

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE
FOR ALL REVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS, FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION,
AND FOR DETERMINATION OF MERIT PAY

HISTORY DEPARTMENT

The History Department adheres to the standards for tenure and promotion outlined in the Faculty Handbook (III.E.6.a).

In further keeping with Faculty Handbook statements (III.E.4.a) regarding a Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP), the History Department expects faculty to assign specific weights to teaching, scholarship and service prior to the start of each academic year.

During their probationary period Assistant Professors will meet every year in January with an advisory committee consisting of the chair of the Personnel Advisory Committee, the Department Head, and their faculty mentor to discuss their teaching, research, and service activities and the progress they have made toward fulfilling the standards required for tenure outlined below. It is the responsibility of the chair of the Personnel Advisory Committee to convene the annual advisory committee meeting. The meeting with the advisory committee is not an evaluation or a review but is intended to provide Assistant Professors with guidance and direction. At the conclusion of the meeting, all participants will sign a written statement—which will be placed in the Assistant Professor's personnel file—summarizing the proceedings of the meeting. Such meetings may be held more than once year, if needed.

As the nature of what constitutes effective teaching, scholarship, and service continues to change, so too should the History Department's criteria for evaluating these. Therefore, the History Department should periodically revisit and, if necessary, revise the following criteria for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service.

TEACHING

1. Teaching increases students' knowledge of subject matter and heightens their ability to engage in critical analysis, write effectively and coherently and problem solve effectively.
2. Methods of teaching appropriate to courses will vary not only with the nature of individual courses, but also with the individual approaches to teaching which the faculty member has found effective.
3. Course objectives shall be spelled out in syllabi for each course. Separate course syllabi shall be used in combination 400/600 level courses and shall reflect the level of expectation for those courses. The extra hour per week spent with graduate students in 600 level courses shall be considered in any evaluation of teaching.
4. A variety of factors shall be used to determine and evaluate teaching effectiveness. Those shall include:
 - a. Faculty member's own descriptions of his or her achievements in teaching
 - b. Peer evaluations and department head visitations
 - c. Course syllabi and how well courses conform to departmental goals, objectives and course level requirements as well as how effectively they conform to college and university general education goals and objectives.
 - d. Willingness and receptiveness of faculty to modify/change teaching approaches and techniques as factors such as technology, new scholarship and new directives and directions within the university occur.
 - e. Involvement of faculty in curriculum development, introduction of new courses and revision of existing courses.
 - f. Involvement in Studies Abroad and Travel Study programs.

- g. Involvement in distance learning and alternative forms of instruction to enhance learning.
 - h. Involvement in grants for teachers, internship experiences and outreach responsibilities.
 - i. Advising of students in the major/minors located in the department, and in the ISS and IDLS programs.
 - j. Writing letters of recommendation for undergraduates and graduates and other assistance in the procurement of grants, employment and career advancement.
 - k. Mentoring students by directing and reading honors theses, independent studies and Master's theses and by serving on MA examining committees.
 - l. Mentoring newly arrived junior faculty or faculty who may have achieved unsatisfactory evaluations and are subject to a professional development plan.
 - m. Student evaluations through utilization of evaluation forms agreed upon by the department.
5. In evaluating the teaching effectiveness of department members, the Department Head and the PAC shall conduct independent reviews. The Department Head shall assess the degree and level of effectiveness with which faculty have complied with factors identified in #4, review annual faculty FAAP and faculty assessments of their own teaching, review faculty summaries of student evaluations, make class visitations, and conduct First Year and Mid-Tenure reviews of faculty. The PAC shall evaluate teaching effectiveness through class visitations, PAC chair review of

- class write-ups, and through First Year and Mid-Tenure reviews of faculty. Using the above criteria, faculty are to be rated excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. In the first-year review only, faculty are to be rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
6. The above criteria for teaching shall be used for annual evaluations of all faculty.
 7. The above criteria for teaching shall be used for the determination of merit pay for all faculty.

SCHOLARSHIP

1. Scholarly research is a continuous, on-going enterprise that advances historical study through teaching, publication, scholarly presentations, and consulting. It is expected that each faculty member in the Department of History actively engage in research and that this research has the promise of contributing to the advancement of the study and the teaching of history. By its very nature historical scholarship does not always lend itself to a speedy conclusion, quick expression, or a single descriptive template that can be universally applied to all faculty members in the Department of History.
2. All requirements for faculty research are premised on adequate support at the institutional level, including the acquisition of research materials and relevant technology, sabbaticals, release time, and assistance with preparation of grant applications. When evaluating faculty research, the Department of History considers a broad range of forms of presentation, recognizes that publication of a print monograph by an academic press need not be the primary basis for judgment, and acknowledges that the direction and the results of historical research will reflect the particular strengths and scholarly interests of each individual faculty member. To

receive tenure and advance in rank, Assistant Professors must give evidence of progress in their research through a substantial body of written work, on the order of one book or three articles or the demonstrable equivalent. Evidence of such work might include but is not limited to:

- a. Book publications, print or electronic, such as historical monographs, edited reference works, edited collections of original articles, edited anthologies, document readers, book translations, textbooks and textbook updates.
- b. Articles, print or electronic, such as those appearing in peer reviewed scholarly journals, in edited volumes, as author-attributed encyclopedia entries, conference proceedings, or translations. Research-based articles published in reputable non-academic national and regional magazines and newspapers will also be considered.
- c. Public history research, in print, magnetic, microform, electronic or physical display formats including museum exhibits and curatorial work, collections of oral histories, collections and transcriptions of historic documents, documentary films, and the scholarly examination of historic sites and structures.
- d. Research aimed at enhanced teaching and mentoring of graduate, undergraduate and K–12 history students.
- e. Book reviews, review essays, and exhibit reviews published in scholarly journals or electronically under the auspices of a professional organization.
- f. Scholarly presentations of research at academic conferences, public or policy forums, or over electronic or broadcast media as well as on- and off-campus

consulting, which promotes the scholarly reputation of the university and the Department of History.

- g. Refereeing activities for scholarly journals and publishers, reviewing grants or manuscripts, serving as jurors for book prizes, etc.
 - h. Successful grant applications, from internal or external sources, to support any of the above research activities.
3. At the beginning of their second semester of service, Assistant Professors will provide a written, detailed description, to the Department Head and to the chair of the Personnel Advisory Committee, of how their research project(s) have the promise of scholarly presentation, and/ or publication; or how their research project(s) will result in enhanced teaching and/or mentoring of students; or how their consulting project(s) will promote the scholarly reputation of the university and/or the Department of History.
 4. At the mid-tenure review and in the first semester of the penultimate year of the probationary period, the Department Head and the Personnel Advisory Committee will independently determine if the faculty member's research progress is excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
 5. Associate Professors seeking promotion to full rank will follow the annual review procedures outlined in paragraph # 3 above, and they will meet with the chair of the Personnel Advisory Committee and the Department Head to discuss their research as often as needed.
 6. In the year an Associate Professor seeks promotion to full rank, the Department Head and the Personnel Advisory Committee will independently determine if the

- faculty member's research progress in the period of time from promotion to Associate Professor to the application time for full Professor is excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
7. In evaluating the scholarly productivity and scholarship of members of the department, the Department Head and the PAC shall conduct independent reviews. The Department Head shall review annual faculty FAAP, conduct First Year and Mid-Tenure reviews of faculty, and shall examine publications such as historical monographs, articles, edited anthologies, textbooks, book reviews, exhibits, films and shall attend scholarly presentations when feasible. In evaluating the scholarly productivity and scholarship of members of the department, the PAC shall conduct First Year and Mid-tenure reviews of faculty, review research progress reports submitted to the chair and reports on visits to the PAC chair describing research progress, and shall examine publications such as those listed above in this paragraph. In evaluating scholarship, the Department Head and the PAC will consider research completed if it has been accepted for publication, whether or not it has actually appeared.
 8. Using the above criteria, faculty are to be rated excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. In the first-year review only, faculty are to be rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
 9. The above criteria for scholarship shall be used for annual evaluations of all faculty.
 10. The above criteria for scholarship shall be used for the determination of merit pay for all faculty.

SERVICE

1. All members of the department are expected to engage in committee service and leadership at James Madison University and/or in professional or educational organizations; or service otherwise enhancing the profession, the Department of History, the College of Arts and Letters or the University as a whole; or in types of service to the community.
2. Forms of service may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. membership on, or chairing of, department, college or university standing committees or specially-created committees,
 - b. membership on, or directing of, programs of study such as interdisciplinary programs, General Education Clusters or institutes, workshops and seminars both on and off campus,
 - c. membership on, or chairing of, professional and educational organizations,
 - d. representing the department, college or university at on-or off-campus meetings,
 - e. serving as advisor to student organizations,
 - f. presentation of programs to city/county organizations or school groups or membership and involvement with community groups.
3. The History Department does not expect service by first year faculty. However, by the beginning of their second year, Assistant Professors should be familiar with committee and service opportunities in the department and the college, and to some extent the University, and should have volunteered to serve or agreed to be appointed to committee or leadership positions. By the end of their second year faculty should be making satisfactory progress in service.

4. During succeeding years of employment at the University, faculty in all ranks are expected to engage in a range of service activities.
5. Service is not required as part of the first year review, but by the time of the mid-tenure review the Department Head and the PAC review committees shall check to ensure that faculty are serving on departmental, college, or university committees and/or advising and/or engaging in service activity in professional organizations or in the community. The quality of that service will also be evaluated.
6. To aid in evaluation of the quality of service, faculty in their FAAP reports and in other reporting of their service involvement, should include the following:
 - a. purpose of the committee /commission or organization in which the service occurred,
 - b. individual's role in the organization or on the committee/commission,
 - c. statement regarding activities performed, nature of those activities, and time spent in service involvement,
 - d. impact of service involvement
7. In evaluating the service effectiveness of members of the department, the Department Head and the PAC shall conduct independent reviews. The Department Head shall review annual faculty FAAP, conduct First Year and Mid-Tenure reviews of Faculty, assess the quantity and quality of faculty service and insure that there has been ongoing satisfactory service involvement. The PAC shall evaluate service effectiveness of members of the department by conducting Mid-Tenure reviews of faculty, considering any reports to the PAC chair of service involvement and assessing the quantity and quality of faculty service to insure satisfactory involvement.

8. Using the above criteria, faculty are rated excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in service.
9. The above criteria for service shall be used for annual evaluations of all faculty.
10. The above criteria for service shall be used for the determination of merit pay for all faculty.

Adopted by a vote of the History Department Faculty on September 6, 2006.

DETERMINATION OF MERIT PAY

The Department of History, by unanimous vote of the PAC and full department, employs the same document and standards for annual review and merit considerations that are used for tenure and promotion review. The document is on file and has been reviewed and approved in accordance with the requirement in the Faculty Handbook.

The PAC asks that decisions on merit be determined by the Head of the Department, applying the criteria for Annual Evaluations and for Tenure and Promotion established by the PAC, approved by the Head and full faculty, and in accordance with the provisions of the the Faculty Handbook

<http://web.jmu.edu/facultysenate/facultyhandbook/Current%20Handbook/1.7.05%20official%20amended.pdf>).

Each faculty member submits an annual summary of activities in each area on a form adopted by the department. Accompanying this document are: a summary of course evaluations for all courses offered during the year, the raw student evaluations, an updated curriculum vitae, and a list of objectives and percentages of anticipated effort for the coming year. These materials are submitted in May, reviewed over

the summer by the Head, who prepares a narrative review evaluation with a rating of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each area. Faculty receive their reviews at the beginning of the fall semester, then meet with the Head individually to discuss them. They may offer corrections in fact or conclusions drawn from fact and these result in an amended document. Signed copies are maintained in the department. The final part of the process is merit pay consideration. The Head reviews the narratives for each faculty member and ranks each based upon what they have contributed and accomplished during the year. This results in an initial ranking into thirds (upper, middle, and lower) for all faculty deemed satisfactory. The total salary pool is then divided accordingly with each third further subdivided so that each faculty member receives merit in keeping with what each has accomplished.

The PAC reserves the right to ask to be included in the process of determining merit pay at any time.

Policy regarding “DETERMINATION OF MERIT PAY” reaffirmed by unanimous vote of the History Department Personnel Advisory Committee on April 8, 2008.