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The annual evaluation process is used in making personnel decisions, including allocation of merit pay, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review.

**Faculty Activity Plan.** Each faculty member will complete a Faculty Activity Plan, consisting of a description of anticipated activities for the coming year. The proposed set of activities is submitted to the Department Head at a date set by the Department Head but no later than the start of the academic year. For tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty and RTA’s, the faculty member and the Department Head will together agree on a personal set of relative weights to be applied to the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service for the coming academic year. This agreement may be amended by mutual consent during the academic year.

**Summary of Activities.** At the conclusion of the academic year, the faculty member will submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and service. All faculty members in the department will use the common Summary of Activities form to report performance activities. Typically, the Department Head will request performance reports at the end of the academic year, usually due in May. Any professional activities performed in the summer months will be reported in the next academic year Summary of Activities.

**Evaluations.** A preliminary written evaluation is given to each faculty member by the Department Head at least one day prior to an evaluation conference. The evaluation conference must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member’s performance, professional contributions and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the Department Head. The official written evaluation shall not be made until after the evaluation conference. The last date that the conference can take place is Sept 21. The Department Head will provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by October 1. Further processes, such as an appeals process, are described in the Faculty Handbook.

**Performance Ratings.** The department will employ a nine-point scale using three levels of performance evaluation ratings for each of evaluation category of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent, with ratings of 0 – 2 for unsatisfactory, 3 – 5 for satisfactory, and 6 – 8 for excellent. Faculty members will also receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory, or satisfactory, which will be based on relative weights assigned to each area of performance.

Faculty with a score of zero in any single functional area (teaching, scholarly achievement, or service) will receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory for that evaluation period. A zero will be given when faculty have not made a good faith effort to fulfill their responsibilities in a functional area. Faculty may avoid a zero rating by demonstrating that they are striving to fulfill their functional obligations, e.g., by making changes in how they interact with students or present course material when previous practices have been pedagogically ineffective, by writing articles and submitting them for review, by accepting and fulfilling assignments to serve the department, university, or profession. The annual evaluation for an RTA faculty member shall include a recommendation on extending that faculty member’s appointment.

The James Madison University Faculty Handbook states that promotion to Associate Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least one of the three functional areas (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement, and service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional areas and as at least satisfactory in the third area.