Department of English

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2023

Department of English Policies and Procedures Document James Madison University

Department Approved December 2022

Table of Contents

Department of English Policies and Procedures

Part 1:   Composition and Procedures of the AUPAC

A. Composition

A.1.   Initial Composition of Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC)

A.1.a. The Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) shall be comprised of six members, selected by faculty vote held late in the Spring semester (in coordination with the Curriculum and Instruction committee) for the upcoming academic year. The composition of AUPAC shall be five full-time, tenured faculty members (serving staggered two-year terms); and one non-voting, full-time, non-tenured faculty member (serving a one-year term). If no non-tenured faculty member is available to serve, the AUPAC will consist of only five tenured faculty members.

A.2.   Replacement Members of AUPAC

A.2.a. AUPAC members who anticipate being on leave at some time during their term on the committee must notify the AUPAC Chair so that elections for replacement members may be held in a timely fashion.

B. Procedures

B.1.   Selection of AUPAC Chair

B.1.a. Candidates for the AUPAC Chair will be chosen by nomination (including self-nominations).

B.1.b. The AUPAC chair must be a tenured faculty member in the Department.

B.1.c. Before the conclusion of the first week of classes in the fall semester, but after the election of new members at the end of spring semester, current AUPAC members, including those nominated, shall choose the new AUPAC chair by majority confidential vote. This vote shall be tabulated independently by the outgoing AUPAC chair. If the current AUPAC chair is unavailable or is among those nominated, they will delegate the tabulation of voting to another member who is not nominated.

B.2.   Other AUPAC Procedures

B.2.a. All AUPAC deliberations will be held in the strictest of confidence. Failure to maintain confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the AUPAC or for a misconduct charge. (Faculty Handbook, Sections III.E.2.b. and III.A.25.).

B.2.c. Individuals who are not part of the AUPAC may participate in the meetings at the discretion of the AUPAC.

B.2.d. Voting for promotion and/or tenure decisions, and for the resolution of evaluation appeals will be decided by majority vote in a method agreed upon by the AUPAC.

B.2.e. A voting quorum for AUPAC shall be 100% of AUPAC members. A non-voting quorum for AUPAC shall be 60% of members of the AUPAC.

B.3. Revisions to the Governing Document

B.3.a. Revisions to this document may be proposed to the AUPAC by any fulltime faculty member in the department, including the Academic Unit Head (AUH), at any point before March 15.

B.3.b. Proposed amendments or revisions to this document shall be distributed to the faculty at least two weeks before a faculty meeting to discuss any changes.

B.3.c. In the determination of the approval of these amendments by the AUPAC, all members of the AUPAC are eligible to vote on amendments to procedure. All AUPAC members are eligible to deliberate on revisions to the annual evaluation guidelines or the promotion and tenure criteria and standards but only tenured faculty are permitted to vote.

B.3.d. The AUPAC will, in coordination with the AUH, schedule a faculty meeting for all faculty to comment upon all proposed amendments. This meeting shall be scheduled some time after the faculty have had at least two weeks to review the changes.

B.3.e. After deliberating on the proposed amendments, the AUPAC will provide a proposed amended document no more than two weeks after the discussion of changes by the faculty. The AUPAC Chair will arrange for a confidential vote (in-person or electronic) to take place, with the votes being tallied within two weeks of sharing the amendments. The amendments must be approved by a majority of the full-time faculty members in the Department.

B.3.f. Once approved, the proposed document will be presented to the AUH. The AUH must notify the faculty within two weeks of the approval or disapproval of the proposed changes.

B.3.g. If approved by the AUH, the new document with the proposed revisions shall be sent by the AUPAC chair to the Dean for approval. The AUPAC chair must report to the AUPAC every three months on the status of the document until approved or disapproved. All approved revisions are to be effective as of the beginning of the next academic year. The current AUPAC document will be available electronically and a copy will be provided to new faculty by the AUH.

B.3.h. If the AUH disapproves of the proposed changes, the AUPAC Chair may submit a request within two weeks to the College of Arts and Letters Dean to resolve the differences between the AUPAC and AUH.

B.3.i. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor must follow the procedures set forth in the most recent version of the faculty governance document, but they may choose to be evaluated under the criteria set forth in the governing document in effect at the time of hire. Candidates for promotion to full professor must follow the procedures set forth in the most recent version of the faculty governance document, but they may choose to be evaluated under the criteria set forth at the time tenure and/or promotion to associate professor was granted. Faculty electing to use earlier evaluation criteria must specify this in their personal statement.

Part 2: Responsibilities

A. Responsibilities of the Faculty Member

A.1. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by the AUPAC during their third year (or as otherwise specified in their contracts) and when they apply for promotion and/or tenure (P&T).

A.2. Non-tenure track faculty members who are eligible for promotion may include Renewable-term appointment (RTA) faculty or lecturers. Promotion-eligible RTA faculty at the rank of assistant or associate professor follow the same timeline and evaluation process as tenure-track faculty and, per the Faculty Handbook (III.D.4) have the same performance expectations as tenure-track faculty.
Promotion-eligible lecturers have different expectations, which will be detailed in Part 4 of this document.

A.3. Faculty who are candidates for interim review or promotion and/or tenure must submit a dossier according to the guidelines specified in this document to the Academic Unit Head (AUH) and to the AUPAC Chair. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must submit the dossier by **October 1**. Candidates for third-year reviews must submit the dossier by **March 15.**

B. Responsibilities of the AUPAC

B.1. The tenured members of the AUPAC shall evaluate a tenure-track faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, interim evaluation of tenure-track and promotion-eligible RTA faculty, and hear any appeal of annual evaluations.

B.2. The AUPAC shall use the candidate's self-prepared tenure and/or promotion packet to evaluate the candidate's performance as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The AUPAC shall consider each candidate for tenure and/or promotion and render a

recommendation, by **November 15.** For third-year review evaluations, the AUPAC shall render a recommendation by **April 25.** A copy of all AUPAC recommendations shall be sent to the candidate, AUH, and Dean.

B.3. When hearing an appeal of an annual evaluation, the AUPAC shall consider the AUH's official written annual evaluation, written and quantitative student evaluations, relevant documents in the department's personnel files, and any aspect of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance positively or negatively.

C. Responsibilities of the AUPAC Chair

C.1. The Chair of the AUPAC will be responsible for convening meetings and conducting confidential votes by the AUPAC.

C.2. The Chair will be responsible for conducting AUPAC meetings in a professional manner and in such a way as to facilitate wide participation by the AUPAC members in the discussion of issues.

C.3. The Chair is responsible for circulating all official communications from the AUPAC to voting members of the AUPAC for feedback in a timely manner, delivering promotion and tenure or interim review letters to the candidates, and providing copies as appropriate to the AUH and Dean. C.4. The AUPAC Chair is a voting member of the AUPAC.

C.5. Any of the responsibilities of the AUPAC Chair may be delegated at the discretion of the AUPAC Chair.

D. Responsibilities of the Academic Unit Head (AUH)

D.1. With respect to promotion and tenure, the AUH shall:

D.1.a. inform individual faculty and the AUPAC Chair of who will be reviewed for promotion and tenure or for whom there is to be an interim evaluation during the next academic year by May 1;

D.1.b. provide new faculty members with a copy of this document and inform them that they will undergo an evaluation during their first and third years (or as otherwise provided in their contract);

D.1.c. facilitate the gathering of information by the AUPAC at the request of the AUPAC Chair; and

D.1.d. consider each candidate for tenure and/or promotion and render a recommendation by **November 15** to the Dean.

D.2. The AUH shall provide the annual performance evaluation to the faculty member by **October 1**. For third-year evaluation of tenure-track or RTA faculty, the AUH shall provide the candidate with a letter and the AUPAC chair with a copy by

April 25. The AUH shall make independent evaluations in accordance with this document based upon, but not be limited to, relevant documents in the faculty member's departmental personnel file and any aspect of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance. (Handbook III.E.2.b.)

D.3. The AUH shall maintain copies of signed annual evaluations and both numeric and written student evaluations in the department personnel file of each faculty member. Statistical summaries and evidence comparing faculty to others in the department shall also be included in a faculty member's department personnel file. Duplicates of all materials maintained in the department personnel file shall be maintained in an electronic personnel file. Paper copies of student evaluations shall be destroyed after six years.

Part 3:   Initial and Third-Year Evaluations, Non Renewal

A. Initial and Third-Year Evaluation Procedures

A.1. Initial Evaluation of faculty hired at all ranks. By **March 15** or midway through the faculty member's second full semester, the AUH will observe one of the faculty member's classes and will write an initial evaluation of their teaching and scholarship (faculty are exempt from service in their first year unless otherwise specified in their offer letter or contract). Any appeal of this evaluation shall be to the AUPAC within one week of receiving the initial evaluation. The AUPAC shall hear the appeal within two weeks of receiving notice of the appeal. The AUPAC shall render its recommendation to the AUH, the Dean, and faculty member within two weeks of its hearing.

A.2. Third-Year Evaluation of tenure-track and RTA faculty at the rank of assistant professor. The purpose of the third-year review is to assess the progress of tenure-track and RTA faculty at the rank of assistant professor toward promotion and/or tenure in the areas of teaching, research, and service, to point to areas in need of improvement and to suggest means of improvement. Faculty hired at a rank higher than assistant professor may also undergo an interim review at a time specified in their contracts. The faculty member may seek assistance or advice about the process from the AUPAC chair(s) or members of AUPAC at any time.

A.2.a Required Documents

A.2.a.i. An up-to-date curriculum vitae. The c.v. should include details sufficient to clarify accomplishments to a committee that may be unfamiliar with the faculty member's specific field. Full citations of conference presentations and publications should be included. If a journal, publisher, conference, or organization referred to in the c.v. is not widely known, the faculty member should provide information that will assist the AUPAC in its assessment (for example, the journal's or press's scope and content, whether or

not it is peer-reviewed, and its reputation and audience). For manuscripts under review or forthcoming, the faculty member should indicate where it was submitted and date of submission or date of projected publication. It is also helpful to include details of pending conference presentations and research-in-progress (projected date of completion and targeted journal or press, for example).

A.2.a.ii. A cover letter divided into the three areas of teaching, research, and service, which summarizes and elaborates on the faculty member's accomplishments as well as plans for the final two years leading up to the tenure review. The cover letter should be viewed as an explanatory expansion of the c.v., including discussion of the faculty member's ongoing research agenda, plans for new or revised course offerings or other pedagogical goals, and planned service contributions to the department, college, and/or university.

A.2.a.iii. Copies of student course evaluations for at least one course per semester that faculty member has taught, ideally representing different course levels, organized chronologically with each set (by semester) and preceded by the numerical summary of all student course evaluations.

A.2.a.iv. Peer evaluations by at least two current members of AUPAC.Faculty members should invite AUPAC members to observe their classes during the semester before or the semester in which the third-year review is conducted. The faculty member may select specific classes or offer a range of options. It is helpful, though not essential, for the observer to be given a copy of the class syllabus and day's reading and/or assignment in advance of the class visit. The observer will write a letter for the faculty member's review file. Additional peer observations earlier in the faculty member's tenure at JMU can, of course, be included as well.

A.2.a.v. Copies of the annual evaluations written by the AUH and a copy of the first-year review written by the AUH.

A.2.a.vi. While the AUPAC may ask for additional documentation, faculty members need not provide copies of publications, supplemental teaching materials, or documentation of service commitments beyond the details included in the c.v., although such documentation will be required for the tenure and promotion file and faculty are encouraged to keep good records during the period leading up to the tenure/promotion year.

A.2.b. Timetable

The third -year review is conducted in the spring semester of the faculty member's third full year of teaching. Incoming faculty who have negotiated shorter probationary periods with the AUH and have documentation of this in their contract or offer letter should arrange for an interim review with the AUPAC midway through their probationary period. Documents should be submitted to the chair of the AUPAC by **March 15**.

The AUPAC members will read the documents, meet to discuss them, and prepare a letter by **April 25.** Copies of this letter are then sent to the faculty member and to the English Department AUH, and the Dean. The AUH will address the AUPAC's letter in the faculty member's annual evaluation.

A.2.c. Format

Applicants will create a single electronic PDF file that contains the documents outlined above. The PDF should begin with a table of contents that lists the order of documents. The complete PDF file should be delivered to the English department office manager at least three business days before the deadline so that the file can be uploaded to a secure site for AUPAC access. Candidates should consult **Part 4. Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Standards** of this document for more guidance.

A.3. Lecturers eligible for and interested in promotion to senior lecturer may benefit from an interim review by the AUPAC after serving in the role for at least four semesters. If they wish to have one, they should notify the AUH and AUPAC Chair by October 1 in the year in which they are seeking an interim review. Lecturers seeking this review must submit documentation and follow procedures as described in A.2.a.

B. Non-Renewal of Appointment

Recommendations of non-renewal of tenure-track or RTA faculty may be made by the AUPAC to the AUH or by the AUH at any time. When either the AUPAC or AUH initiates deliberations of nonrenewal, notice of those deliberations will be given to the other assessment body and the faculty member. The AUPAC and AUH will make independent recommendations to the Dean within 30 days of the initiation of the review, with copies provided to the other and the faculty member. Notice of non-renewal shall be in accord with the deadlines established by the *Faculty Handbook*. If nonrenewal is the result of misconduct on the part of the faculty member, it shall be handled in accordance with university policy that supersedes this document.

Part 4: **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

A. General Requirements

The English Department recognizes a variety of pedagogies, avenues for scholarly achievement, and opportunities for service to the department, the college, and the university. While it is clearly not possible or desirable to codify these, this document offers guidelines prepared by the English department Personnel Advisory Committee of assessment of teaching, scholarship, and service.

A.1. Requirements for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty

In compliance with the James Madison University faculty handbook, section III.E I., the English Department establishes the following criteria for evaluating faculty in tenure and promotion decisions. The criteria listed below may differ slightly from that used in Annual Evaluations. Annual Evaluations can provide probationary faculty and faculty seeking promotion feedback on performance across the categories of teaching, research, and service, and these evaluations should be included in any application for promotion, but faculty should keep in mind that tenure and promotion evaluations, which consider longer trajectories of faculty performance, may not correspond directly to Annual Evaluations. For probationary faculty the evaluations done at the end of the first year by the AUH and at the end of the third year by both the AUH and the Personnel Advisory Committee will provide the most detailed guidance about progress towards tenure.

> The English Department AUPAC will evaluate applicants for tenure and promotion as described in the faculty handbook, sections III.E.6 and III.E.7. An AUPAC recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor must be accompanied by a rating of excellent in either teaching or research, and at least satisfactory ratings in the other two areas. An AUPAC recommendation for promotion to full professor must be accompanied by a rating of excellent in two areas and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area. For any substantial activities that bridge two or three areas of evaluation, applicants should place the activity in the area that they feel is most appropriate. In exceptional cases, an activity may be substantial enough to contain discrete components that can be described in more than one area.

> Since the requirements for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor are identical, faculty members should apply for both simultaneously, using one set of application materials. Faculty at the assistant professor level should state in their application letters that they are applying for both tenure and promotion to associate professor. Non-tenure track faculty at the rank of assistant or associate professor should follow the same timeline and guidelines for promotion as tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty at the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer should consult the department's guidelines for promotion to senior lecturer or principal lecturer.

In tenure and promotion decisions, the College of Arts and Letters only considers those materials published or presented after the time of the faculty member's hiring by the university. Materials published prior to the faculty member's hiring by the university may be counted only if it is so stipulated in the faculty member's offer letter. In applications for promotion to full professor, faculty should submit only relevant material that has not been used previously toward promotion or tenure.

A.2. Requirements for Promotion of Lecturers

In compliance with the James Madison University faculty handbook, section III.E I., the English Department establishes the following criteria for evaluating lecturers in promotion decisions. The criteria listed below may differ slightly from that used in Annual Evaluations. Annual Evaluations can provide probationary faculty and faculty seeking promotion feedback on performance across the categories of teaching, research, and service, and these evaluations should be included in any application for promotion, but faculty should keep in mind that promotion evaluations, which consider longer trajectories of faculty performance, may not correspond directly to Annual Evaluations.

The English Department AUPAC will evaluate lecturers applying for promotion as described in the faculty handbook, sections III.E.6 and III.E.7. An AUPAC recommendation for promotion to senior lecturer must be accompanied by a rating of excellent in teaching, and at least satisfactory ratings in the other two areas. An AUPAC recommendation for promotion to principal lecturer must be accompanied by a rating of excellent in teaching and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area. For any substantial activities that bridge two or three areas of evaluation, applicants should place the activity in the area that they feel is most appropriate. In exceptional cases, an activity may be substantial enough to contain discrete components that can be described in more than one area.

In promotion decisions, the College of Arts and Letters only considers those materials published or presented after the time of the faculty member's hiring by the university. Materials published prior to the faculty member's hiring by the university may be counted only if it is so stipulated in the faculty member's offer letter. In applications for promotion to principal lecturer, faculty should submit only relevant material that has not been used previously toward promotion.

B. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

B.1. Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Applications for tenure track faculty and RTAs at the rank of assistant or associate professor. This timeline presumes that the faculty member has successfully completed a first-year review by the AUH and a third-year review by AUPAC. Faculty seeking early tenure and/or

promotion under the College of Letters Compelling Case policy should consult C.32.

Year before submitting the application (penultimate year of probationary period or year before seeking promotion to professor)
Fall:
- Discuss with the AUH eligibility for promotion: review contract and confirm the details of tenure clock and publication expectations.
- Read 1) the university guidelines for tenure and promotion, 2) the College of Arts and Letters guidelines and procedures for tenure and promotion, and 3) the English department Personnel Advisory Committee's guidelines and procedures for tenure and promotion. Questions about these three documents should be directed to, respectively, the Provost's office, the Dean's office, or the chair of the English Department AUPAC.
- Contact two current tenured members of AUPAC and the AUH to observe at least one class session each in either fall or spring. Faculty are encouraged to seek peer evaluations at a variety of course levels (200, 300, 400), though AUPAC understands that this is not always possible.

Spring:
- Arrange for classroom observations if not completed in the fall semester.

Summer:
- Assemble documents for BOTH application packets (department and CAL). *Please note: the content of these packets may have different requirements.* Additional work may include:
    - For forthcoming work: secure formal acceptance notification or contract to include in the packet;
    - Conduct research on ranking and acceptance rates for journal publications for the personal statement;
    - For non-traditional scholarship (digital, public, etc.) that has not undergone a peer review process: solicit two2 external letters of support from faculty in the field for each project counted in scholarship;
    - Optionally, solicit letters from former students for inclusion in the application packet;
    - Become familiar with Adobe software used to create the digital application packet. Look for workshops on this software if additional guidance is needed.

Year of application (final year of probationary period or year of application seeking promotion to professor) September:
- Provide AUH with written intent to apply for tenure and/or promotion by September 1.

- Arrange for classroom observations if not completed the prior academic year.
- Assemble two digital application packets as two single PDFs (department and CAL) and submit to the English department office three business days prior to October 1. The English department will provide the faculty member with access to Adobe software if needed.
- By October 1, notify the AUH that the department and CAL PDFs have been uploaded to a secure site. The AUH will notify AUPAC and will upload the candidate's CAL file to a secure site for Dean's office review.

November 15: AUPAC and AUH deliver letters to the Dean's office in hardcopy on department letterhead with wet signatures. On the same day, AUPAC and AUH will both place a copy of their letter in a sealed envelope in the faculty member's mailbox. Copies of these letters must also be supplied to the AUH and AUPAC Chair as directed in III.E.6.b.(5) and III.E.7.f.(5) of the Faculty Handbook.

December 15: Dean will make a recommendation to the Provost; a copy of this letter will be shared with the faculty member, AUPAC Chair, and the AUH.

February 1: Provost will make a recommendation to the President; a copy of this letter will be shared with the faculty member and the AUH.

February 15: The President will make a recommendation to the Board of Visitors by this date. Tenure and promotion decisions will be official after the Board of Visitors takes action, often as late as April. Changes in rank will commence in the new academic year. The AUPAC knows of no cases in which the recommendation of the Dean has been rejected.

B.2. Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Applications for faculty and RTAs at the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer. Lecturers who have received generally positive annual evaluations may apply for promotion after they have completed five years in their current rank. Lecturers applying for promotion should notify the AUH of their intent to apply by September 1 of the year of the application and submit the required documentation (see C.4.) at least three business days before October 1 of the application year. Lecturers seeking promotion should follow the guidelines and procedures laid out by the College of Arts and Letters.

B.3 Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion. Tenure-track faculty members who have completed at least four years as an assistant professor or four years as an associate professor at James Madison University may apply for early tenure and/or promotion under the College of Arts and Letters "Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion" policy. This process requires a higher threshold of evaluation (two excellent ratings for associate, three excellent ratings for

professor) as well as external letters of support solicited by the CAL Dean's office. Faculty interested in presenting a compelling case must meet with the college's associate dean for faculty relations to discuss their case by **March 1** in the year before the early application.

B.4 Checklist for Promotion and Tenure for tenure-track and RTA faculty at the rank of assistant or associate professor. The instructions below outline the contents and format of the promotion packet that faculty will send to the English AUH and AUPAC for review. Applicants will create a PDF file that contains documentation required by the English AUPAC in support of teaching, scholarship, and service as outlined below. The PDF should begin with a table of contents containing "Teaching," "Scholarship," and "Service" sections and a list of documents in each section. The document should come as a clearly labeled, single PDF file with the documents presented in the order below. The complete PDF file should be delivered to the English Department office manager at least three business days before the October 1st deadline so that the file can be uploaded to a secure site for AUPAC access.

Applicants are also responsible for creating an additional PDF file that is organized according to the CAL Dean's instructions. These instructions are located on the CAL website.

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL
- Cover sheet:
  - Include: name; academic unit; current rank and title(s); desired action (promotion to specific rank, promotion with tenure, tenure only, etc.); year of appointment to present rank; rank and date of JMU initial appointment; other ranks held at JMU and years in each.
- Personal statement:
  - A compressed, succinctly written statement from the candidate, addressing significant accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative achievement, and service. Statements should also address the faculty member's contributions to DEI initiatives. Statements should conclude with a paragraph of anticipated directions for the future. Do not exceed 6 double-spaced pages.
- Contract and Offer Letter
- *Curriculum Vitae* (Refer to the CAL document for formatting specifications)
- Copy of First-Year Review by AUH
- Copy of Third-Year Review by AUPAC
- Copies of AUH annual evaluations from each year of the period related to the promotion

- Optional: DEI Statement *(only if the statement expands significantly on the description of DEI activities outlined in the CV and personal statement)*

TEACHING

Sample syllabi and assignments: at least one from each level in which the applicant has taught during the period. Please include a brief narrative introduction to and/or reflection on these sample documents, not to exceed 2 double-spaced pages.
- Teaching peer observation reports
    - For promotion to associate professor, please include: first-year AUH observation, two third-year AUPAC observations, and three observations from within twelve months of the application for tenure and/or promotion (two from AUPAC members, one from AUH). AUPAC observations must be from current, tenured members of AUPAC in the year of the observation. Ideally, these observations should cover a range of courses offered at different levels (200/300/400/600), though AUPAC understands that this is not always possible. For promotion to full professor, inclusion of teaching observation reports is optional.
    - In their observations, AUPAC members should note how the teaching fulfills any of the following criteria: demonstrates knowledge of the course's subject, enhances students' ability to think critically or write coherently, provides clear and effective instruction, supplies clear digital or oral presentations, cultivates skills appropriate for the program or field, indicates careful preparation for class meetings, or engages students intellectually.
- Quantitative demonstration of teaching effectiveness, preferably in tabular form, not the individual qualitative evaluations from every student ever taught. Ideally, this quantitative data from teaching evaluations should not exceed two pages in length.
- Student evaluations:
    - For promotion to associate professor: submit complete course evaluations from at least one course at each level in which the applicant has taught during the probationary period.
    - For promotion to professor: submission of course evaluations is optional.
- Optional: solicited or unsolicited correspondence from former students and/or other forms of evidence of student success (faculty should NOT solicit correspondence from students currently enrolled in their courses).
- Optional: Other supporting documentation (award notifications, nomination letters, external professional development, etc.)

SCHOLARSHIP

- List of publications, including full citations and links for digital projects:
  - The list, given in reverse chronological order, shall include full publication details for work that has actually appeared, including date of publication, volume, issue, and page numbers, etc.. If published electronically with no page numbers, a word count should be given. Candidates may provide a separate listing for forthcoming work, but such work must be clearly labeled as forthcoming and not included in the above listing. In this case, provide exact details about the item in question (accepted pending minor revisions, etc.). Candidates should be prepared to supply supporting documents if requested. The CV provides a place for listing work in various states of completion (articles with a revise and resubmit, etc.). There is no need to list such work here.
  - Please note: for the purposes of the tenure and promotion application, October 1 is the end of the probationary period. Faculty may only submit work that has appeared or been formally accepted by October 1 of the year of the application. Forthcoming work set to appear after October 1 may be included in this application as "forthcoming" or may be deferred and counted for a future promotion (in the case of promotion to Associate Professor). Faculty wishing to defer work that will appear after the probationary period should describe it as "work in progress." ● PDF copies of all print publications:
  - These should be ordered to correspond with the list submitted above. Authored, co-authored, or edited books issued in paper, and items issued as DVDs or media formats should be sent in their published form separately to the English office and the Dean's office and should be labeled to correspond to the list above.
  - For any example of non-traditional non-peer reviewed scholarship faculty should consult the "MLA Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media" (2012) and/or the "MLA Guidelines for Evaluating Publicly Engaged Humanities Scholarship in Language and Literature Programs" (2022) and use these guidelines to provide: an abstract of the project that addresses the faculty member's role in the project and the project's scholarly value, audience, impact, and sustainability, not to exceed 2 double-spaced pages; and at least two external letters from qualified reviewers attesting to the project's scholarly value and impact; additional (optional) evidence may include statements from JMU faculty or community members, a grant award letter, a list of related publications utilizing the project, documentation of coverage of the project in academic or other media, etc. *Please note that according to current CAL guidelines, non-traditional scholarship cannot be used to meet the three-article threshold for*

> *satisfactory scholarship, though AUPAC encourages candidates to include non-traditional scholarship in their case for "excellent" scholarship.*
> ○ For forthcoming work, AUPAC needs copies of letters of acceptance and/or book contracts and typescripts or page proofs.
- Optional: other supporting documentation (grant award notification, notification of invited lecture, nomination letters, etc.)

SERVICE

The faculty member's CV will include a list of the candidate's service tasks. Their personal statement will also include a description of service activities and a brief discussion of those that have had the most significant impact on the department, college, or university. AUPAC requires no additional documentation related to service *unless such documentation significantly expands on the material presented in the CV and personal statement.*

B.5. Checklist for Promotion of RTA faculty at the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer. The instructions below outline the contents and format of the promotion packet that faculty will send to the English AUH and AUPAC for review. Applicants will create a PDF file that contains documentation required by the English AUPAC and CAL in support of teaching, scholarship, and service as outlined below. The document should come as a clearly labeled, single PDF file with the documents presented in the order below. The complete PDF file should be delivered to the English Department office manager at least three business days before the October 1st deadline so that the file can be uploaded to a secure site for AUPAC access. A dossier should include:
- a curriculum vitae
- a summary of five pages or fewer highlighting activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service during period under review
- documentation supporting the summary
- copies of annual reviews from the period under review

B.6. Tenure and Promotion Decisions

B.6.a. The AUH and AUPAC shall make independent evaluations of the facts to include, but not be limited to, relevant documents in the faculty member's departmental personnel file and any aspect of a faculty member's conduct which impacts performance positive or negative (Handbook III.E.2.b.) and make independent recommendations for promotion and/or tenure based on the criteria outlined in this document. However, sharing of facts between the two is permitted.

B.6.b. The letters of recommendation by the AUPAC and AUH will rate the candidate as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in teaching, research and service, and will include justification for each rating. The letter will also include an overall positive or negative recommendation.

B.6.c. A positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor requires an evaluation of excellent in teaching or scholarship, and evaluations of satisfactory in the remaining areas. A positive recommendation for promotion to Professor requires an evaluation of excellent in at least two areas and an evaluation of at least satisfactory in the remaining area. Compelling Case applications for early tenure and/or promotion requires a higher threshold as detailed in C.2. above.

C. Assessment of Teaching

The Department of English considers teaching proficiency to enhance students' knowledge of courses' subject matter and to sharpen their ability to think critically and write coherently. All faculty must teach the courses assigned to them, the number of courses stipulated by their contract, and the courses required for the department's and program's rotation. Faculty must also follow the appropriate course load and rotation, align course syllabi to department, program, and General Education standards, meet classes as scheduled, hold office hours weekly, fulfill their assigned duties as academic advisors, and support the academic and professional growth of students and advisees.

SATISFACTORY TEACHING

A case for satisfactory teaching can be made by demonstrating a consistent commitment to the department, college, and university's teaching needs that includes, but is not limited to, regular participation in a range of the following activities:

- Receiving generally satisfactory teaching peer observation reports for tenure and promotion to associate professor
- Demonstrating a generally satisfactory alignment of course instruction, assignments, preparation, and student feedback with department, program, and General Education goals, as articulated in the introductory teaching narrative, syllabi, and assignments
- Developing new courses or new content for existing courses
- Guiding student work toward presentation at a student conference, publication in a student journal, or co-authorship on a student digital or public humanities project
- Supervising occasional independent studies, MA theses, internships, Honors projects, and graduate assistants
- Participating in pedagogical workshops, institutes, and conferences
- Participating in study abroad programs or team-teaching opportunities

- Receiving generally satisfactory letters of appreciation from students, and/or other evidence of generally satisfactory student success
- Receiving generally satisfactory quantitative and qualitative student evaluations; please note that AUPAC will take student bias into account when assessing student evaluations, and the assessment of student evaluations will not be used as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness

EXCELLENT TEACHING

For a rating of excellent, the faculty member must clearly meet and exceed the expectations for a satisfactory rating and make a case for their teaching meriting an "excellent." AUPAC and the AUH will ultimately judge if their teaching activities merit an "excellent" rating. Such activities may include:

- Demonstrating a thoughtful and sustained engagement with DEI principles and practices in relation to teaching, as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix), and as cumulatively evidenced by syllabi with *a substantial presence* of primary and secondary material *or* critical frameworks engaging intersectional identities of minoritized perspectives, including those of people of color; assignments devoted to social justice or DEI community engagement; leading or participating in professional development opportunities focused on DEI pedagogy; teaching a course for AAAD, LAXC, Women's Studies, Disability Studies, or World Literature; teaching a DEI-focused independent study, etc.
- Receiving teaching awards, teaching grants, or other recognition of excellence in teaching
- Receiving generally superior teaching peer observation reports for tenure and promotion to associate professor
- Demonstrating a generally superior alignment of course instruction, assignments, preparation, and student feedback with department, program, and General Education goals, as articulated in the introductory teaching narrative, syllabi, and assignments
- Developing new courses or new content tied to changes/transformations within the discipline, to serve departmental goals or student professionalization, to significantly support service teaching needs in ENG 299, General Education, or Honors, or to serve interdisciplinary minors
- Developing unusually innovative assignments or syllabi, including but not limited to project-based, digital humanities, community engaged, archival, and/or multimedia courses, content, or assignments
- Guiding student work toward presentation at a professional conference, publication at a professional journal, or co-authorship on a professional digital or public humanities project
- Supervising a significant quantity and/or quality of independent studies, MA theses, internships, Honors projects, and graduate assistants

- Leading pedagogical workshops, institutes, and conferences
- Developing and/or leading study abroad programs or team-teaching opportunities
- Receiving generally superior letters of appreciation from students, and/or other evidence of generally superior student success
- Receiving generally superior student evaluations; please note that AUPAC will take student bias into account when assessing student evaluations, and the assessment of student evaluations will not be used as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness

D. Assessment of Scholarship/Creative Work

Scholarly activity in the discipline of English takes many forms, and assessment guidelines below recognize the core disciplinary standards of publication as well as a host of other forms that professional scholarship/creative work may take. Faculty are expected to engage in ongoing scholarly/creative inquiry in their respective fields that contributes to the advancement of those fields and the discipline at large.

The AUPAC recognizes the wide variety of scholarship occurring in the discipline, and draws on the Modern Language Association's "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media" and "Guidelines for Evaluating Publicly Engaged Humanities Scholarship in Language and Literature Programs" for assessment of scholarly projects appearing in new forms. Nevertheless, department guidelines necessarily draw on the College of Arts and Letters requirements, which may evolve in the future. Because of this, faculty should consult the most recent college level guidelines for tenure and promotion well in advance of submitting their application for tenure and promotion.

The English department requires the following:

SATISFACTORY SCHOLARSHIP

For a rating of satisfactory in a tenure and/or promotion application, a faculty member must meet one of the following thresholds.

For faculty members working in research fields, any of the following items would rank as satisfactory:

- The publication of at least three peer-reviewed, essay-length articles in a scholarly journal or edited collection
- The publication of a monograph with a recognized press

For faculty members working in creative writing, any of the following items would rank as satisfactory:

- The publication of at least three significant essay-length creative works (or shorter works–such as poetry, micro-essays or flash fiction–of equivalent substance and quality) in recognized venues
- The publication of a book-length creative work with a recognized press

Some faculty may be working in a hybrid mode across the creative/critical divide and may combine work from these two areas toward an application for tenure and promotion if such hybrid work is commensurate with their specialization within the discipline.

EXCELLENT SCHOLARSHIP

For a rating of excellent, the faculty member must clearly meet and exceed the expectations for a satisfactory rating and make a case for their scholarship meriting an "excellent." Exceeding this threshold can be done in any number of ways. The applicant can exceed this threshold by publishing in especially prestigious venues or producing more than the requisite number of publications (i.e. more than three peer-reviewed articles or a book), although simply exceeding the number of requisite publications does not guarantee an "excellent" rating.

Excellence may also be demonstrated by additional scholarly and creative work that does not fall under the strict guidelines for "satisfactory." AUPAC and the AUH will ultimately judge if the additional work merits an "excellent" rating. Such activities may include:

- Demonstrating a thoughtful and sustained engagement with DEI principles and practices in relation to scholarship, as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix), and as cumulatively evidenced by publications, scholarly presentations, or projects devoted to DEI, receiving grants for advancing DEI scholarship, editing DEI-focused publications, etc.
- Serving as an editorial advisor or on the editorial board for a peer-reviewed, widely recognized scholarly or literary journal
- Serving as editor or guest editor of a peer-reviewed scholarly or literary journal
- Publication of co-authored books, essays, or creative work in a recognized venue
- Publication of an edited or co-edited volume with a recognized press
- Publication of scholarship on teaching and learning (of all above types)
- Publication of a chapbook
- Publication of a translation
- Publication of book reviews, entries in a literary encyclopedia or scholarly reference work, an essay or chapter in a non peer-reviewed book or journal, or other non-peer reviewed work (op eds, community lectures, media interviews, etc.)
- Production, launch, or significant development of non-traditional scholarship such as a digital humanities or public humanities project. In line with the "MLA Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media" (2012)

and the "MLA Guidelines for Evaluating Publicly Engaged Humanities Scholarship in Language and Literature Programs" (2022), faculty seeking to use non-peer reviewed, nontraditional scholarship as part of a case for an excellent ratings should consult the above MLA guidelines for direction in describing the project in their own materials, and must seek two external letters from qualified reviewers attesting to the project's scope, value, and impact

- Publication of especially groundbreaking, field-defining, or ambitious scholarly/creative work
- Receipt of an internal or external research, scholarship, or creative grant/fellowship/award
- Papers or presentations at international, national, and regional professional meetings, including invited lectures
- Delivery of a keynote speech to a scholarly and/or national audience
- Direction or production of a performance, exhibit, or digital project for a local, regional, national, or international audience
- Delivery of papers, presentations, or participation in departmental or campus-wide seminars, colloquia, or conferences
- Selection for and participation in scholarly/creative professional development in national or international workshops, seminars, or institutes (e.g. NEH Summer Seminars or Institutes, School of Criticism and Theory, Rare Book School, Cave Canem, Sewanee Workshops, etc.)
- Designing and leading national or international scholarly workshops, seminars, or institutes (e.g. NEH Summer Seminars, School of Criticism and Theory, Rare Book School, Cave Canem, Sewanee Workshops, etc.)

E. Assessment of Service

The AUPAC acknowledges and values the wide variety of service done by faculty at many levels: college, university, and broader professional service. These activities facilitate the day-to-day functioning of the department, the college, the university, and the profession at large. All faculty are expected to engage in a minimum amount of service, including advising students, regularly attending department meetings, participating in job searches, and other duties outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Ratings of satisfactory and excellent require additional service on the part of each faculty member.

SATISFACTORY SERVICE

A case for satisfactory service can be made by demonstrating a consistent commitment to necessary departmental, college, university, and professional service that includes, but is not limited to, regular participation in a range of the following activities:

- Serving on a department, college, or university committee, including search committees, APR committees, SACS committees, AUPAC, C&I, task forces, ad hoc committees, Faculty Senate, etc.
- Mentoring a PFF Fellow or junior faculty member, or organizing a faculty interest group (e.g., Madison Caucus for Gender Equality, Madison Hispanic Caucus, LGBTQA, etc.)
- Advising & mentoring students, including: writing letters of reference; acting in a minor capacity as the faculty advisor to student organizations; or acting as mentor/support person for students of color, first generation students, students suffering from discrimination, assault, health concerns, etc.
- Participating regularly in events such as undergraduate conferences, awards ceremonies, speaker visits, faculty candidate visits, career and majors fairs, assessment, group advising, recruitment, and/or fundraising activities
- Promoting academic culture on campus by arranging speakers' visits to campus, advising JMU Special Collections acquisitions and exhibits, advising Institute for Creative Inquiry exhibits, reviewing papers submitted to student journals, etc.
- Playing a supporting role in organizing or coordinating a JMU, regional, national, or international conference or symposium
- Serving as a peer reviewer for: grant/award applications for professional organizations; submissions to a professional meeting or conference; article-length work for a scholarly or literary journal; or book-length work for an academic or commensurate literary press
- Writing external review or recommendation letters for peers, including for: tenure and promotion packets; fellowship or award applications; book blurbs, etc.
- Serving K-12 curricula, students, and teachers, including serving in advisory capacity or in some other way for AP College Board or other K-12 organization, or working with Valley Scholars, Centennial Scholars, and the Professor in Residence program
- Participating or serving as an officer or board member in local, state, national boards, commissions, community organizations, and/or task forces

EXCELLENT SERVICE

For a rating of excellent, the faculty member must clearly meet and exceed the expectations for a satisfactory rating and make a case for their service meriting an "excellent." AUPAC and the AUH will ultimately judge if the additional service activities merit an "excellent" rating. Such activities may include:

- An extraordinary commitment to necessary departmental, college, university, and professional service activities, which might include: making a significant impact across a broad and numerous range of the activities listed above;
- Demonstrating a thoughtful and sustained engagement with DEI principles and practices in relation to service, as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix), and as cumulatively evidenced

by (but not limited to): serving on DEI task forces or committees; hosting events or inviting speakers devoted to DEI; meaningful participation in DEI campus activities; demonstrated role in advancing DEI initiatives on campus or in the community; leading or participating in workshops, conferences or other professional development opportunities focused on DEI; supervising a DEI-focused thesis or capstone; consulting for organizations on DEI issues; and/or advising DEI-focused student organizations

- Demonstrating a record of successful and impactful leadership in departmental, college, university, and professional service that includes, but is not limited to:

  - Serving in a major role in the department, such as Graduate Director, Undergraduate Director, Director of Internships, Departmental Awards Chair, Assessment Chair, or Sister Speak/Sigma Tau Delta advisor
  - Serving in a major role outside of the department, such as CFI or JMU Libraries Faculty Associate, First Year Advisor, DEI Faculty Fellow, AAAD Internship Director, LAXC Minor Advisor, etc.
  - Serving as chair or leader on department, college, or university committee or taskforce, including search committees, APR committees, SACS committee, AUPAC, C&I, Faculty Senate, etc.
  - Developing, coordinating, or directing a university minor, major, center, or significant university program (such as the Haynes Scholars program or THRIVE)
  - Holding responsible or elected office in national or regional academic organizations
  - Organizing or coordinating a JMU, regional, national, or international conference or symposium
  - Receiving competitive and substantial service-related grants or awards

Part 5:   Annual Evaluation Guidelines

Faculty will be rated as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service) based on the criteria listed below. A publication can be counted either in the year that it is accepted by a journal or press or in the year it appears in print. With the exception of book publications, which can be counted for three years in a row, please do not "double-count" activities across multiple years or in multiple areas.

A. Annual Evaluation Procedures

A.1.   The AUH shall evaluate each faculty member each year in accordance with the requirements set forth by the *James Madison University Faculty Handbook*. The annual evaluation will consider the faculty member's work for the academic year and the preceding summer. In addition to charting faculty progress, annual evaluations are typically used to assign merit pay salary adjustments to faculty.

A.2.   By June 1, faculty must submit to the AUH in bullet point format a summary of activities and accomplishments during the previous 12 months. Faculty members may indicate the rating (0-4) they claim for teaching, scholarship, and service and the relative percentage for each category. The numbers must not exceed 100%, and faculty must count at least the minimum percentage in teaching, scholarship, and service. Appended to their annual self-evaluation, each faculty member must also include a bullet point list of anticipated activities and anticipated percentages for the coming year. Criteria for annual evaluations are found in Part 5 of this document.

A.2.a.   Guidelines for acceptable percentages to be used in annual evaluations of tenure track and promotion-eligible RTA faculty at the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor are as follows:
> Teaching: 45-60%
> Scholarship: 30-45%
> Service: 10-20%

In exceptional cases, and only when approved by a vote of the faculty, these percentage ranges may be altered. Faculty should multiply the rating they have claimed by the percentage chosen to generate a total out of 400 possible points. So, for example, if you claim a "4" in teaching, a "3" in scholarship, and a "2" in service, you will multiply 4 X 55, 3 X 35, and 2 X 10, for a total of 355 (out of a possible score of 400).

A.2.b.   Guidelines for acceptable percentages to be used in annual evaluations of lecturers are as follows:
> Teaching: 70-90%
> Scholarship: 5-15%
> Service: 5-15%

In exceptional cases, and only when approved by a vote of the faculty, these percentage ranges may be altered. Faculty should multiply the rating they have claimed by the percentage chosen to generate a total out of 400 possible points. So, for example, if you claim a "4" in teaching, a "3" in scholarship, and a "2" in service, you will multiply 4 X 80, 3 X 10, and 2 X 10, for a total of 370 (out of a possible score of 400).

A.2.c.   Faculty who receive one or more course releases due to exceptional service obligations, scholarly achievement, or internal or external academic leaves may shift up to 10% of their time per course release to the appropriate area of performance. In exceptional cases, faculty may negotiate different percentages with the AUH. Faculty who have received a one-year or one-semester service exemption (for example, in their first year or during an educational leave) may shift 5-10% of their time per semester to teaching and/or scholarship.

A.3.   The AUH will provide their written assessment of each faculty member's performance on or before October 1. The AUH will accept the ratings (0-4) claimed by the faculty member or will change the numbers according to their interpretation of the annual evaluation guidelines and recalculate the overall score. If merit pay is available, the AUH will look at all the scores of department members and distribute merit pay accordingly.

A.4.   The AUH will hold an evaluation conference with each faculty member after the receipt of the written assessment.

A.5.   Faculty members wishing to appeal the annual evaluation must submit a written appeal to the AUPAC within one week of the evaluation conference with the AUH. If the written appeal is sufficient for the AUPAC to make a judgment on the appeal, it may do so. If not, the AUPAC will request an interview with the faculty member and the AUH to render a judgment on the appeal. Depending on the findings of the AUPAC, the AUPAC chair and AUH will meet to discuss possible modifications to the annual evaluation. If a resolution of the appeal, signed by the faculty member, cannot be achieved within the department the matter must be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean by **October 21**. In the event that the annual evaluation is provided to the faculty member before **October 1**, the time periods set forth above may be extended by the AUPAC, but in any event an appeal to the Dean must occur by **October 21**. (Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.4.h).

A.6.   The annual evaluation process is separate from the promotion and tenure evaluation process. A succession of satisfactory annual evaluations in teaching, scholarship, service or overall performance is necessary but not sufficient evidence that the faculty member's work is satisfactory for purposes of tenure or promotion. The procedures for tenure and promotion are presented in Section C of Part 3 and in Part 4.

B. Teaching

Tenure Track faculty may choose to count teaching within the range of 45-60% of the annual evaluation. Lecturers may choose to count teaching within the range of 70-90%. If a faculty member has received one or more course releases for scholarship or service, they may shift up to 10% of their time per course release to the appropriate area of performance, unless otherwise negotiated with the AUH. Teaching is evaluated on a 0-4 scale. Criteria for evaluation are below.

"0"   Unsatisfactory

"1"   Satisfactory (Emerging): Met classes as scheduled and taught well-prepared material. Received generally positive student evaluations. Demonstrated accessibility to students by keeping adequate posted office hours.

"2" and "3"Satisfactory (Developing) and (Strong): AUPAC recognizes that quality teaching is the hardest category to assess as well as prove, and the burden of proof rests on the individual faculty member. We suggest that when a faculty member describes teaching success, she considers the following factors:
- met classes as scheduled and taught well-prepared material
- prepared strong syllabi, examinations, and assignments
- received positive student evaluations
- revised course preparation
- served as an honors thesis reader
- guided student essay to successful publication in a student publication or student conference
- meaningfully participated in or engaged with teaching activities that support DEI principles and practices as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix)

"4"   Excellent: Demonstration of Outstanding Teaching. Supporting materials for such a rating might include
- developed unusually innovative assignments or syllabi
- created or developed a new course for English, General Education, Honors, or interdisciplinary minor curricula
- served as honors thesis director during the student's final semester of work
- guided student essay to successful publication in peer-reviewed, professional scholarly journal, or its equivalent
- sponsored student work (from the faculty member's course) and accompanied student to present at a professional academic conference
- received extraordinarily positive student evaluations
- received a grant to develop a new course
- received nomination for or accepted a teaching award
- designed or led significant teaching-related activities that support DEI principles and practices as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix)
- Note: coordinating a student's independent study counts as "4" in instances in which the faculty member offers exceptional, selfless, and dedicated guidance

C. Scholarship

Tenure track faculty may choose to count scholarship within the range of 30-45% of the annual evaluation. Lecturers may choose to count scholarship within the range of 5-15%. Scholarship is evaluated on a 0-4 scale. Criteria for evaluation are below. Please note: Any work may be counted as published in the year that it is accepted by a journal or press, or the year it appears in print.

"0"   Unsatisfactory

"1"   Satisfactory (Emerging): Evidence of scholarly or creative activity, such as
- broadened one's field of study
- cultivated ideas with an intention to produce a conference presentation
- researched for course preparation

"2"   Satisfactory (Developing): Evidence of scholarly or creative activity, such as
- published a note, a short review, or a short entry in a literary encyclopedia or other scholarly reference work, or an essay or chapter in a non peer-reviewed book or journal
- reviewed a book for a peer-reviewed journal
- presented a conference paper at a regional, national, or international conference (not primarily a local audience)
- presented creative work at a regional, national, or international reading (not primarily a local audience)

"3"   Satisfactory (Strong): Peer-reviewed scholarly research or commensurate creative activity, such as
- delivered an invited talk or keynote speech to a scholarly and/or national audience
- published a chapbook
- published an article, chapter, poem, short story, translation, or essay in a peer-reviewed journal, scholarly essay collection, or the equivalent
- received a substantial, peer-reviewed, competitive grant or fellowship
- contributed to significant development of a digital humanities or public humanities project
- meaningfully participated in or engaged with scholarship-related activities that support DEI principles and practices as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix)
- Note: multiple conference papers at regional, national, or international conferences in the same year constitutes a "3" rating

"4"   Excellent: Outstanding peer-reviewed scholarly research or commensurate creative activity, such as
- published or edited a peer-reviewed scholarly book, translation, or creative book-length work. Such a book counts as a rating of "4" for three years in a row.
- served on the editorial board for a peer-reviewed, widely recognized scholarly or literary journal
- directed or produced a performance at a regional, national, or international venue (not primarily a local audience)

- published an article, chapter, poem, short story, translation, or essay in a highly selective journal (e.g, *PMLA*, or its equivalent)
- served as Editor or guest Editor of a peer-reviewed scholarly or literary journal
- received a nationally competitive grant or fellowship (e.g., the Mellon Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, or the American Council of Learned Societies.)
- led significant development of a digital humanities or public humanities project
- designed or led significant scholarship-related activities that support DEI principles and practices as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix)
- Note: multiple peer-reviewed publications in a single year, or multiple invited scholarly talks in a single year, constitutes a "4" rating

D. Service

Faculty may choose to count service within the range of 10-20% of the annual evaluation. Lecturers may choose to count service within the range of 5-15%. Faculty who have received a one-year or one-semester service exemption (for example, in their first year or during an educational leave) may shift 5-10% of their time per semester to teaching and/or scholarship. Service is evaluated on a 0-4 scale. Criteria for evaluation are below. Labor-intensive and exceptional service obligations (see listings under "4" below) count as "4" for service, even if the activity is the faculty member's only service contribution. Faculty members who take on multiple, "less prestigious" but still substantial service responsibilities (see listings under "3" below) in a single year should also receive a "4" in the area of service for that year.

"0"   Unsatisfactory

"1"   Satisfactory (Emerging): Advising plus light service (e.g., participated in program assessment)

"2"   Satisfactory (Developing): Advising plus moderate service (e.g., presented an award to a student at annual award ceremony)

"3"   Satisfactory (Strong): Advising plus substantial service; these activities are characterized as substantial. Taking on multiple activities from the following list is characterized as exceptional.
- served on a departmental search committee
- hosted a visiting scholar or guest lecturer
- served on a department, college, or university committee
- developed new or redesigned existing on-campus programs
- assisted in group advising, recruitment, and/or fund-raising activities

- assisted or coordinated alumni talk events
- sponsored or advised student groups or publications (e.g., Sigma Tau Delta, Sister Speak, Gardy Loo, Cinemuse, etc.)
- organized a faculty interest group (e.g., Madison Caucus for Gender Equality, Madison Hispanic Caucus, LGBTQA, etc.)
- organized panels or sessions at regional or national conferences
- served as a reader of an article-length submission for a scholarly journal, academic press, or commensurate literary press
- reviewed manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting or conference
- performed public service by applying professional skills and knowledge (e.g. lectures, media interviews, etc.)
- developed classes or workshops for groups outside the university (e.g., advised community groups, outreach programs, etc.)
- participated in local, state, national boards, commissions, and/or task forces
- mentored a PFF fellow
- meaningfully participated in or engaged with scholarship-related activities that support DEI principles and practices as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix)

"4"   Excellent: Advising plus exceptional service. These activities are characterized as exceptional.
- served as officer of a professional or academic organization, or a local, state, or national board, commission, or task force
- served as chair of a search committee
- served as a faculty senate officer
- chaired a major college or university committee
- chaired departmental AUPAC or C&I committee
- chaired a departmental committee
- organized an academic conference
- served as a reader for a book-length submission to an academic press or commensurate literary press
- chaired the departmental scholarship & awards committee and arranged the departmental awards ceremony
- coordinated or developed a university minor
- served as department graduate or undergraduate director
- designed or led significant service-related activities that support DEI principles and practices as defined in the Department's Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Appendix)

Part 6:   **Departmental Academic Leaves**

A. Governing Principles for Internal Academic Leaves
   A. 1. Introduced in Fall 2011, the English Department's academic leave supports faculty development in the areas of scholarship and teaching, allowing faculty to pursue research, writing, and course development without teaching or service responsibilities for one semester.
   A. 2. Faculty will receive a one-semester leave in their fourth year of service at JMU, unless an earlier leave is agreed upon due to a shorter tenure clock designated in the faculty member's contract. Faculty will then receive a leave roughly every 6-7 years following the initial leave and thereafter, once all other eligible faculty members have received their internal leave.
   A.3. The AUH shall maintain an updated document with the rotation for academic leaves. This document shall remain accessible to faculty through the department website. The AUH will update the rotation each year to address personnel changes, including retirements and new hires.
   A.4. Faculty members who receive a competitive internal leave of a semester or year will have their internal leave moved to a slot after all other eligible faculty have received an internal leave. Faculty members who receive a competitive external grant supporting a semester or year leave will remain in their existing spot in the internal leave rotation.
B. Reporting Responsibilities for Internal Academic Leaves
   B. 1. Faculty members must submit a written report to the AUH summarizing activities undertaken during the internal leave. These reports should be submitted no later than the Friday of the second week of the semester following the internal leave. These reports need not be lengthy, provided that an accurate summary is made of the activities undertaken during Leave. They should not exceed one page.
   B.2. These reports will enable the department to identify and track how the internal leave policy has enhanced faculty prosperity. These reports will not be used to evaluate faculty members in any way.

Appendix: Department Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

JMU English upholds the dignity and recognizes the worth of all members of the JMU community, inclusive of race, ethnicity, embodiment, identity, background, and rank. Our department believes that learning a range of experiences, perspectives, and modes of literary expression leads to a fuller, richer, and more equitable understanding of human existence. JMU English equally values all scholars and the questions they bring to the discipline. Our department amplifies traditionally marginalized voices in our teaching, research and writing activities, in the events and projects we organize, and through the substantial support we give to WGSS, AAAD, LAXC, and related interdisciplinary programs. In addition to our recruitment activities, our teaching and mentoring, and our connections with our alumni, our research and creative endeavors, our service commitments to the University and the discipline, and our programming all contribute

toward building a complex, inclusive, and evolving ethical sensibility of what it means, and what it has meant, to share a planet over time.

Index