consideration, normally the last five years. Teaching, research, and service must be evaluated annually by the home unit; the administrative service must be evaluated annually by the dean. Annual evaluations omitted during the evaluation period will not be considered and will therefore delay the application for promotion. A “360 review” of administrative performance is required.

The availability of this opportunity would be limited to those faculty who, based on the previous promotion, had achieved an appropriate level of success in their area(s) of significant contribution at that time.

Upon completion of a “360 review” during the final year of the term, resulting in an unequivocal reappointment in that role, the candidate could be considered for promotion using academic administrative service as the basis for making a significant contribution in service. A memorandum of understanding delineating these expectations in greater detail would be prepared upon appointment to the administrative role or at the point of approval of the dean, and subsequently by the Chancellor of HSC to pursue this option. External reviews of administrative service and the other area of significant contribution would be required. Documentation for these purposes must include annual goal statements and their metrics, as well as annual assessments of the achievement of the goals, prepared by the individual and validated by the dean.

XII. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

In years when a faculty member is being considered for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor or a tenured faculty member is being considered for promotion to professor, the digital evaluation file must contain external evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's area of significant contribution(s) as identified in the letter of appointment or subsequent memorandum of understanding. External evaluations are among the many factors to be considered when evaluating tenure-track and tenured faculty members.

Although teaching, service, and clinical-track faculty seeking promotion to any rank are generally not required to seek external reviews, this requirement may be defined more specifically in individual school guidelines. If research is an area of significant contribution, external reviews are required for promotion at all levels. External reviews will be maintained in a separate section of the digital evaluation file. The various committees and individuals directly involved in the promotion and tenure review process shall be granted access to that section of the digital evaluation file as needed. The faculty member shall have the right to petition the dean’s office to see the reviews after any identifying information has been removed and the

first level of review is complete. Upon conclusion of the review process, the external evaluations shall not be used in any subsequent personnel actions.

The names of persons who will be asked to provide external reviews must be selected with participation by the faculty member who is to be evaluated and the persons in the department who will conduct the evaluation. The suggested method for identifying external evaluators is for the departmental evaluation committee (either with or without participation by the chairperson) and the faculty member to propose a list of names of appropriate evaluators. These evaluators should be selected for their professional competence in the discipline. Each list should contain six names. A paragraph describing each evaluator should be submitted indicating qualifications to serve in this capacity. Any personal or professional relationship the faculty member has or has had with the evaluator must be identified. The chairperson or dean should select a sufficient number of names from each list to result in evaluations from both lists. A minimum of four external evaluations is normally required. If a minimum of four external evaluations is not met, the chairperson or dean must determine additional appropriate evaluators. If four evaluations are not received by the time the file is closed, the deadline for including such evaluations in the file may be extended with the written consent of the faculty member, chairperson, and dean.

Persons who have been closely associated with the person being evaluated, such as co-authors, doctoral research advisors, or advisees, may be asked for evaluations, but, as with all evaluators, must identify their professional or personal relationship to the candidate for promotion or tenure. The faculty member has the right to review the list of potential evaluators, to comment upon those who may not provide objective evaluation, and to request deletions. The faculty member's written comments and requests must be forwarded to the chairperson or dean and included in the external evaluation section of the digital evaluation file.

In selecting evaluators, the chairperson or dean may consider the faculty member's comments and requests, but the faculty member does not have the right to veto any possible evaluator, nor is the final selection of evaluators to be achieved through obtaining the consent of the faculty member.

The term "significant contributions" in research are normally those that meet or exceed the standards outlined in WVU, school, and/or departmental promotion and tenure guidelines and receive overall positive reviews of the quality and impact of their research efforts by external evaluators at peer or aspirational peer research universities.

If external reviewers of research from non-university settings are used, there must be an explanation of their professional competence in the discipline that led to their selection rather than the selection of a reviewer from a university setting. As a general principle, reviewers of research from non-university settings should be used only under very special circumstances and should be a minority rather than a majority among the reviewers selected. External reviewers of research from universities should be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought.

The chairperson, using letters approved by the dean (or designee), should request the external evaluations, stressing that the standard used as a basis for review should be the quality of the work and the impact or potential impact on the field. The specific area of significant contribution to be externally reviewed must be stated. Further, the other areas of contribution that should not be reviewed shall be explicit. A copy of the letter used to request external evaluations must be included in the faculty member's file with identifying information removed. The external evaluator may also assess the faculty member's potential for continued excellent quality and impactful teaching, service, or scholarly development. For faculty, the standard should be based on one's success in meeting or exceeding the expectations identified in the letter of appointment, any relevant MOU, as well as HSC and/or school promotion and tenure guidelines. The assessment of whether the quantity of scholarly work is sufficient for promotion or tenure is a judgment best left to the

department and WVU. If an external evaluator comments on an area of contribution that was not specifically stated or provides information and characteristics unrelated to the criteria, those comments must be ignored. The evaluations should be forwarded to the dean and/or appropriate administrator by the external evaluators.

Tenure-track faculty members who received an approved extension of the tenure clock under Board of Governors Faculty Rule 4.5 should be evaluated on their overall record. The overall time since their original appointment is not a factor to be considered by the external evaluator.

XIII. EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluations of the achievements of faculty will normally be carried out at three levels of university organization: department, school, and Chancellor for Health Sciences. A judgment is made at each of these levels both by the faculty committee and by the administrative officer of the unit. All full-time faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor can serve on the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel, regardless of their type of position. All faculty who serve on department and/or school committees also vote on each case, but the majority of voters for tenure cases must be tenured faculty members. In schools without departments, the committee functions like a departmental committee. Faculty members shall neither initiate nor participate in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, annual evaluation, promotion, salary, leave of absence, etc.) to members of their immediate family or household or other qualified adults, and shall not participate in any other promotion and tenure decisions in a year in which a case so described is under consideration.

Each level of review will consider only the material in the candidate's digital evaluation file. Recommendations made in previous annual reviews are also considered, and may help inform the evaluation statements and recommendations. All recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their critical year will be forwarded through the complete review process. Recommendations against continuation of a tenured, tenure-track faculty member, or a non-tenure-track faculty member must receive review at all levels, including that of the HSC Chancellor. Participants at each level of review will exercise professional judgment regarding their assessment of the evaluation file in arriving at a recommendation or, in the HSC Chancellor's case, a decision.

If any member of the evaluation process believes that inappropriate and/or prejudicial remarks were made, as defined as Prohibited Conduct outlined in BOG Governance Rule 1.6 or for faculty utilizing BOG Faculty Rule 4.5, the member is obligated to raise their concern during the meeting, citing university rules. Further, the member of the evaluation process must discuss the issue with the appropriate leader which may be the chairperson, dean, or HSC Chancellor.

A. Department Level in Schools

1. Evaluation committees at the department level are engaged in two specific activities: annual reviews, with accompanying personnel action recommendations as defined in Section V of this document and reviews for purposes of promotion and/or tenure. Each department shall have a faculty evaluation committee, normally consisting of a minimum of five members. Membership must reflect the types of faculty positions excluding faculty equivalent/academic professional (FEAPs) (e.g., if units have non-tenure-track faculty, they are eligible to serve) within the unit. In the case of smaller schools or departments, the school-wide committee may substitute for departmental committees. The method of selection of members is left to the discretion of the program unit, but the chairperson of the department shall not be a member of the committee. If needed, a department may supplement committee membership with faculty members from a related discipline. This supplementation may occur where multi/trans/inter-disciplinary work is involved.

Exceptions to the committee composition as described above must be approved by the Chancellor for HSC.

A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure is not eligible to serve on any committee reviewing their evaluation file. Members of the committee vote on tenure recommendations at the department level. The departmental committee will review and evaluate material in the faculty member's evaluation file. Based only on this evidence, the committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against continuation, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. The committee shall indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the department chairperson. If desired, committee members may include minority statements, which must be included in the body of the evaluation, without separate signatures. The total number of positive or negative votes must be recorded. A recusal must occur when there is a conflict of interest as disclosed by the recusing member. Should opinions differ as to the presence of a conflict of interest, the chair will be consulted and a decision rendered. The chair's decision may be appealed to the dean. A committee member who recuses due to a conflict of interest should not be present during the review or vote of the specific file in question.

2. The department chairperson will review the evaluation file as well as the committee's evaluation statement and recommendation regarding each faculty member and will make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for each faculty member. The department chairperson shall indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. In a recommendation for tenure, the chairperson shall take into account the long-range staffing pattern of the department. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the evaluative comments and recommendations of both the department committee and the chairperson at the same time. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's digital evaluation file and shared with the faculty member, including the signatures, votes or recusals, and minority statement from the department committee, if applicable. Should the chairperson have a conflict of interest, an appropriate designee (e.g., associate chair, associate dean) may conduct the review.
3. If the faculty member receives a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure from either the department committee or chairperson, the file is submitted for review at the school level. If both such recommendations are negative, the file is submitted to the dean for information, except in the critical year, when the file is reviewed by the school committee and the dean.
4. When a recommendation against tenure or promotion, or for non-continuation of appointment has been made, the faculty member may include a rebuttal to the departmental evaluations for review at the school level. The rebuttal must be forwarded to the dean within five (5) working days of receipt of the evaluations.
5. A faculty member may petition the dean for a review of negative departmental recommendations for promotion (i.e., when both the department committee and the department chairperson render negative recommendations). The petition must reach the dean within five (5) working days following receipt of notification of the negative recommendations. The dean shall forward the petition and any submitted rebuttal to the school evaluation committee as a matter of course for its recommendation. Negative department reviews of tenure cases or non-continuation cases are automatically reviewed by the school committee and the dean.

- 891 6. Responses to annual reviews must be forwarded to the chairperson and/or dean within ten (10)
 892 working days of receipt of the evaluation(s). The response will be added to the faculty member's
 893 digital evaluation file. Errors of fact should normally be corrected by the chairperson with an
 894 additional memo to the file. If the faculty member disagrees or otherwise takes issue with the
 895 evaluations or the assignment of descriptors, the faculty member may work informally with the
 896 chairperson. After working informally with the chairperson, the faculty member may ask the dean
 897 to review the evaluations or descriptors. However, any informal efforts to resolve any such issue
 898 will not serve to suspend or otherwise delay the statutory time requirements set forth in the West
 899 Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure for the filing of grievances. After considering the
 900 faculty member's request, the dean may direct the chairperson or the committee to reconsider their
 901 action based on a written justification that would be placed in the faculty digital evaluation file.
 902 Any subsequent adjustments would be documented in an additional memo to the file.
 903

904 B. School Level
 905

- 906 1. Each school shall have a school faculty evaluation committee. In schools without departments, the
 907 committee functions like a departmental committee. A person who is under consideration for
 908 promotion and/or the award of tenure shall not serve on the school committee reviewing their
 909 personnel file. Each faculty evaluation committee shall normally consist of a minimum of five
 910 members. Membership must reflect the types of faculty positions excluding faculty
 911 equivalent/academic professional (FEAPs) (e.g., if units have non-tenure-track faculty, they are
 912 eligible to serve) within the unit. The method of selection of members is at the discretion of the
 913 dean of the school. No faculty member shall serve on both a departmental and school committee
 914 and no chairperson shall serve on a school committee. Exceptions to the committee composition as
 915 described above must be approved by the Chancellor for HSC.
 916
- 917 2. The school faculty committee will review departmental evaluations of the candidates, as well as
 918 their evaluation files as forwarded by the dean. The committee will prepare a written evaluation in
 919 each case with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, tenure, and/or promotion,
 920 as applicable. The evaluation must indicate, when appropriate, the faculty member's progress
 921 toward, and expectations for, tenure and/or the next promotion. Normally, the committee will
 922 review cases in which promotion, tenure, or non-continuation are recommended at the department
 923 level, although, at the dean's discretion, annual reviews may also be considered. A recusal must
 924 occur when there is a conflict of interest as disclosed by the recusing member. Should opinions
 925 differ as to the presence of a conflict of interest, the dean will be consulted and a decision rendered.
 926 The dean's decision may be appealed to the HSC Chancellor. A committee member who recuses
 927 due to a conflict of interest should not be present during the review or vote of the specific file in
 928 question. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and
 929 forwarded to the dean. The total number of positive and negative votes must be recorded.
 930 Committee members may include a minority statement in the body of the evaluation without
 931 separate signatures.
 932

933 The dean (or dean designee) will review evaluations and recommendations from the department
 934 and the school faculty committee and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal
 935 recommendations for each faculty member, indicating, when appropriate, the faculty member's
 936 progress toward and expectations for tenure and/or the next promotion. The faculty member shall
 937 be notified by the dean (or dean designee) that the evaluations and recommendations of both the
 938 school committee and the dean are placed in the faculty member's digital evaluation file including
 939 the signatures, votes or recusals, and minority statement from the school committee, if applicable.
 940

3. If either the school faculty committee or the dean supports a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty evaluation file, including both department and school recommendations together with external evaluations, is forwarded to the Chancellor for Health Sciences. If a request for discretionary promotion receives negative recommendations by both the school committee and the dean, the faculty evaluation file will not be forwarded to the next level, except when a rebuttal has been submitted by the faculty member.
4. A faculty member may include a rebuttal to the school-level recommendations for review at the next level. A rebuttal must be forwarded to the Chancellor for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of the recommendations. A faculty member seeking to rebut a negative decision for tenure based in any part on financial determinations shall be provided reasonable background information to assess the financial aspects of the decision.
5. A faculty member may petition the Chancellor for Health Sciences for a review of negative recommendations for discretionary promotion from the school level, i.e., when both the school committee and the dean (or dean designee) render negative decisions. The petition must reach the Chancellor for Health Sciences within five (5) working days of receipt of notification by the dean (or dean designee) of negative recommendations at the school level.
6. Deans (or dean designees) have the responsibility for determining whether all committee evaluations have been conducted fairly within the school and for assuring that comparable norms are appropriately applied in like units.
7. Recommendations by the dean (or dean designee) for tenure must include a statement indicating how the proposed awarding of tenure of a probationary faculty member will affect the long-range staffing pattern of the department and/or school, taking into account expected attrition, accreditation, budgetary limitations, and the need for flexibility.

C. HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel

1. The HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel will consist of at least one member from each of the five schools selected by WVU Faculty Senate Executive Committee. No person who has reviewed faculty at the department or school level during the current cycle, or who is being considered for promotion or tenure, may serve on the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel.
2. The recommendations and faculty appeals will be reviewed by the HSC Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel. Primary attention will be given to the following four questions:
 - a. Has each recommendation been supported by objective evidence in the digital evaluation file to ensure that no faculty member is being treated capriciously or arbitrarily?
 - b. Have the review procedures at all levels been followed?
 - c. Is each recommendation consistent with the HSC and unit policies and objectives?
 - d. Are the recommendations consistent with the department, school, division, and HSC criteria for promotion and tenure?
3. The Advisory Panel will advise the Chancellor for Health Sciences regarding the cases considered and will prepare written statements addressing such. The statement must be signed by all members of the panel, dated, and added to the faculty member's file. Panel members may include minority statements with the general statement.

D. Chancellor of Health Sciences Level

1. For the purposes described in these guidelines, the decision-making authority of the President has been delegated to the Chancellor for Health Sciences.
2. Decisions on promotion, tenure, and non-continuation recommendations will be made by the Chancellor for Health Sciences, after review of the recommendations by departments, schools, and their administrators, as well as the HSC Advisory Panel's findings. If the final decision by the Chancellor for Health Sciences is non-continuation a one-year terminal contract will be issued. Such notice of termination of appointment/employment shall be mailed "Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested," first class mail and electronic mail.
3. The President or designee will report the decisions to the Board of Governors. This report will indicate the number of decisions as well as the individuals receiving positive action and will verify that the appropriate standards and guidelines have been met.
4. The faculty member, chairperson, and the appropriate dean will be notified in writing of the decision rendered.

E. Negative Decisions

1. Non-retention During Tenure-Track Period

A faculty member may request from the President or designee, within ten (10) working days of receipt of the notice from the President's designee of non-retention during the tenure-track period, the reasons for the decision (Section 6.7 of WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2). Within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons, the faculty member may appeal the decision by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.

2. Tenure Denied; Termination of employment/appointment during Tenure-Track Period in the "critical year"

A faculty member may appeal a decision on termination of employment/appointment within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of the reasons by filing a grievance with the President's designee by using W.Va. Code §6C-2-1 et seq., in accordance with Section 11 of Board of Governors Rule 4.2.

3. Promotion Denied; Other Personnel Decisions

A faculty member may appeal a decision on promotion or other personnel decisions not included above by using W.Va. Code §6C-2, as described in Board of Governors Rule 4.2. The appeal should reach the office of the President's designee within fifteen (15) working days after receipt of the written decision.

WVU Board of Governors Rule 4.2 and W.Va. Code §6C-2 are available in the offices of the Dean and department/division Chairperson, and may be obtained from the offices of the Provost, the Vice President for Health Sciences, the Campus Presidents, and the Wise, Evansdale, and Health Sciences Center Libraries. They are accessible on-line at <http://bog.wvu.edu>, and <http://pegb.wv.gov/Faculty> may wish to check with the Division of Human Resources (Morgantown) to assure that they have access to the most recent copy of the procedures.