I. The purpose and membership of the AUPAC [Approved 12-5-11]

The Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) of the School of Communication Studies is a composite of appointed peer advisory bodies, accountable to both the faculty of the school and the administration regarding the development and assessment of faculty qualifications and the maintenance of standards regarding performance of the school's faculty.

In accordance with the JMU faculty handbook, the AUPAC advises the Academic Unit Head (AUH) on matters of personnel, and assists faculty on matters of their academic development.

Faculty, as referred to in this document, are defined as those continuing faculty in tenure-track or RTA lines.

In the School of Communication Studies, these activities include:

A. Communicating with faculty and administration about the manner in which faculty are to meet criteria for evaluated performance in areas of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and service;

B. Assessing the suitability of criteria and evidence used to evaluate faculty performance and qualifications;

C. Forwarding recommendations to the appropriate administration regarding applications for tenure and promotion;

D. When requested by a faculty member or the AUH, providing feedback on performance as evidenced in areas of teaching, scholarly achievements and professional qualifications, and professional service;

E. Assisting faculty in the development and achievement of academic goals that promote successful and rewarding participation in the academic culture of the school;

F. Facilitating the process of faculty appeals of annual evaluations.

The AUPAC is not charged with making decisions regarding merit.

To accomplish these functions and goals, the AUPAC may be comprised of several sub-
II. Membership of the AUPAC [Approved 12-5-11]

A. The AUPAC is comprised of elected members of the faculty in the School of Communication Studies: 80% of the tenured faculty or more to ensure odd numbered membership, 2 tenure-track faculty, 2 RTA/Lecturers. Members of the AUPAC are to be faculty in “good standing.” To be in good standing is to have the previous annual performance evaluation from the School Director be at least “Satisfactory” in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and service. It is the ethical responsibility of faculty members who are not in good standing to remove themselves if nominated for election. Any member during formal review for remediation for having failed to meet minimum criteria for annual performance will not be allowed to participate in evaluation of faculty seeking tenure and promotion. RTA/Lecturers and tenure-track faculty would be allowed to serve on AUPAC tasks but not on the PTAC subcommittee.

B. The chair of the AUPAC will be a member of the tenured faculty and will be elected using the school’s processes for elected committee chairs.

C. Committee membership in the AUPAC entails regular and timely participation in all AUPAC committee activities. Members of the AUPAC may be recommended for removal for the remainder of a particular academic year for a pattern of non-contribution. It is the responsibility of the AUPAC Chair to conduct a meeting of the AUPAC to discuss whether a committee member should be removed and if 75% of the AUPAC so decide, the AUPAC chair presents the committee’s recommendation to the SCOM Director regarding the removal of the committee members from further deliberations of the AUPAC.

1. The non-contributing member, scheduled for removal, may appeal to the AUPAC within 10 business days of notification within a nine-month contract schedule, to reverse the recommendation for removal for the balance of the particular academic year. In cases of appeals, the Faculty Advisory Committee will serve as the body to hear the case. The AUPAC chair will forward the non-contributing members statement to the FAC chair as well as a statement from the AUPAC that describes the grounds for removal.

2. To file an appeal, members must first present their case in writing to the AUPAC before a removal appeals hearing can be scheduled. The FAC
must vote to uphold the appeal of the member scheduled for removal from the AUPAC with a 2/3 majority.

3. If a hearing regarding non-removal is scheduled, the FAC decision must be supported by a 2/3-majority vote.

D. A committee member must recuse him/herself from participation in AUPAC deliberations when there is a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest is described in the JMU Faculty Handbook, Section III.A.5.

E. Members of the AUPAC who are on leave for 12 weeks or more during their appointment to the committee will be replaced by someone of the same rank through an election.

III. Responsibilities of the AUPAC [Approved 12-5-11]

A. A subcommittee of the AUPAC composed of an elected 80% of the tenured faculty (or more to ensure odd numbered membership) will constitute the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC). This subcommittee is required to provide a performance evaluation for probationary candidates in the third year, and the penultimate year of their probationary period and make a recommendation regarding tenure and promotion to the dean independent of the AUH. If applicants believe they have a compelling case for tenure and/or promotion or if their contract began with a shortened probationary period, they will be reviewed earlier. A subcommittee of the AUPAC that includes all Full Professors on the committee is required to provide a performance assessment and recommendation to the dean independent of the AUH for candidates applying for promotion to Full Professor. The specific charges and responsibilities of the PTAC subcommittee are outlined in the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee’s bylaws.

B. An individual faculty member may request optional advisory feedback from the AUPAC in accordance with the timelines and guidelines presented in this document. The AUPAC may also give feedback to an individual faculty member as requested by the AUH in accordance with the timelines and guidelines presented in this document.

C. The AUPAC will facilitate processes for faculty appealing the Annual Evaluation performed by the AUH. [Approved February, 2011]

As per the JMU Faculty Handbook, the AUPAC is responsible for developing a faculty process for appealing faculty evaluations other than that of requests for promotion and tenure. The Faculty Handbook does not specify the nature of the
process. What follows is set procedures and by-laws recommended by the AUPAC for faculty appeal as a formal process.

1. If a faculty member disagrees with the content of the written Annual Evaluation by the AUH, the concluding assessment for each of the areas of performance, or the overall evaluation of performance, they should first bring their concerns to the School Director during the Annual Evaluation meeting. The faculty member should describe the grounds for their concerns at the meeting as well as bring additional evidence that would support their case. The faculty member and School Director should then work cooperatively toward some resolution to the dispute.

2. If a satisfactory resolution is not reached at the Annual Evaluation Meeting and the Final Annual Evaluation letter is still under dispute by the faculty member, the faculty member has seven business days\(^1\) to file an appeal with the AUPAC. The written Letter of Appeal should include:
   a. A statement articulating those parts of the written evaluation that are being appealed and a description of those forms of evidence that are provided to support the appeal.
   b. A statement describing which path the faculty member would like to take in pursing the appeal. (See Appeals.4)
   c. Evidence in the form of documents that the faculty member intends to rely upon shall be attached to the request for a hearing, submitted to the AUPAC, and may include but is not limited to the faculty member's personnel records, recommendations from the AUPAC, AUH or dean, and any other records appropriate to provide substantiation of the faculty member's arguments.

3. Appeals Committee
   The AUPAC serves as the Appeals Committee to review the submitted Letter of Appeal and attending evidence to determine if pursuant action is warranted. The committee will decide by majority vote whether an appeal will be considered. The AUPAC will only consider documentation related to that which is being appealed. The primary criteria for determining the legitimacy of the appeal is (1) evidence that the faculty member and Director made a good faith effort to follow the informal

\(^1\) A business day is considered any consecutive day during which the faculty member is under contract. No appeals will be heard during the period between May 20 and August 15. That period will be considered to be one business day for the purposes of an appeal. The Appeals Committee will only convene during the academic year during which faculty are contracted.
procedures toward resolution; (2) the faculty member adhered to the
guidelines for timely submission of the Letter of Appeal; (3) the faculty
member included all relevant materials in their Letter of Appeal; and (4) a
resolution was not previously agreed upon by the faculty member and
the AUH. The AUPAC will not render judgment on whether the appeal is
warranted based on their evaluation of the appeal as reasonable or on
the likelihood that a pursuant committee will be able to render assistance
or a judgment. The chair of the AUPAC will notify the faculty member of
their decision.

4. Options for Appealing
In the letter requesting an appeal, the faculty member should articulate
which path he/she would like to follow in pursuing an appeal, (1) a
facilitated conversation; or, (2) a hearing.

a. Facilitated Conversation
The faculty member can seek to have their appeal addressed
through conversation facilitated by two trained facilitators
supplied by the JMU Office of Human Resources. The
conversation would occur between the faculty member, the
School Director and the trained facilitators. The chair of the
AUPAC is responsible for contacting the Office of Human
Resources, requesting the participation of two trained facilitators,
and arranging the time and location for the facilitated
conversation. Members of AUPAC are prohibited from being
present at the facilitated conversation.

i. A Facilitated Conversation typically includes four phases:

1. Introduction to the process, the ground rules and the role
   of the facilitators
2. Defining and clarifying the issues
3. Answering questions and solving problems
4. Implementing solutions

ii. The outcomes of the facilitated conversation could include: (1)
better understanding of the two parties’ positions; (2) an oral
agreement; and/or (3) a written agreement. Both parties, the
AUH and the faculty member, must agree as to whether any
written agreements are binding or non-binding.

iii. If the outcome of the facilitated conversation is deemed
unsatisfactory for the faculty member, s/he may continue
their appeal and request to present her/his case before a
Hearing Committee.
The faculty member can seek to have their appeal addressed through a hearing body at the outset of the appeal or after a facilitated conversation. The faculty member will be given an opportunity to present his/her case, including the presentation of relevant evidence, at the hearing and answer any questions by the Hearing Committee. The hearing is open, unless the appellant requests that it be closed. Deliberations of the hearing committee are closed and a decision to dismiss or uphold the appeal will be determined by majority vote. A letter describing the decision will be written to the appellant, the AUH, and the College dean. The College dean determines the resolution for the appeal informed by the recommendation of the hearing committee.

- The Hearing Committee will be composed of five people via random selection of the entire faculty, with the exception of those members currently serving on the AUPAC. A hearing committee is not a standing committee and will be newly composed for each appeal under consideration.
- The appellant may ask the AUPAC that a member of the hearing committee be removed for conflicts of interest at the time the hearing committee is composed.
- Each Hearing Committee will elect a chair. The chair will be responsible for arranging the hearing, overseeing the hearing process, and communicating the outcomes of the hearing with the appellant, the AUH, and the College dean.
- In the case of conflict of interest, members appointed to the hearing committee may recuse themselves and ask that another member be appointed in the case of conflict of interest.
- All members of the hearing committee must be present at the hearing. In the event that a member of the hearing committee cannot attend the scheduled hearing, another member of the committee will be selected from the faculty. If a member of the hearing committee fails to attend the hearing, the hearing and deliberations will proceed without him/her unless the appellant objects.

5. Timeline for Appeals

- The AUH will forward preliminary Annual Evaluation letters to faculty between August 15 and October 1. If an Annual Evaluation Letter is delivered to a faculty member during the summer months when the faculty member is not under contract, that faculty member will have seven business days to appeal starting on August 15.
b. The completed appeals process will take place anytime after August 15 and no later than October 20. A decision made by the hearing committee must be forwarded to the College dean prior to November 1 of a given academic year.

D. The AUPAC is required to participate in the remediation process for any tenured faculty member whose annual performance has been reviewed as “unsatisfactory” for two of the most recent annual evaluations by the AUH. The Faculty Handbook outlines the nature of this process:

1. The AUPAC will be notified by the AUH of a recommended remediation. If a tenured faculty member’s annual performance has been assessed as “unsatisfactory” for two of the three most recent annual evaluations, the AUH shall recommend remediation, notifying both the AUPAC and the dean.

2. The AUPAC will review the tenured faculty member’s performance over the past three years and make an independent evaluation of whether his or her performance has been “unsatisfactory” or “satisfactory” overall. The AUPAC shall submit its written evaluation to the dean by Nov. 30, with copies to the AUH and faculty member concurrently. The evaluation shall include a justification of the AUPAC’s conclusions, using the academic unit’s criteria. A conclusion that performance has been unsatisfactory must be supported by substantial evidence (JMU Faculty Handbook III.E.8.c).

3. The AUPAC will collaborate with AUH in developing remediation plans. See JMU Faculty Handbook Section III.e.8.g.

4. The AUPAC will provide an independent review of the faculty member’s completion of the remediation plan. See JMU Faculty Handbook Section III.E.8.j.

IV. Guidelines for Annual Performance Evaluations [Approved 1-13-12]

A. Definition of Annual Evaluation

The university requires that a faculty member’s work performance be assessed and evaluated annually in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications, and professional service. Every full-time faculty member, tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track, undergoes an evaluation annually and is responsible for understanding the university’s and the school’s guidelines pertaining to that annual evaluation.

The purpose of the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) is “to promote professionalism, to encourage performance at the highest levels and to indicate
areas in which improvement is needed. Evaluations are also used in making personnel decisions, including the allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment and initiation of post-tenure review” (JMU Faculty Handbook III.E).

Faculty members submit evidence of their work performance to the AUH annually in the form of an academic portfolio. Sections V.A.1, VI.A, VII.B, VII.C, and VII.D of this document list types of portfolio documents and materials that provide evidence of work performance and criteria for their evaluation. The AUH’s assessment of the evidence includes both an evaluation of each of the areas (“Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory”) and an overall evaluation of a faculty member’s ongoing work performance (“Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory”), which is copied to the Dean.

The APE criteria are used primarily to determine annual salary increments and adjustments, if any, and are not directly linked to promotion and tenure decisions. However, APEs are included and used in the Promotion and Tenure process. Promotion and tenure standards are different from those employed in the annual evaluation, and the annual evaluation has a different evaluative mission than the AUPAC’s evaluation that considers promotion and tenure requests. Even though the APEs are submitted as part of P&T process, the types of evidence accepted for the APE may be different than the types of evidence that meet P&T guidelines. For information on P&T criteria, see the School’s Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee Guidelines (approved 1/13/2012).

B. Role of the AUPAC in Annual Evaluation Process
1. The AUPAC has no role in the Annual Evaluation Process.

C. Summary of Activities and Accomplishments
1. According to the JMU Faculty Handbook, “By the deadline established by the academic unit, each faculty member shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments during the previous 12 months in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH for review and evaluation purposes.” (JMU Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.4.b).

D. Faculty Activity Plans
1. All members of the faculty are required to provide the AUH with an Annual Activity plan that includes general and specific goals for each of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Qualifications, and Service for the upcoming academic year.
2. “The relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service for an individual faculty member shall be determined by the
E. Academic Portfolio

The contents of the academic portfolio submitted for annual review to the AUH, and for optional advisory feedback by the AUPAC are listed in Section V of this document.

V. The Academic Portfolio for Annual Evaluation [Approved 12-5-11]

A. Contents of the Academic Portfolio

1. Faculty member must submit to AUH
   a. Faculty Activity Report (FAR) (Appendix A). The Faculty Activity Report contains a report of faculty activities during the year under evaluation in the areas of teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service. Faculty members are responsible for demonstrating their achievements and progress in the areas of teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service.
   b. Faculty Activity Plan (FAP) (Appendix B). The Faculty Activity Plan contains a report of proposed faculty activities during the year following the academic review in the areas of teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service.
   c. Curriculum Vitae
   d. Previous Letters from the Academic Unit Head (3 consecutive years)
   e. Quantitative and qualitative evaluations for each course taught
   f. Syllabus for each course taught

2. AUH Has Access to These Components
   a. Grading distributions

B. Access to Academic Portfolios

1. When required by the bylaws, members of the AUPAC can assess faculty portfolios and are to maintain strict confidentiality regarding the content of their deliberations on all matters under consideration.
2. The school will provide a private space not available to students for locked storage of portfolios and for AUPAC review of portfolios;
3. Members of the AUPAC will be provided with keys to this space for the duration of their appointment to the committee.
VI. Materials for Optional Advisory AUPAC Feedback [Approved 12-5-11]

A. When requesting advisory feedback from the AUPAC a faculty member has the option of also including additional documentation to allow for a more thorough response. Additional documents should be submitted in a portfolio along with required documents (i.e., FAR, FAP, see above section).

1. For teaching this additional evidence might include the following: summary of classroom observation; sample tests and exams/ sample project assignments; sample lecture materials; sample advising materials;

2. For scholarship and professional qualifications this might include copies of presentations, papers, journal articles, books, course and workshop materials, or licensures;

3. For service this might include reports or documents produced by one’s committees, documentation of participation in the committee, thank you letters, awards, evidence of additional advising.

B. Provision of AUPAC Feedback

1. The AUPAC will produce a typed summary of advisory feedback for faculty in teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications, and/or service. Faculty may request advisory feedback in one or more areas.

2. This document will not evaluate whether each category is excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

3. This document will only be given to the faculty member and will not be shared with the AUH.

4. The intent is to provide supportive guidance to faculty members and not evaluation.

5. Members of the faculty seeking tenure are required to obtain an evaluation from the PTAC at different increments during their tenure-seeking process. This would constitute an evaluation rather than advisory feedback and would be given by a sub-group of the AUPAC.

VII. Guidelines for Performance Evaluations² [Approved 12-5-11]

A. “A factor in determining overall annual performance must be the relative weight associated with each of the areas of performance” (Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.) Per the handbook relative weights should be used only in overall evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory) not in evaluating each individual area (teaching, research/professional qualifications, service). Standards for evaluating each of the individual areas follow in sections B-D.

² The guidelines for performance evaluations set the criteria for the AUH annual evaluation of faculty. These guidelines also set parameters for the AUPAC to provide feedback, and for the sub-committees of the AUPAC to provide evaluations.
A faculty member receives a numerical score that is relative to the AUH evaluation of each performance area: three points of excellent, two for satisfactory, and zero for unsatisfactory. The overall evaluation of performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is determined by summing the weighted evaluation scores per area. To calculate overall evaluation score, multiply the relative weight by each area score and sum the total. A score of 2 or higher will receive a satisfactory overall evaluation. Scores below 2 will receive an unsatisfactory overall evaluation.

Details regarding how annual performance evaluations are used to make decisions and weight faculty comparatively for the purpose of awarding merit can be found in the School of Communication Studies Merit Policy document (approved 2/28/2014).

B. Evaluation of Teaching

Effective teaching in the School of Communication Studies involves developing students’ understanding of communication processes, providing students with opportunities to develop communication skills, and fostering academically rigorous and positive learning environments that pursue the university’s mission. Effective teaching performance is not restricted to the classroom, as it may include activities that develop positive mentoring and advising relationships, innovate curricula and academic programming, and lead co-curricular initiatives. Quantitative and qualitative student comments should only be part of how faculty are evaluated on teaching. Process as well as outcome should be considered in the evaluation of faculty teaching.

Evidence of Teaching Performance

1. Faculty must provide evidence of TEACHING performance by submitting the following materials:

   • Faculty Activity Report (FAR);
   • Faculty Activity Plan (FAP);
   • Quantitative student evaluations and qualitative student comments;
   • Grade distributions for classes taught;
   • Syllabi.

Persons working toward promotion and/or tenure should also review criteria and guidelines by the School and College for securing promotion and tenure, particularly as those guidelines and criteria for evaluating teaching may differ from guidelines and criteria outlined here for the Annual Performance Evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluating Performance in Teaching
There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding that one’s performance in the area of teaching is satisfactory or excellent for the year. What follows is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. These standards should be applied appropriately in light of the nature and level of the course.

1. **Satisfactory Performance in Teaching**

   A *Satisfactory* evaluation of teaching performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

   a. Qualitative student evaluations indicate general satisfaction;
   b. Course syllabi clearly state learning objectives, course requirements, course content and instructional policies, demonstrate appropriate rigor, and course description reflects catalog description;
   c. Scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near a rating of “average” to “above average”;
   d. Course material description in FAR narrative and syllabi reflect that the faculty member is keeping up-to-date and is teaching current information;
   e. Grade point distributions, descriptions of assignments, as well as FAR and FAP, indicate academic rigor appropriate for the course and level.
   f. Provides timely and accurate advising communication.

2. **Excellent Performance in Teaching**

   An *Excellent* evaluation exceeds that of a satisfactory performance. An excellent evaluation of teaching performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

   a. Qualitative student evaluations report valuable learning experiences such as challenging assignments, and realizations of practical applications;
   b. Substantial revision of existing courses or developed new courses and/or programs;
c. A variety of course preparations were successfully taught, demonstrating breadth of expertise and teaching adaptability to meet school demands;
d. Syllabi and course materials indicate innovative, reflective, and engaged assignments that provide a rigorous and challenging experience that reflects the catalog description of a course;
e. Scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near “excellent;”
f. Students are provided with learning opportunities outside the classroom (e.g. field trips, engagement with outside organization);
g. Innovative teaching strategies and assignments have been implemented;
h. Reflection on teaching methods and practice is demonstrated;
i. A comprehensive rationale for grade distribution linked to their pedagogy and philosophy of teaching is given;
j. Grade point distributions, descriptions of assignments, graded student work, and copies of examinations indicate academic rigor appropriate for the course and level and reflection upon prior teaching experiences;
k. Teaching workshops on campus and at relevant professional associations have been developed and given;
l. Teaching, advising, or mentoring awards have been received;
m. Grants for developing curriculum materials or instructional strategies and techniques have been received;
n. Participation in or direction of undergraduate honors theses or research projects is evidenced;
o. Participation in or direction of graduate theses or projects is evidenced.
p. Participation in graduate comprehensive exams/comprehensive assessment is evidenced.
q. Participation in training to learn innovative teaching methods and curriculum development is evidenced (e.g. CIT and CFI workshops);
r. Proactive advising and/or the creation of special advising materials is demonstrated;
s. Participates in independent studies with graduate or undergraduate students.
t. Student outcomes are presented at conferences.

C. Evaluation of Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications

Scholarship is a systematic and disciplined process of academic inquiry and production. Effective scholarly achievements contribute to the discovery and development of knowledge and inquiry to the field of communication studies
through communications made available to the academy and accessible to the
general public for scrutiny and review.

Professional qualifications are necessary skills, recognized accomplishments and
valued associations that afford one’s status as being qualified to perform desired
tasks in an organization. Continued development of professional qualifications is
necessary for the production of scholarship and maintenance of currency in the
classroom. Membership in a professional association in the area in which faculty
members are researching or teaching is considered necessary, but not sufficient
as evidence for their continued development of professional qualifications.

Effective scholarly achievements and continued professional qualification are not
simply a matter of academic publication and professional training, but may also
include activities that translate communication knowledge to lay audiences,
continue one’s own education and development of specialized knowledge so as
to complement her/his field of study, and apply communication research and
criticism toward generating solutions to community problems (e.g. community
engaged research).

Evidence of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

1. Faculty must submit as evidence of SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT and
   PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS:

In their FAR faculty should report on the following:
A written description of an ongoing or developing line of research inquiry in the
field of communication studies and/or a description of continued professional
qualification. A written statement articulating specific professional goals and
recognized professional accomplishments in terms of both scholarly
achievement and professional qualifications

Persons working toward promotion and/or tenure should also review
criteria and guidelines by the School and College for securing promotion
and tenure, particularly as those guidelines and criteria for evaluating
teaching may differ from guidelines and criteria outlined here for the
Annual Performance Evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluating Performance in Scholarly Achievement and Professional
Qualifications

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding that
one’s performance in the area of scholarly achievement and professional
qualifications is satisfactory or excellent for the year. What follows is a list of
indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and
activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor
comprehensive and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for
calculating success in this area. Evaluations of performance in scholarly
achievement and professional qualifications must consider rank. Faculty should
articulate in their FAR how they have met some of the following criteria.

1. **Satisfactory Performance in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications**

   A *Satisfactory* evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

   a. Evidence of ongoing scholarship or developing line of research inquiry in communication studies or the scholarship of teaching and learning, including, but not limited to: data collection, grant writing, professional development and certification, and preparation of manuscripts for publication, even if such scholarship does not result in a refereed conference paper presentation or publication in a given academic year. Awarding of satisfactory scholarship on this basis may only occur once in any given three-year period. Evidence must be provided to document the particular activities, such as excerpts from data collected, works in progress/revision, and revisions of grant applications.

   b. Organization and facilitation of seminars, webinars, workshops or short courses at state, regional, national, or international conferences.

   c. Panel presentation of scholarship at state, regional, national, or international conferences.

   d. Presentation(s) of refereed manuscript of scholarship at state, regional, national, or international conferences.

   e. Publication of scholarship in non-refereed regional journals or books.

   f. Receipt of internally supported research grant.

   g. Receipt of internally supported grant for research training and development, or training and development in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

---

1. Indicators evidenced should be appropriate to the rank of the faculty being reviewed.
h. Attendance at a workshop designed to enhance discipline-related teaching (e.g. short course or webinar in teaching undergraduate research methods or the Basic Course Conference at ECA).

i. Documented participation in professional development activities that are commensurate with the agreed upon goals for scholarly achievements and professional development in the annual activity plan.

j. Academic-based research that benefits and engages the community.

2. Excellent Performance in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

An Excellent evaluation exceeds that of a satisfactory performance. An excellent evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

a. Refereed manuscript recognized as a “top paper” at a regional, national, or international conference.

b. Multiple paper presentations at national and regional conferences.

c. Successful defense of a culminating research project (e.g., thesis, doctoral dissertation, etc.) or examination of licensure leading to the award of graduate degree beyond that possessed at the start of one’s appointment contract.

d. Regional, national, or international recognition or award for past scholarly activity.

e. Publication of an article or chapter in a collection or anthology that highlights the faculty member’s status as an expert in his/her area of study in the communication discipline.

f. Publication of an article or chapter in a collection or anthology that has been refereed by scholars relevant to the communication discipline or is published by a recognized university press.

g. Publication of scholarly article in refereed regional, national or scholarly outlet for communication studies research and criticism, or within a specific domain of communication inquiry.

h. Publication of scholarship in refereed state journals recognized for their outstanding scholarship (e.g., document rejection rates, etc.).

---

4 Indicators evidenced should be appropriate to the rank of the faculty being reviewed.
i. Publication of a refereed scholarly book or textbook relevant to communication studies.

j. Receipt of externally supported research grants or fellowships of regional, national, or international significance.

k. Editor of a regional, national, or international journal of communication studies or communication related scholarship.

D. Evaluation of Professional Service

Professional service is an essential component of the university mission and the responsibility of all faculty members. Service can be both intramural and extramural. Service by members of the faculty to the university, state, nation, and world in their special capacities as scholars should be recognized and rewarded.

Within the university, professional service includes participation in department, college, and university committees, and any involvement in aspects of university governance and academic citizenship. University, college, and departmental committee leadership roles are seen as more demanding than those of a committee member or just regularly attending faculty meetings.

Extramural professional service includes participation in professional and disciplinary organizations both as an elected office holder and/or a member; serving as a paid or unpaid consultant/speaker to individuals, businesses, agencies, governmental and non-governmental organizations; representing the university, college, school, or discipline on governmental, nongovernmental or private sector bodies; and/or building collaborative programs locally, regionally, statewide, nationally or internationally.

Evidence of Professional Service Performance

1. Faculty must provide evidence of SERVICE by submitting the following materials:

   Faculty should report in their FAR a summary of activities performed in all committee assignments.

   Persons working toward promotion and/or tenure should also review criteria and guidelines by the School and College for securing promotion.

5 Publication of a refereed scholarly book or textbook would constitute multiple indicators for Excellent.
6 Service activities that result in compensation greater than honoraria are not counted toward annual performance in service.
7 Definition modified from the University of Idaho’s Faculty Handbook, Chapter 1, 1565.
and tenure, particularly as those guidelines and criteria for evaluating teaching may differ from guidelines and criteria outlined here for the Annual Performance Evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluating Performance in Professional Service

1. Satisfactory Performance in Professional Service

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding that one’s performance in the area of professional service is satisfactory or excellent for the year. What follows is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area.

A Satisfactory evaluation of professional service performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

a. Regularly attends and constructively participates in school, college, and university committees;
b. Advises student organizations or co-curricular activities beyond those directly related to teaching duties;
c. Participates in ongoing campus programs that contribute to service and outreach activities of the school, college, or university;
d. Serves on committees or participates in the organizational activities of discipline-related local, regional, or state organizations.
e. Serves as a manuscript reviewer for regional, national, or international communication-related conference planning.
f. Serves as a manuscript reviewer for scholarly books and/or textbooks.

2. Excellent Performance in Professional Service

An Excellent evaluation exceeds that of a satisfactory performance. An excellent evaluation of professional service performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.
a. Serves on and constructively contributes to work-intensive committees at the school, college, or university level;
b. Serves as the chair of school, college, and university committees and demonstrates effective leadership;
c. Advises student organizations or co-curricular activities that results in exceptional student success or service to the school, college, university, or discipline;
d. Successfully participates in, leads, designs and/or implements ongoing campus programs that contribute to instructional, service and/or research activities of the school, college or university;
e. Holds office in discipline-related regional, national, and international organizations;
f. Provides significant discipline-related expertise to the school, college, university, discipline, or community;
g. Receives award or other honor for service to the school, college, university, or discipline, for JMU alumni outreach or for service to the community;
h. Secures funding or other resources for service activities that directly support on-going activities of the school, college or university.
i. Serves on the editorial board of a communication-related journal or completes multiple ad hoc manuscript reviews for journals or scholarly books.
j. Facilitates workshops or events as a Madison Teaching or Research Fellow.

VIII. Definitions for Contract Periods and Academic Year [Approved 12-5-11]

A. Contract Period

Following the JMU Faculty Handbook, the contract period for most full-time instructional faculty begins two weeks (10 business days) prior to the first day of the Fall semester, and ends two weeks (10 business days) following Spring commencement. For example, the contract period for faculty during the 2010-11 Academic Year is August 16, 2010 – May 20, 2011. For the 2012-2013 Academic Year, the contract period will be August 15, 2011 – May 18, 2012.

Accordingly, the timelines for submitting and reviewing the required Annual Evaluation of the Academic Year, and requested Academic Year and Tenure Performance Evaluations are designed to honor faculty contract periods while meeting conditions of the JMU Faculty Handbook.
B. Academic Year

The performance academic year, or simply Academic Year (AY), is the annual period by which faculty performance is to be evaluated. The AY is June 1 – May 31, with the exception of new faculty who should consider August 15 – May 31 as the AY for their first year.

Accordingly, portfolio content should include materials from the period of June 1 – May 31. Faculty in their first year should include materials from the period of August 15 – May 31.

IX. Performance Evaluation Timelines for AUH

First Monday of Spring Semester Portfolios of First Year Faculty Due

Faculty members in their first year of appointment submit mid-year FAR and for evaluation. The AUH will schedule an evaluation conference.

AUH may request additional materials to review first year faculty.

Mid-January Mid-Year Evaluations for First Year Faculty

The AUH will provide the faculty member a written initial evaluation within 14 days of the evaluation conference.

Friday of the Third Week Mid-Year Evaluation Process by the AUH Finalized

The initial evaluation process shall be completed by the end of the third week of second full semester. AUPAC shall be notified if the AUH determines the faculty’s performance was unsatisfactory for the first semester and thus a nonrenewal of contract. The AUPAC is then required to review the faculty member’s performance.

Late January – Early February AUPAC Review (if necessary) of First Year Faculty

The AUPAC review must be completed and sent to the dean within seven (7) days of receiving a recommendation of non-renewal of a first-faculty member from the AUH.

June 1 Academic Portfolios Due to AUH

All faculty members must submit a FAR and FAP that represents work from the previous Academic Year (June 1 – May 31) for an Annual Evaluation by the School Director, as required by the JMU Faculty Handbook. This is due no later than June 1, but can be submitted earlier.

The portfolio must include a FAR and a FAP.
June 1 – October 1

AUH Reviews Submitted Materials, begins meeting with faculty, and conducts Annual Evaluations.

The AUPAC will review materials and give advisory feedback to faculty members during this time period.

October 1

Annual Evaluations due to Faculty

The AUH must have provided all faculty members with a written copy of their Annual Evaluation. *Note: Faculty have seven business days after receiving their Annual Evaluation to file an appeal with the AUPAC.*

October 21

Appeals Process Completed

Appeals process for any faculty appeal must be completed.

October 28

Signed Annual Evaluations to the Dean

Annual Evaluation letters must be signed by the AUH and Faculty and submitted to the Dean.

November 15

The Dean makes a decision regarding an appeal to an Annual Evaluation

X. Advisory Feedback Timelines for AUPAC

Faculty may request feedback from the AUPAC at any time as long as there are at least seven weeks remaining in the semester. Faculty may request feedback no more than every other year. To request feedback a faculty member should contact the chair of the AUPAC. A three person subcommittee will meet with the faculty member to determine what they would like feedback on. The faculty members and three representatives from the AUPAC will discuss the best way to gather data and provide feedback. This might include a teaching observation. Following the process of gathering information the three-member subcommittee of the AUPAC will develop some written feedback for the faculty member and will meet again with the faculty member face-to-face to discuss the feedback.

XI. School Tenure and Promotion Timelines

[Approved 12-5-11]

August 15

Faculty in tenure-track lines should submit their portfolio materials to the PTAC by the August prior to the start of their fourth year. The submission of these materials is for the purpose of a third-year review. An evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Notification of intent to apply for promotion and tenure due to AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Formation of ad hoc Tenure and/or Promotion committee [if necessary]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>As defined in the tenure subcommittee bylaws, if the subcommittee of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eligible faculty to make recommendations on tenure and/or promotion is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than five persons, an ad hoc committee must be formed. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership of the ad hoc committee will be finalized and approved by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Dean by October 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Tenure and/or Promotion Application Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1–</td>
<td>Tenure Subcommittee Reviews Applications and Makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendations Due to Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Tenure and/or Promotion recommendations are sent to the Dean, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure and/or Promotion recommendations by the AUH are sent to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean and copied to the candidate and the tenure subcommittee of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUPAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>