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The procedures described in this document are consistent with the policies and procedures mandated in the JMU Faculty Handbook. Faculty members should be familiar with Section III.E. of the Handbook.

I. School of Engineering Annual Evaluation Protocol

Based on the previous year’s Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP), faculty members will compile relevant information about their activities in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional qualifications, and professional service on an annual basis in the Faculty Activities Report (FAR). The Academic Unit Head (AUH) will evaluate the faculty member based on the FAR and other relevant information to assign a performance rating in each area and an overall rating based on the criteria described in this document. The AUH may consult with the AUPAC during the annual evaluation process. The AUH will make the final decisions regarding annual evaluation ratings. For purposes of annual evaluations, faculty will receive a designation in teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional service and an overall rating that reflects one of three levels of performance.

A. Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty members in School of Engineering (SOE) should be dedicated, accomplished, and viable educators and scholars. School of Engineering faculty members should meet the general responsibilities of a full-time JMU faculty member as defined in the Faculty Handbook. Along with these professional responsibilities, SOE faculty will enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of academic freedom.

Faculty members are responsible to accurately report activities in a timely manner as defined in the timeline for annual evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

B. Criteria

The SOE will use the Faculty Handbook criteria for re-appointment, promotion, and the award of tenure. These criteria are (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and (c) professional service. These criteria will also be used as the basis for the annual evaluations of SOE faculty.
The standards included in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service will tacitly include consideration of the following three criteria:

**Personal leadership.** A measure of self-initiative and follow through, the ability to discern high-priority areas of need and suggest effective solutions, and the willingness to accept responsibility for completing assigned or self-initiated tasks.

**Professional commitment.** The measure of commitment, attitude, and enthusiasm for the SOE program and its needs. Professional commitment does not seek personal incentives nor rewards for responding and reflects generosity of personal time in serving the program.

**Professional collegiality.** A measure of the extent to which the faculty member participates and cooperates with other faculty members, generates a spirit of teaming, is sought by others as a colleague in performing tasks, and/or fosters harmony among faculty, staff, and students.

C. Flexibility of Criteria

The evaluation standards described here should not be interpreted as inflexible and absolute. The reward system within the SOE should be sufficiently flexible so that all members of the faculty can align their activities with the mission, goals, and needs of the unit. Annually, these activities shall be reflected in the Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAR).

II. Procedures for Annual Evaluations

A. **Annual Review**

1) Prior to the beginning of each academic year, the faculty member and the AUH shall determine the relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. (See JMU Faculty Handbook, 2009).

2) Faculty members in the School of Engineering will submit their FAR to the AUH by June 1 each year. This summary will cover the faculty member’s activities and accomplishments in the teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional service areas during the previous 12 months.

3) The AUH will rate each performance area and the overall performance of each faculty member using the evaluation rating categories of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The AUH will assign his or her independent ratings for each faculty member.
4) For faculty members on a tenure track contract, the Annual Evaluation after the third year may also include review by the AUPAC, at the request of the faculty member. Faculty members will be responsible for preparing and submitting a dossier of their activities to date to the AUH (and the AUPAC, if desired) for review. Both the AUH and the AUPAC will prepare a letter documenting the faculty member’s performance to date.

B. Evaluation Ratings for Annual Performance

*Satisfactory Performance*
This designation reflects competence in professional responsibilities. The faculty member is performing in accordance with the standards of the School of Engineering. This category requires documentation from the faculty member that demonstrates performance at this level.

*Excellent Performance*
This designation signifies that the faculty member meets the criteria at the satisfactory level, but also demonstrates a higher level of performance that stands out among competent faculty. Performance at this high level conforms with the excellent levels required for promotion according to the faculty handbook. This category requires documentation from the faculty member that demonstrates performance at this level.

*Unsatisfactory Performance*
This designation signifies that the faculty member has not performed at a level that is in keeping with the standards of the School of Engineering. Its occurrence should be interpreted by faculty as substantive concern for success in the faculty role. Designations in this category may jeopardize tenure or promotion and may initiate post-tenure review processes. The procedures for post-tenure review are described in the JMU Faculty Handbook.

An overall designation of *Satisfactory* or *Unsatisfactory* will be made of faculty performance for the purpose of determining eligibility for salary increments based on merit. The overall evaluation will take into consideration the evaluations in each area, but will not be simply the sum of evaluations in the three areas. All performance designations will be made in a qualitative, holistic manner, taking into account such factors as level of involvement, amount of time committed, and the value of contributions. The AUH may request additional information or evidence to assist him or her in making fair judgments.

C. Standards for Reappointment

The minimum qualification for a faculty member to receive a non-tenure-track reappointment is *Satisfactory* ratings in all three review criteria, although factors similar to consideration for tenure (such as promise of continued long-term performance) will also be evaluated in determining qualification for reappointment. Other factors, such as program need
and program financial exigencies, must also be considered in determining reappointment of faculty.

D. Annual Evaluation Letter and Conference

1) The AUH will write a preliminary evaluation letter and give the letter to the faculty member at least one day prior to the faculty member’s annual evaluation conference as stipulated in the JMU Faculty Handbook. The AUH and faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty member’s accomplishments during the previous year, the annual evaluation ratings, and the faculty member’s goals for the next year. Within seven days of the evaluation conference, the AUH will write the final evaluation letter and give it to the faculty member. The conference must be scheduled so that the final letter can be delivered to the faculty member by September 15.

2) If the faculty member concurs with the AUH’s annual evaluation ratings, he or she will sign the final evaluation letter and return it to the AUH within seven days of receipt of the letter. No further action is required by the faculty member. The AUH will forward the final evaluation letter with the faculty member’s signature to the appropriate Vice Provost by October 21.

3) If the faculty member does not concur with the AUH’s annual evaluation ratings, but does not wish to appeal the ratings, the faculty member will return the letter unsigned. The AUH will forward the final evaluation letter without the faculty member’s signature to the appropriate Vice Provost by October 21.

E. Appeals Procedures

If the faculty member does not concur with the AUH’s annual evaluation rating, then he or she has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to appeal in writing. The entire appeal process must be completed by October 21.

1) To initiate the appeal, the faculty member must write the appeal letter outlining the area(s) of disagreement and send the letter to the AUH with a copy to the AUPAC.

2) Within seven days of the receipt of the appeal letter, the AUH will meet with the faculty member to discuss the appeal and consult with the AUPAC about the appeal. The AUH will decide either to keep the original evaluation letter or to write a new evaluation letter. The AUH must notify the faculty member of his or her decision within seven days, and if a revised letter is written, must give the letter to the faculty member during this period.

3) If the faculty member still disagrees with the AUH’s final evaluation ratings, within seven days of the receipt of the final reissued or revised evaluation letter, the faculty member may write an appeal letter outlining the area(s) of disagreement and send the letter to the School of Engineering Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee with a copy to
the AUH and the AUPAC. The School of Engineering Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee will be comprised of three former AUPAC members (or a committee appointed by the appropriate Vice Provost, if three former AUPAC members are not available).

4) The Appeals Committee must adhere to the appeals policy outlined in the JMU Faculty Handbook: “In considering an appeal, the crucial questions for the reviewing body are whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH, and whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment.” The AUH will provide the Appeals Committee with the FAR for all faculty members, a list of the ratings for all faculty members, and a copy of all appeal letters and recommendations. The Appeals Committee will report its findings in writing to the faculty member and the AUH within seven days of receiving the appropriate documents.

5) Within seven days of the receipt of the Appeals Committee letter, the AUH and faculty member will meet to discuss the evaluation. The AUH will decide either to keep the most recent evaluation letter or to write a new evaluation letter, and will send the reissued or revised evaluation letter to the faculty member within seven days of the meeting.

6) If the faculty member agrees with the reissued or revised final evaluation letter, he or she will sign the letter and return it to the AUH within seven days of receipt of the letter. If the faculty member does not agree with the evaluation letter at this point, he or she will inform the AUH of this disagreement in writing and indicate if he or she would like the documentation of the appeal sent to the appropriate Vice Provost along with the unsigned evaluation letter. The AUH will forward the final evaluation letter without the faculty member’s signature and, if requested, the appeal documentation, to the Vice Provost for STEM by October 21.

Note: The time periods noted in this process are strongly recommended but changes in these time periods can be negotiated among the parties involved to accommodate other commitments.

III. School of Engineering Protocol for Promotion and Tenure

The School of Engineering procedures regarding promotion and tenure are based on the procedures described in the JMU Faculty Handbook.

A. Evaluation Ratings for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion
The promotion standards used are taken from the *JMU Faculty Handbook*. The *JMU Faculty Handbook 2009* (III.E.6.a. Standards) states that “the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory”. The following are the standards for promotion in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

Tenure

The standards for awarding tenure are in Section III.E.7 of the Faculty Handbook.

B. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Review

*The Promotion and Tenure Dossier*

Faculty members applying for promotion or tenure complete a Professional Dossier according to the School of Engineering guidelines posted at www.jmu.edu/engineering. The dossier should also conform to any additional documentation requirements and suggestions for faculty in the School of Engineering. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to make their own case in an accurate and timely manner and to support their case with the appropriate documentation.

In both promotion and tenure decisions, the AUPAC and the AUH will consider the quality of performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service of a candidate. It is faculty member’s responsibility to clearly present and properly cross-reference any activities that fall in multiple categories.

C. Decision Process for Promotion and Tenure Review

The university procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook* in sections III.E.6.b. and III.E.7.f..

IV. Teaching: Promotion and Tenure Criteria

A. Evaluation Criteria

To receive a *Satisfactory* rating for teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate *many* of the activities listed below:

1) Commitment to assigned classes, such as thoroughness of class preparation, careful and objective grading, and timely assessment of and feedback to students;

2) Mastery of subject matter;