

Department of Geology and Environmental Science

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024

Table of Contents

SECTION 1. DEPARTMENT GOALS AND VALUES.....	3
1.1 VISION	3
1.2 MISSION.....	3
1.3 OBJECTIVES	3
1.4 VALUES	3
SECTION 2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	4
2.1 UNIT FACULTY AND STAFF.....	4
2.2 FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES.....	5
2.3 DEPARTMENT MEETINGS.....	6
2.4 DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES	6
SECTION 3. HIRING AND NON-REAPPOINTMENT.....	9
3.1 HIRING GUIDELINES.....	9
3.2 NON-REAPPOINTMENT GUIDELINES.....	10
SECTION 4. FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES	11
4.1 INITIAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES.....	11
4.2 ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES.....	13
4.3 MERIT PAY EVALUATION GUIDELINES	17
4.4 MID-PROBATIONARY (3 RD YEAR) EVALUATION GUIDELINES	18
4.5 PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATION GUIDELINES.....	21
4.6 POST-TENURE EVALUATION GUIDELINES	26
SECTION 5. FACULTY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	26
5.1 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA OF FACULTY	26
5.2 QUALIFICATIONS FOR RANK AND TENURE	29

Section 1. Department Goals and Values.

1.1 Vision

To be a premiere undergraduate geoscience teaching and research program, as recognized by the geoscience community.

1.2 Mission

The principal mission of our instructional program is to serve two vital needs of the JMU students. First, our geoscience programs are specialized to focus student learning of earth materials, internal and external earth processes, analysis of earth history, and application of geology to environmental, climate, and engineering issues. Fundamental to this mission is a commitment to foster the ability to think analytically and to communicate both within the discipline and with non-scientists. Course work and research experiences prepare the student for postgraduate study or professional careers that are subject to rapidly changing societal needs.

Second, we are committed to enhancing general education by offering timely and challenging courses that provide insight into earth processes and human-environment interactions. These courses promote life-long learning by fostering critical thinking and an awareness of natural science.

1.3 Objectives

We support our vision, mission, and the College of Science and Mathematic's and University's academic affairs strategic goals through our pursuit of the following objectives:

1. Enriching and developing faculty and student research to drive innovation within the program, contributing to the body of scientific knowledge, and serving as a springboard to engage with the general public.
2. Educating geoscience majors and minors to understand the evolving discipline and to think scientifically in order to solve increasingly complex societal and environmental problems and/or to pursue careers in fundamental research.
3. Continuing efforts to develop meaningful and sustainable relationships with constituents at the university and the community at large that are invested in pre-college science education to support STEM teacher preparation.
4. Preparing an educated and enlightened citizenry through general education course offerings that examine the Earth and the human relationships with it.
5. Increasing the number and diversity of STEM majors and STEM graduates by recruiting and retaining more Geology and Earth Science majors, and thereby increasing the STEM-trained workforce.

1.4 Values

We value the exchange of ideas when framing, identifying, and solving scientific problems. It is an opportunity and a privilege to benefit from diverse perspectives and contributions from all members of our departmental community. We strive to achieve an inclusive departmental

environment. To this end, we welcome a multiplicity of identities including, but not limited to gender identity and orientation, ethnicity, race, age, spiritual belief, geographic origin, socioeconomic background, veteran status, and varied abilities. We strive to create an environment of learning, scholarship, and mentorship that is free of prejudice, intimidation, or discrimination. We expect all members of our departmental community to uphold these values.

Section 2. Roles and Responsibilities.

2.1 Unit Faculty and Staff

The Department of Geology and Environmental Science membership includes an Academic Unit Head (AUH); tenured and tenure-track faculty (TT); full-time faculty on a Renewable Term Appointment (RTA), administrative and professional (A&P) faculty; staff; faculty on Fixed Term Appointments (FTA) including visiting professors (all ranks) and part-time instructors; research scientists; emeritus faculty and staff; and adjunct faculty. See the [Faculty Handbook III.B](#) for definitions of faculty status, positions, and ranks. The general voting membership consists of all full-time faculty members holding the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full professor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer, as well as the Lab Manager. Temporary, visiting, and part-time faculty are welcome to attend full department meetings to voice opinions and advise the voting faculty regarding general business, but are ineligible to vote. The voting membership for curricular issues consists of all full-time instructional faculty.

In this document, “department” is the general voting membership of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science, and “faculty member” is a general voting member of the department. Collectively, “faculty members” represent “the faculty.”

In this document, the “AUPAC” refers to the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee. This committee must exist as defined in the [Faculty Handbook III.E.2.](#), and for the Department of Geology and Environmental Science, it consists of all full time faculty members that hold the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer.

Special Faculty Status. Special faculty status appointments are described in the [Faculty Handbook section III.B.3](#). Recommendation for appointment to research, adjunct, emeritus or other special faculty status is by a majority vote of the faculty. The AUH may veto a recommendation, which must then be forwarded to the Dean for resolution by arbitration. Recommendation to terminate an individual in any of these categories must be supported by a 2/3 majority vote of faculty. The AUH and the Dean have the authority to terminate special faculty status.

2.2 Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty members in the Department include the Academic Unit Head, teaching and research faculty (T&R), and administrative and professional faculty (A&P). All faculty are entitled to academic freedom and responsibilities in the discharge of their professional duties in accordance with the [Faculty Handbook Section III.A.2](#). Faculty are expected to conduct themselves with professional ethics and academic integrity, consistent with policies and procedures outlined in the [Faculty Handbook Section III.A.3-9](#).

Academic Unit Heads (AUH). AUHs are considered teaching and research (T&R) faculty members, but have a special administrative role and unique responsibilities. For more details, see [Academic Affairs Policy #2: Academic Unit Heads Policy](#). The primary responsibility of the AUH is to facilitate high quality undergraduate education in geosciences by providing strategic leadership towards this goal. This includes fostering cooperation among the faculty, encouraging the faculty toward excellence in teaching and all forms of scholarship, building research programs (emphasizing research involving undergraduates), campus and community engagement, managing departmental resources prudently, and being responsive to the needs of the department. The AUH also presides over department meetings, appoints committees, manages the budget, and acts as a liaison between the faculty and higher administration. The AUH and/or their designees prepare class schedules and direct future plans of the department. The AUH evaluates the faculty annually. AUPAC input on evaluation shall occur at specific points in a faculty member's academic career as outlined in Section 4. The AUH determines salary increments in consultation with the Dean as necessary.

Selection of AUH shall take place in accordance as outlined in the [Faculty Handbook III.C.3. Appointment of Academic Unit Heads](#). Academic unit heads serve at the pleasure of the Dean, as outlined in [Academic Affairs Policy #2: Academic Unit Heads Policy](#). The GES faculty may recommend nonrenewal of the AUH to the Dean. Recommendation for non-renewal of AUH shall require a vote of at least 3/4 of the voting department faculty (other than the AUH). If at least 3/4 of the voting department faculty (other than the AUH) vote in favor of recalling the AUH, the AUPAC Chair shall inform the AUH and provide written documentation of justification for nonrenewal to the Dean and the AUH.

Teaching and Research (T&R) Faculty. T&R faculty perform scholarly activities (e.g., teaching, discovery, application, integration of Boyer 1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered*) in accordance with all JMU policies and the priorities of the JMU College of Science and Mathematics (CSM). These activities include:

- Engaging in the appropriate level of scholarship for rank (see Sections 4 and 5).
- Engaging in appropriate levels of service to the university, with the community, and the profession (see Sections 4 and 5).
- Engaging in professional development.
- Attending department meetings, college and university assembly meetings, and assigned commencements.

- Participating in departmental and university governance.

Reassigned time from teaching for scholarship and/or service is negotiated between individual department faculty and the AUH.

Administrative and Professional (A&P) Faculty. A&P faculty perform scholarly or administrative activities in accordance with all JMU policies. These include:

- Engaging in professional development.
- Engaging in an appropriate level of service to the university, community, and/or profession.
- Attending department meetings, and college and university assembly meetings.
- Performing duties as assigned by the AUH.

2.3 Department Meetings

The AUH shall call one or more formal departmental meetings each semester. Weekly meetings may be called to deal with curricular, college and university business, and obligations. The AUH may also convene a committee in order to address specific issues. Meetings may be held during summer sessions when deemed necessary by the AUH. For formal meetings, notice shall be given at least five (5) days in advance. The AUH or designated delegate thereof shall preside at each meeting.

All full-time faculty members (i.e., voting members) are expected to attend the meetings. A majority of the voting faculty shall compose a quorum. A majority vote for suspension of rules allows for consideration of business not on the agenda. Proxy voting shall be allowed with documented permission. The latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall be used in resolving parliamentary disputes.

2.4 Department Committees

In most cases, the department functions as a committee of the whole. Except for specific departmental issues assigned by this document to other committees, the matters brought before the department for its actions are at the discretion of the AUH.

Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC). As required by the [Faculty Handbook III.E.2.a](#) and [IV.B.](#), the AUPAC has responsibilities in shared governance at the academic level. The responsibilities of the AUPAC in the area of personnel include advising the AUH on personnel matters at the academic unit level and serving as an appeal body for annual evaluations. The AUPAC also works in partnership with the AUH to review, maintain, and revise the department governance document.

Formal evaluation review by the AUPAC occurs at particular junctures in a faculty member's academic career. These junctures are (1) at the time of mid-probationary review for tenure-track and RTA faculty, (2) at the time of tenure application, (3) at the time of promotion application,

(4) during post-tenure review, and (5) in cases of annual review appeal, under conditions stated in the [Faculty Handbook sections III.E.4.](#) and [III.E.8.](#) In addition, in the case of a faculty vote for AUH nonrenewal, the AUPAC also communicates the vote and written documentation for nonrenewal to the AUH and the Dean.

As a formal committee, the AUPAC does not provide informal evaluations or mentorship to faculty members. However, the AUPAC **strongly recommends** that faculty member's regularly engage in dialog with senior (including the AUPAC Chair), mid-level, and peer faculty in the department (and elsewhere) to gain multiple perspectives on career advancement, opportunities and strategies for effective teaching, scholarship, and service, and opportunities for collaboration, work-life balance, among other topics.

Constituency and Membership. The AUPAC shall be composed of all members of the general voting membership of the department (not including the AUH). This body is responsible for electing the AUPAC chair at the start of each academic year, and it is responsible for reviewing, maintaining, and editing of the governance document in partnership with the AUH.

Subcommittees of the AUPAC are required for personnel matters.

- The **Tenure Committee** shall be composed of all AUPAC committee members in the department who are tenured, barring conflicts of interest. This committee will have a minimum of 3 members. Terms of Service are open ended.
- The **Promotion Committee for tenure track (TT) faculty** shall be composed of all AUPAC committee members in the department who are above the TT rank of the applicant being considered for promotion, barring conflicts of interest. This committee shall have a minimum of 3 members. Terms of Service are open ended.
- The **Promotion Committee for RTA faculty** shall be composed of all AUPAC committee members in the department who are above the RTA rank or above the parallel TT rank* of the applicant being considered for promotion, barring conflict of interest. This committee shall have a minimum of 3 members. *This modification is needed because our department currently has no RTA senior or principal lecturers; therefore it is necessary to include TT associate and full professors in the evaluation process. Terms of Service are open ended.

Procedures and Guidelines. The AUPAC meets as needed to conduct necessary business, typically conducting most work in the fall semester of each academic year. The AUPAC shall prepare faculty evaluation reports (e.g., mid-probationary evaluation, promotion and tenure evaluation) that are forwarded to the AUH based on the documentation submitted by the faculty member (see section 4). Such reports shall address whether the faculty member meets the teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications (**herein referred to as scholarship**), and professional service appropriate (see section 4 and 5) to their position in the department. The AUPAC shall note practices that they consider commendable and make suggestions that will assist in improving performance in areas where improvement is necessary. A copy of this written report shall be provided to the faculty member being reviewed and to the AUH.

In AUPAC personnel matters, an initial poll shall occur in which subcommittee members shall vote to indicate a candidate's performance ranking. Consensus shall normally be achieved through discussion and an iterative voting procedure. Measures must be in place to protect the integrity of the voting process and avoid undue influence (e.g., power-structure voting intimidation). Measures include, but are not limited to, using silent (paper) polls.

Processes for Changes to Procedures and Guidelines. The full AUPAC will review the governance document annually, which contains the operational procedures and guidelines. Any AUPAC member or the AUH can propose changes to the governance document. The committee and the AUH shall discuss proposed changes, and consensus shall be sought. If consensus is not reached, voting must take place and changes to the governance document must receive a 2/3 majority of the full-time faculty and the Lab Manager.

Academic Unit Committee on Student Grievances (AUCSG). The responsibility of the AUCSG is to make recommendation on a student grievance against a faculty member to the AUH (or the Dean if the grievance is against the AUH), when the alleged grievance does not concern grades, discrimination, or harassment. The AUCSG membership includes a minimum of 3 faculty members and 2 student members. Generally, these student members shall be an officer of Sigma Gamma Epsilon and an officer of one of the standing geoscience student organization in the department (e.g., Geology Club; JMU Chapters of the Association for Women Geoscientists, Sigma Gamma Epsilon, Association for Environmental and Engineering Geoscientists, National Earth Science Teachers Association). Generally, student members shall have earned greater than 60 credit hours from JMU. The selection procedure for committee membership is based on appointment by the AUH. The AUH will select faculty in the Department and students that are majoring in department programs. If there is a grievance against AUH, the AUPAC chair appoints the committee with Dean's approval. Terms of service are open ended. Committee procedures follow those outlined in the [Student Grievance Procedure](#) section of the current JMU Undergraduate Catalog.

Ad hoc committees. An ad hoc committees may be formed at any time for academic purposes. The AUH has the authority to form such committees. The AUH shall solicit volunteers from the faculty to serve on such committees. The AUH may appoint a committee if no faculty member volunteers, or if specific expertise is desired for a given task. In addition, the faculty members themselves may form a committee, with the approval of the AUH. These ad hoc committees follow their own procedures and guidelines with the purpose of completing the task, which must be approved by the committee Chairperson. The Chairperson of the committee may be appointed by the AUH. If no chairperson is appointed, then the committee shall elect a chairperson by simple majority.

Section 3. Hiring and Non-Reappointment.

3.1 Hiring Guidelines

In its hiring practices, the department complies with the Faculty Handbook, [III.C.1. General Procedures for Faculty and Administrative Appointments](#) and [III.C.2. Appointment of Faculty Members](#), and [University Policy 2101](#).

Qualifications. The qualifications for appointment at each academic rank are equivalent to the criteria for promotion to that rank (see [III.E in Faculty Handbook](#) and section 5 in this document).

Procedures. The Department of Geology and Environmental Science endorses and adheres to the University's current human resource (HR) guidelines or policies in all aspects of recruitment and hiring of faculty. Where the following departs from such guidelines, the guidelines shall be followed. Identifying, recruiting, and recommending faculty members for potential hire shall be coordinated by the AUH in consultation with department faculty, or an agreed upon search committee, which may be a committee of the whole. The AUH shall solicit volunteers among the department faculty and select a committee of 3-5 faculty members to serve as the department **search committee**. The search committee for tenure-track faculty positions shall normally be composed of tenure-track and tenured faculty. With approval of two-thirds of the tenure-track or tenured faculty, a non tenure-track/tenured faculty member may serve on the search committee. The department may choose to have membership on the committee from outside of the department. The AUH shall appoint, with Dean's approval, the chair of the search committee.

Search Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty Positions. The recruiting process by the search committee for tenure-track faculty shall follow the [HR guidelines on faculty recruitment](#), [Academic Affairs Guidelines for Recruiting and Hiring Faculty](#), and [University Policy 2101, Faculty Selection and Hiring Procedures](#).

Selected application materials of those candidates invited for on-campus interviews shall be available for review by all faculty members after they have completed all the required (e.g., diversity) training. Appropriate application materials shall be shared.

Hiring Recommendation Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty Positions. After on-campus interviews are complete, the recommendation process for hiring shall commence. Any conflict of interest shall be disclosed by the faculty member and addressed by the committee chair and the AUH as described in [Academic Affairs Guidelines for Recruiting and Hiring Faculty Section 6.3](#).

The search committee should convene to discuss the attributes and potential of each candidate and determine collectively whether each finalist is acceptable. The committee should review feedback received regarding all candidates as well as considering their own impressions, and then summarize the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate vis à vis their potential for success

in the position. The AUH may request that the search committee consider additional factors or address follow up questions.

In compliance with the [Academic Affairs Guidelines for Recruiting and Hiring Faculty](#), the search committee cannot conduct any ranking or provide a ranking of finalists. An initial poll shall occur in which committee members shall vote to indicate if a finalist is acceptable for hire. All finalists must have at least 2/3 support to be considered for hire. Consensus shall normally be achieved through discussion and an iterative voting procedure. Measures should be in place to protect the integrity of the voting process and avoid undue influence (e.g., power-structure voting intimidation). Measures include, but are not limited to, using anonymous polls (e.g, digital polling tools).

The search committee chair will convey their overall assessment of candidate suitability (e.g. acceptable or not acceptable) as well as the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate to the AUH. The search committee may elect to share compiled assessments from individual committee members, especially if there is not unanimous agreement. The search committee does not provide a ranking of finalists.

If consensus cannot be reached, a second meeting shall be arranged no sooner than 24 hours later. At the second meeting, all candidates that were considered at the first meeting shall be considered again, and the discussion and voting process shall commence in the same manner as in the first meeting. If at the second meeting consensus is again not met, the committee shall develop a robust list of pros/cons for individual candidates along with the level of consensus on the individual candidates' acceptability or unacceptability, which the committee chair shall submit to the AUH.

Hiring Procedures to Address Immediate Instructional Needs. On occasion, it may be necessary to hire a temporary, full-time non-tenure track faculty member during the summer, when some faculty members are away from campus. In these situations, the AUH, with assistance from available voluntary department faculty members, will complete the hiring process adhering as closely as possible to the procedures outlined above, and involving available faculty members as much as possible.

Hiring Procedures for Staff, A & P faculty, and Part-Time Faculty. Hiring of Staff, A&P faculty, and part-time faculty is the responsibility of the AUH. When time permits, the AUH will consult with the faculty on hiring of these positions.

3.2 Non-reappointment Guidelines

The department complies with University policies for non-reappointment. Links to relevant policies are provided below.

Full-time faculty. The department complies with University policy for non-reappointment as described in [Faculty Handbook Sections III.E](#) and [III.F](#), and [University Policy 2106, Instructional faculty Separation from Employment](#).

Part-time faculty, staff, and A&P Faculty. The authority for non-reappointment and dismissal of part-time faculty, staff and A&P faculty members is vested with the AUH. See also [University Policy 2104, Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty](#).

Section 4. Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Departmental guidelines for evaluation of faculty complies with University policies: [Faculty Handbook III.E. Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure](#) and [Manual of Policies and Procedures, Policy 1307, Performance Evaluation of Administrative and Professional Faculty](#). There are multiple junctures in a faculty member's career when evaluation occurs. These include: (1) initial review in the first year of hire, (2) annual reviews thereafter, (3) at the time of mid-probationary review for tenure-track and RTA faculty, (4) at the time of tenure application, (4) at the time of promotion application, (5) during post-tenure review should concerns arise, and (6) in cases of annual review appeals. Procedures for these evaluations are described below, as are the relationships between Performance Levels and Performance Criteria. More details and discussion of Performance Criteria are described in Section 5.

4.1 Initial Evaluation Guidelines

In compliance with [Faculty Handbook section III.E.3](#), the AUH will meet with new full-time faculty for initial evaluation.

Evaluation Conference. At the end of the initial semester of employment, the AUH shall provide the faculty member with the Annual Report of Professional Accomplishments (ARPA) form and the Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP) form. These forms shall be completed by the faculty member and sent to the AUH at the beginning of the second semester of employment. The information on these forms will guide the discussion in an initial evaluation conference.

An evaluation conference at the mid-point of a TT and RTA faculty member's first year provides an opportunity to discuss their first semester performance and professional needs as perceived by both the faculty member and AUH. Therefore, an evaluation conference will be scheduled at the beginning of the second semester of the new faculty member's employment at JMU. This conference must be completed by the end of the third week of the second semester.

Written Evaluation. The AUH must provide to the faculty member a written initial evaluation within 14 days following the evaluation conference. The evaluation must state whether the faculty member's overall performance has been acceptable or unacceptable.

A copy of the evaluation, signed by the faculty member and the AUH, must be sent to the Dean by the AUH. If the faculty member refuses to sign the evaluation, this refusal must be noted on the evaluation when the AUH sends it forward to the Dean.

Initial Evaluation Performance Criteria. In their first year of employment, faculty are expected to perform their professional duties as outlined in their hiring contract and offer letter. In addition, faculty eligible for tenure and/or promotion (i.e., TT and RTA faculty) shall start to lay the groundwork for meeting later performance goals. While evidence can be wide-ranging, quality of performance can draw from Performance Criteria activities and the related Qualifications for Rank and/or Tenure in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service (see Section 5).

Performance Levels and their Relationship to Initial Evaluation Performance Criteria. There are two performance levels for initial evaluation: Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. These are described below along with their relationship to initial evaluation performance criteria.

A faculty member's initial performance is deemed **Satisfactory** if they demonstrate contract expectations are being met in a professional manner, and in the case of TT and RTA faculty, demonstrate engagement in teaching, scholarship, and professional service, as appropriate to their hired rank (see Section 5).

- Minimum evidence for satisfactory performance at the point of initial evaluation for **temporary and part-time faculty** is competent presentation of materials and coverage of their first semester courses.
- Minimum evidence for satisfactory performance for **RTA (i.e., Lecturer track) faculty** includes:
 - Drafting a plan for their teaching and learning goals at JMU, engaging in discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for effective teaching and learning, and competent presentation of materials and coverage of their first semester courses.
 - Active participation (e.g., coming prepared, active listening, and contributing to discussions, completing tasks) in department meetings and any assigned committees.
- Minimum evidence for satisfactory performance at the point of initial evaluation for **TT faculty** includes:
 - Drafting a plan for their teaching and learning goals at JMU, engaging in discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for effective teaching and learning, and competent presentation of materials and coverage of their first semester courses.
 - Drafting a plan of research goals at JMU and engaging in one or more activities in support of that plan, such as taking practice steps towards setting up their research lab, setting up opportunities for mentored student research, identifying possible research collaborations, and/or identifying potential grant opportunities.

- Active participation (e.g., coming prepared, active listening, and contributing to discussions, completing tasks) in department meetings and any assigned committees.

These plans shall be described within their FAAP, and reflections on these plans in the appropriate sections of the ARPA.

When the minimal evidence of performance criteria described above are not met, initial performance is deemed **Unsatisfactory**. Unsatisfactory performance determined in the initial evaluation will normally result in nonrenewal of an appointment of an untenured first-year faculty member. If the AUH finds that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory, the AUPAC must then review the faculty member's performance, as specified in [Faculty Handbook, Section III.F.3](#). The AUPAC review must be completed and sent to the Dean within seven days of receiving a recommendation for nonrenewal of a first-year faculty member from the AUH.

4.2 Annual Evaluation Guidelines

In accordance with [Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4](#), the AUH will consider the performance of faculty members annually.

Annual Evaluation Procedure. Before the start of each academic year all faculty members submit a Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP). The FAAP outlines the performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service for the individual faculty member. Importantly, the FAAP also situates those areas of activity within the faculty member's career goals (e.g., their goals for teaching and learning, scholarship, etc). The FAAP therefore is a useful career planning document, which can aid a faculty member career planning, and support dialog between the faculty member and their AUH, mentors (e.g., senior faculty) and colleagues.

The anticipated relative weights of teaching, scholarship, and service are detailed in the faculty member's contract or negotiated with the AUH.

At the end of each academic year all full-time faculty members prepare an Annual Report of Professional Accomplishments (ARPA) that summarizes activities and accomplishments during the previous 12 months in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service. The ARPA is submitted to the AUH for review and evaluation purposes. Faculty may also submit other documentation (see Section 5) as evidence of the performance criteria for teaching, scholarship, and/or professional service to the AUH.

Annual Evaluation Performance Criteria. Annual evaluation performance criteria are based on expectations laid out in the hiring contract and offer letter for all faculty, and on the expectations for teaching, scholarship, and professional service in the promotion and/or tenure guidelines for TT and RTA faculty (see below and Section 5). Faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure are expected to advance their efforts each year towards meeting these performance goals with the guidance of the AUH, the AUPAC (e.g., during mid-probationary review, see below), mentors, and colleagues.

Performance Levels and their Relationship to Annual Evaluation Performance Criteria. The AUH evaluates each faculty member at a performance level with a numerical rating. The performance levels include excellent (1), satisfactory (0), and unsatisfactory (-1). The numerical ratings are used in allocating merit raises (see section 4.3). The performance levels, corresponding numerical ratings, and relationship to performance criteria are as follows:

Excellent Performance, with a numerical rating of 1. A faculty member's annual performance is deemed **Excellent** if they demonstrate contract expectations are being exceeded (temporary and part-time faculty), and/or demonstrate high levels of engagement in teaching, scholarship, and professional service, as appropriate to their rank (TT and RTA faculty, see Section 5).

- Minimum evidence of **excellent** performance for annual evaluation of **temporary and part-time faculty** includes:
 - Competent presentation of materials and coverage of their courses during the past year.
 - Taking meaningful actions in response to recommendations made in the previous year's annual evaluation report that fully address the earlier concerns.
- Minimum evidence of **excellent** performance for annual evaluations of **RTA faculty** includes:
 - Maintaining and updating a plan for their teaching and learning goals at JMU [*The FAAP can serve this purpose*], and demonstrating ongoing commitment and significant progress on their plan. Engaging in discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for effective teaching and learning. Engaging in education practice that includes evidence-based innovative instructional approaches during the past year. Participating in professional development. Sharing effective teaching practices beyond the department community.
 - Active participation (e.g., coming prepared, active listening, and contributing to discussions, completing tasks) in department meetings and any assigned committees. Participating and/or leading other service efforts, as appropriate to their faculty rank.
 - Taking meaningful actions in response to recommendations made in the previous year's annual evaluation report that fully address the earlier concerns.
- Minimum evidence of **excellent** performance for annual evaluation of **TT faculty** includes:
 - Maintaining and updating a plan for their teaching and learning goals at JMU [*The FAAP can serve this purpose.*], and demonstrating ongoing commitment and significant progress on their plan. Engaging in discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for effective teaching and learning. Engaging in education practice that includes evidence-based innovative instructional approaches during the past year. Participating in professional development. Sharing effective teaching practices beyond the department community.
 - Maintaining and updating a plan of research goals at JMU [*The FAAP can serve this purpose.*], and demonstrating ongoing commitment and significant progress on this plan.

- Active participation (e.g., coming prepared, active listening, and contributing to discussions, completing tasks) in department meetings and any assigned committees. Participating and/or leading other service efforts, as appropriate to their faculty rank.
- Taking meaningful actions in response to recommendations made in the previous year's annual evaluation report that fully address the earlier concerns.

Satisfactory Performance, with numerical rating 0. A faculty member's annual performance is deemed **Satisfactory** if they demonstrate contract expectations are being met (temporary and part-time faculty), and/or demonstrate engagement in teaching, scholarship, and professional service, as appropriate to their rank (TT and RTA faculty, see Section 5).

- Minimum evidence of **satisfactory** performance for annual evaluation of **temporary and part-time faculty** includes:
 - Competent presentation of materials and coverage of their courses during the past year.
 - Taking some meaningful actions in response to recommendations made in the previous year's annual evaluation report.
- Minimum evidence of **satisfactory** performance for annual evaluation of **RTA faculty** includes:
 - Maintaining and updating a plan for their teaching and learning goals at JMU [*The FAAP can serve this purpose*], and demonstrating incremental progress on this plan. Engaging in discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for effective teaching and learning. Competent presentation of materials and coverage of their courses during the past year.
 - Active participation (e.g., coming prepared, active listening, and contributing to discussions, completing tasks) in department meetings and any assigned committees.
 - Taking some meaningful actions in response to recommendations made in the previous year's annual evaluation report.
- Minimum evidence of **satisfactory** performance for annual evaluation of **TT faculty** includes:
 - Maintaining and updating a plan for their teaching and learning goals at JMU [*The FAAP can serve this purpose*], and demonstrating incremental progress on this plan. Engaging in discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for effective teaching and learning. Competent presentation of materials and coverage of their courses during the past year.
 - Maintaining and updating a plan of research goals at JMU [*The FAAP can serve this purpose*], and demonstrating incremental progress on this plan.
 - Active participation (e.g., coming prepared, active listening, and contributing to discussions, completing tasks) in department meetings and any assigned committees.
 - Taking some meaningful actions in response to recommendations made in the previous year's annual evaluation report.

Unsatisfactory Performance, with numerical rating -1. Unsatisfactory performance occurs when the minimal evidence of satisfactory performance described above is not met.

Manner of Determining Levels and Overall Performance. The AUH will give consideration to the faculty member's ARPA, FAAP, and any AUPAC reports (e.g., associated with a particular juncture such as mid-tenure review, tenure and/or promotion application). In addition, the AUH may agree on supplemental documents submitted by the faculty member or other sources of evaluative evidence (e.g., in-class observations by teaching specialists).

Written Evaluation and Evaluation Conference. In accordance with the [Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4.f.](#), the AUH shall provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by October 1. Any failure to meet this deadline will extend the appeal process by the number of days the written evaluation is late. Following the receipt of the written evaluation, the AUH and faculty member shall meet to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and AUH.

Appealing Annual Evaluations. A faculty member may appeal an annual evaluation by the AUH. Appeals may be made on any of the following bases:

- Their annual evaluation did not take into account relevant information (e.g., such as could happen if information was not included in the faculty member's FAAP or ARPA).
- The information was not objectively reviewed by the AUH.
- The AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using a different standard of judgment.

Appeal Procedure. The faculty member should first discuss the appeal with the AUH. If the concern is not resolved, the faculty member can send a written appeal to the AUPAC.

In accordance with the [Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4.g-h](#), a faculty member has seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to appeal the evaluation in writing. A copy of the appeal must be provided by the appealing faculty member to the AUH.

An ad-hoc review committee consisting of an AUPAC member, a tenured faculty member appointed by the AUH, and a tenured faculty member chosen by the appealing faculty member will be appointed to consider the appeal.

The appeal must include a copy of the three most recent annual evaluations and future anticipated activities plan (if applicable), the faculty member's most recent ARPA, and a detailed explanation of the bases for the appeal. The appealing faculty member is expected to supply any other information or documentation that the review committee deems relevant, upon request by the review committee.

The review committee will review the appeal and issue a written recommendation to the AUH, with a copy sent to the appealing faculty member and the Dean, by October 21 of the year in which the evaluation is received. The review committee may decide:

- that the appeal was filed on an inappropriate basis, in which case the appeal will be dismissed; or
- that the appeal was filed on an appropriate basis, in which case the review committee will consider the documents presented and decide that the documents do not support the allegations; or
- that the appeal was filed on an appropriate basis, in which case the review committee will consider the documents presented and decide that the documents support the allegations.

If the review committee determines that the documents support the allegations in the appeal, the review committee may recommend to the AUH and the AUPAC/Executive Committee that the evaluation be changed.

The recommendation will be considered by the AUH and AUPAC, who have until October 28 to finalize the evaluation and present it to the faculty member as their final decision. The AUH will request the faculty member's signature on the final evaluation. A signature indicates that they have received the evaluation, not that they agree with it. A faculty member's failure to sign the final evaluation will result in the AUH sending the final evaluation to the Dean without the faculty member's signature on the form, with a notation of the faculty member's failure to sign.

4.3 Merit Pay Evaluation Guidelines

Merit raises are derived from the evaluations using the three category rating scale (Excellent, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) in each of the three performance areas (teaching, scholarly achievement and professional service). The merit raise pool for the department is divided into two parts. The larger portion, the Satisfactory Merit Pool, represents 67% of the total amount. The Satisfactory Merit Pool is divided among all faculty as a uniform percentage of the faculty member's salary and represents the merit raise for overall satisfactory performance.

For example, if the merit raise pool is 3% of the total faculty salaries and the Satisfactory Merit Pool is 67% (2/3) of this, then the Satisfactory Merit Pool is 2% of the total. In this case, each faculty member gets a merit raise of 2% of his/her salary for overall satisfactory performance.

The remaining 33% of the total merit pool, the Incremental Merit Pool, is used to increase or decrease this base raise according to each faculty member's evaluations in fixed dollar increments. Each of the three rankings are assigned a numerical Incremental Merit Point value as follows:

Rating	Incremental Merit Points
Excellent	+1
Satisfactory	0
Unsatisfactory	-1

The Incremental Merit Points for all faculty are summed. The total Incremental Merit Pool is divided by the total Incremental Merit Points to give the raise/Incremental Merit Point. This is multiplied by the number of merit points each faculty member has received to determine the additional increment for each faculty member. This addition may be a positive or negative change in the base merit pay for satisfactory performance.

For example, if the total number of Incremental Merit Points for all faculty is 12 and the Incremental Merit Pool is \$12,000, then the raise/Incremental Merit point is \$1,000. A faculty member with ratings of Excellent, Satisfactory and Satisfactory in the three performance areas would get $(1 + 0 + 0) * \$1,000 = \$1,000$ added to the percentage already awarded for satisfactory performance.

Occasionally, there are situations where supplemental raise money is available or there are special circumstances for a particular faculty member. In these cases, special adjustments may be made in consultation with the Dean to rectify historical inequities or address unusual situations.

4.4 Mid-Probationary Evaluation Guidelines

The mid-probationary evaluation (3rd year of appointment) is an opportunity for formal advice from the AUPAC to guide the faculty member towards a positive trajectory for tenure and/or promotion. Informal dialogue between TT and RTA faculty and senior (including the AUPAC Chair), mid-level, and peer faculty in the department (and elsewhere) is encouraged to gain multiple perspectives on career advancement, as part of a healthy and supportive department culture.

Mid-Probationary Evaluation Procedure. Mid-probationary evaluation generally occurs in the Fall of the faculty member's third year following appointment, however a different timeline may be requested if a tenure clock adjustment has been approved or offered as an option to all eligible faculty due to external events (see [Faculty Handbook section III.E.7.c.](#)). Tenure track faculty must

undergo a mid-probationary review. RTA faculty (e.g., lecturer to senior lecturer) who are interested in applying for promotion, are strongly encouraged, but are not required, to undergo this formative process.

The faculty member shall submit their mid-probationary evaluation materials (described below) to the AUPAC chair and copied to the AUH by September 15.

The AUPAC chair will provide these submitted materials to the rest of the committee. The committee shall review all submitted materials and meet to discuss their findings. The committee chair has the option of consulting with the AUH should questions arise regarding the annual evaluations.

The AUPAC chair will provide the faculty member a written mid-probationary evaluation signed by the AUPAC members by November 1. The evaluation must state whether the faculty member's progress, and potential thereof, is deemed excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service. It will also include commentary on the faculty-member's strengths and weaknesses in each performance area, with recommendations for adjustments. A copy of the evaluation will also be provided to the AUH at this time.

Mid-Probationary Evaluation Materials. The material submitted by the faculty member is essential to the mid-probationary evaluation process. Guidelines on content and format of these materials are provided below. Guidelines on length are intended for a succinct yet reflective narrative. Tables and lists are not included in the length guidelines.

- A statement (~1 page) that briefly describes the impact (if any) of **external events** (e.g., COVID-19, medical or family leave; see [Faculty Handbook section III.E.7.c.](#)) on research, teaching, and service. The goal is to contextualize the narrative so the AUPAC and AUH can appropriately evaluate the submitted mid-probationary evaluation materials.
- A short (~2-4 page) narrative that discusses the faculty member's **teaching** that must include, but is not limited to: teaching goals and objectives; reflections on the evolution of their course designs, modifications, and instructional practices; independent evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., original assignments, products of student activities, assessment data, syllabus, etc.).
- A short (~2-3 page) narrative that discusses the faculty member's **scholarship** that must include, but is not limited to: a description of their primary scholarship foci and significance of it; a list of students mentored in research projects; a list or table of published articles, books, or other media; a list of presentations at professional meetings; and a record of grant applications and grant awards.
- A short (~2 page) narrative that discusses the faculty member's **professional service** that must include, but is not limited to: a record of all department, college, and university committees, engagement and service to the community and the profession, as well as memberships and offices held.

- A short (~1-2 page) narrative on **career goals, and plans to achieve these goals**, in each of the three evaluation categories (Teaching, Scholarship, Service) for the next three years that will lead up to the faculty member's tenure and promotion review.
- The faculty member's current **CV**.
- Copies of the **AUH annual evaluations**.

Mid-Probationary Evaluation Performance Criteria. The mid-probationary evaluation aims to evaluate a faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure and/or promotion and offers a formal opportunity for pre-tenure and/or promotion-track faculty to get feedback from their unit colleagues. Therefore, the Performance Criteria and the Qualifications for Tenure and Rank outlined in Section 5 are used as a guide for faculty preparing their mid-probationary evaluation materials.

Manner of Determining Levels and Overall Performance. Mid-probationary evaluation is based primarily on the evidence laid out in the materials submitted by the faculty member, and also informed by AUPAC direct observations in professional settings. Performance levels of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory are determined for each area of teaching, scholarship, and service based on:

- the AUPAC's evaluation of the faculty member's activities over the probationary period in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, as pertinent to the roles and responsibilities of TT faculty or RTA faculty (see Section 5);
- the faculty member's adjustment(s) of their activities made in light of annual evaluation feedback from the AUH; and
- the likelihood that future plans described in the submitted materials are achievable and appropriate to qualify for tenure and/or promotion in the time remaining.

Performance Levels and Their Relationship to Mid-Probationary Evaluation Performance Criteria. Performance levels of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory have the following relationship to mid-probationary evaluation performance criteria:

A faculty member's mid-probationary performance is deemed **Excellent** in any area of teaching, research, or service if:

- Activities during the probationary period demonstrate a pattern of leadership growth, innovation, and expanded impact, guided by iterative planning and thoughtful reflection. [Occasional, piecemeal, or one-off accomplishments are not sufficient for performance level excellence.]
- They have successfully adjusted their activities in light of annual evaluation feedback from the AUH, such that any earlier performance concerns are moot.
- Future plans show reasonable potential of continuing their established trajectory of leadership, innovation, and impact, and are appropriate for entering the next faculty rank in the time remaining (e.g., before tenure application).

A faculty member's mid-probationary performance is deemed **Satisfactory** in any area of teaching, research, or service if:

- Activities during the probationary period include some evidence of leadership, innovation, and impact, but are piecemeal (lack a demonstrated pattern) and/or generally small scale (e.g., impact is limited to the departmental program). Iterative planning and reflection are partially successful in guiding faculty activities.
- They have partially adjusted their activities in light of annual evaluation feedback from the AUH, such that some earlier performance concerns are moot.
- Future plans show some potential leadership growth, innovation, and expanded impact, but may need adjusting to meet the expectations for entering the next faculty rank in the time remaining (e.g., before tenure application).

A faculty member's mid-probationary performance is deemed **Unsatisfactory** in any area of teaching, research, or service if evidence of satisfactory performance described above is not met.

4.5 Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Tenure-track (TT) faculty can be considered for promotion to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. RTA faculty hired under the new university guidelines (adopted 2022-2023) can be considered for promotion to the ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer. *RTA faculty hired prior to the new university adopted guidelines, have ranks that mirror the TT, but otherwise follow the promotion evaluation guidelines for RTA as described below.* Only tenure-track faculty can be considered for tenure.

Promotion Procedures. Faculty members should be familiar with statements in the [Faculty Handbook Sections III.B, III.D, and III.E](#), which gives minimum requirements for promotion.

- For TT Faculty, all ranks at or above the rank of Assistant Professor, the department requires that the faculty member hold a doctorate in the geosciences or a related field.
- For RTA Faculty, all ranks at or above the rank of Lecturer, the department requires that the faculty member hold a master's degree in the geosciences or a related field.

A faculty member who is eligible for promotion as outlined by the JMU Faculty Handbook submits a written application dossier, including detailed justification that complies with the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers (below). This application is submitted to the AUH and AUPAC. Details on the submission timeline are provided below.

Tenure Procedures. The [JMU Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e](#) outlines the policies and procedures that apply to applications for tenure. Only tenure-track faculty can be considered for tenure. The candidate for tenure must have the appropriate number of years of service, including credit granted for service elsewhere, unless a different probationary period has been agreed upon by the candidate, the AUH, and the Dean at the time of hire. Typically, faculty apply for tenure in

the fall semester of their sixth year. The candidate submits an application for tenure, including an application dossier created using the guidelines detailed below, to the AUH and AUPAC. Evidence of potential for future career advancement and indications of effort in that direction are expected and essential.

Promotion and Tenure Timelines. Faculty considering application for promotion and/or tenure must notify the AUPAC and AUH no later than September 1 of the year in which they plan to apply. A written application dossier along with information on potential external reviewers (see below) must be submitted to the AUH and AUPAC by October 1 of the year in which they plan to apply. The AUPAC Chair requests letters from external reviewers in early October. The AUPAC and the AUH conduct the evaluation of the submitted materials and external reviews received in late October/early November. The written recommendations of the AUPAC and AUH, including justification of their conclusions, must be submitted to the Dean by November 15, and a copy of both recommendations must be provided to the faculty member. The Dean must submit their recommendation to the Provost by December 15, and provide copies to the AUH, AUPAC and the faculty member.

By February 1, official written notification of denial must be sent to the faculty member, with concurrent copies to the Dean, AUH, and AUPAC. If the Provost recommends awarding tenure, the recommendation must be sent to the president by February 1, with concurrent copies to the dean, AUH, AUPAC, and faculty member.

If the President recommends awarding tenure, the recommendation must be sent to the Board of Visitors (BOV). The BOV must act on the recommendation, and notification of its decision must be sent to the faculty member within fifteen days after the BOV's meeting. Official notification awarding tenure may be conveyed to a faculty member only after the formal action of the BOV. The award of tenure becomes effective at the beginning of the following academic year.

External Reviews. For tenure of TT faculty and/or for promotion of TT and RTA faculty, the candidate will submit the names and contact information for at least six potential reviewers who are external to the department and are familiar with the applicant's contributions to one or more evaluation criteria areas. The candidate will provide the context in which they know the potential reviewer (if at all). The expectation is that potential reviewers could provide valuable perspectives on one or more components (e.g., for TT faculty: teaching, scholarship, professional service, for RTA faculty: primarily teaching) of the candidate's tenure and/or promotion application packet. The committee may solicit additional names of potential reviews from the candidate, if necessary (e.g., unresponsive reviewers). In consultation with the AUH, the committee shall choose at least three of these reviewers from whom they will request letters. The committee chair shall contact external reviewers and provide to external reviewers the candidate's CV, narrative, and department governance document, as well as contextual information on the candidate's teaching loads and department focus on undergraduate education.

Guidelines for Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers. Prior to preparing and submitting a dossier, the candidate should engage in dialogue with senior colleagues (including members of the AUPAC), as well as the AUH, and the Dean. In preparing a promotion and/or tenure dossier, a faculty member should make the strongest possible evidence-based case that satisfies the department's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure.

The promotion and/or tenure dossier must include a table of contents, a narrative, a CV, and supporting appendices. These materials are to be submitted digitally to the AUPAC Chair and to the AUH. The promotion and/or tenure dossier shall be sent to the Dean by the AUPAC Chair when the AUH and AUPAC evaluation are submitted to the Dean.

Guidelines for the content of the narrative are provided below. The narrative should be ~14-18 pages. These guidelines on length are intended for a succinct yet reflective narrative. In the narrative, the faculty member should relate evidence of excellent performance to the performance criteria. Figures and tables may be included; they do not count in the suggested total page length.

- The **Executive Summary** (1-2 pages) should capture the main arguments and evidence provided in the more expansive sections of the narrative.
- Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall include an **External Event Impact** statement (<1 page) in their dossier that briefly describes the impact (if any) of external factors (e.g., COVID-19, medical or family leave) on scholarship, teaching, and service. The goal is to contextualize the narrative so the AUPAC and AUH can appropriately evaluate the submitted promotion and/or tenure review materials. If no external events impacted progress to promotion and/or tenure then this should be stated.
- The section on **Teaching** must include, but is not limited to, a statement of teaching philosophy, course listing and descriptions, reflection on course evolution, the role of student and peer feedback in shaping course development, and a summary of independent evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., original assignments, products of student activities, assessment data, syllabus, etc.).
- The section on **Scholarship** should include, but is not limited to, a statement of scholarship vision and themes, description of research projects (including student research), research funding, and outcomes and dissemination.
- The section on **Service** must include, but is not limited to, a statement on engagement in service, a synthesis of Department, College, and University committees on which the applicant has served, service to the community, and service to the professional discipline, including memberships and offices held.
- The description of **Future Plans** must outline plans for the next few years for teaching, scholarship, and service and the relationship to long-term career goals.

The **CV** must include, but is not limited to, sections of education history, employment, scholarship (publications, presentations, student research, and grants), courses taught, service, and professional development.

The **Appendices** must include evidence to support the narrative.

- Appendix A (Required). Evaluations and Reviews. These include the AUH's evaluations for at least the preceding five years, and previous reviews by the AUPAC (such as the mid-tenure year review; see guidelines in section D below).
- Appendix B (Recommended). Supporting Evidence for Teaching: This may include representative syllabi, example teaching materials, and other independent evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- Appendix C (Recommended). Supporting Evidence for Scholarship: This may include publications, select conference abstracts, and summaries of grant proposals. Links to resources are encouraged.
- Appendix D (Recommended). Supporting Evidence for Service: This may include documentation of engagement activities, including links to outcomes, articles, official letters of thanks or appreciation, and other materials.

Promotion and/or Tenure Evaluation Performance Criteria. The promotion and/or tenure evaluation aims to evaluate a faculty member's accomplishments in the area of teaching, scholarship, and service and likelihood of future success. Therefore, the Performance Criteria and the Qualifications for Tenure and Rank in Section 5 are used as guides for faculty preparing their promotion and/or tenure evaluation materials, as well as the descriptions below levels of performance and their relationships to performance criteria.

Manner of Determining Levels and Overall Performance. Promotion and/or tenure evaluation is based primarily on the evidence laid out in the dossier submitted by the faculty member, and supplemented by assessments made by external reviewers. Performance levels of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory are determined for each area of teaching, scholarship, and service based on:

- The AUPAC's and AUH's evaluation of the faculty member's activities during the probationary period in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, as pertinent to the roles and responsibilities of TT faculty or RTA faculty;
- The faculty member's adjustment(s) of their activities made in light of the mid-probationary evaluation feedback from the AUPAC and the annual evaluation feedback from the AUH; and
- The likelihood that future plans described in the submitted materials are achievable and appropriate to continue post-tenure and/or following promotion to the next rank.

The tenure and/or promotion committee will review dossiers based on the relevant guidelines and provide a written statement of their recommendation to the Dean, after sharing it with the AUH.

The AUH will make their own independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate's application packet based on the relevant guidelines (see above). The AUPAC Chair and AUH will have a discussion regarding their evaluations prior to finalizing the written statements. Finalized written statements of recommendation will be shared between the AUPAC Chair and the AUH, and then sent to the Dean. These written statements will accompany the applicant's dossier.

Performance Levels and Their Relationship to Promotion and/or Tenure Evaluation Performance Criteria. Performance levels of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory have the following relationship to performance criteria for promotion and/or tenure:

A faculty member's promotion and/or tenure evaluation performance is deemed **Excellent** in any area of teaching, research, or service if:

- The progression of activities while at each rank (e.g., instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, senior lecturer, associate professor) demonstrate a pattern of leadership growth, innovation, and expanded impact. Such accomplishments shall be guided by iterative planning and thoughtful reflection. [Occasional/piecemeal accomplishments are not sufficient for performance level excellence.]
 - An example of expected progression: evidence of grant applications with positive reviews (satisfactory) prior to applying for Associate Professor, and the attainment of external funded grant(s) or contracts (excellent) prior to applying for Full Professor.
- They have successfully adjusted their activities in light of evaluation feedback from the AUPAC and the annual evaluation feedback from the AUH, such that any earlier performance concerns are moot.
- Future plans show reasonable potential of continuing their established trajectory of leadership, innovation, and impact, and are appropriate for tenure and/or entering the next faculty rank.

A faculty member's promotion and/or tenure evaluation performance is deemed **Satisfactory** in any area of teaching, research, or service if:

- The progression of activities while at each rank (i.e., instructor, assistant professor, associate professor) include some evidence of leadership, innovation, and impact, but lack a consistent pattern and/or are of limited scale. Iterative planning and reflection have been partially successful in guiding faculty activities.
- They have partially adjusted their activities in light of evaluation feedback from the AUPAC and the annual evaluation feedback from the AUH, such that some earlier performance concerns are moot.
- Future plans show some potential leadership growth, innovation, and expanded impact, but may need adjusting to meet the expectations for sustained success at the next faculty rank.

A faculty member's promotion and/or tenure evaluation performance is deemed **Unsatisfactory** in any area of teaching, research, or service if evidence of satisfactory performance described above are not met.

Promotion and/or Tenure Appeals. If a faculty member is denied promotion and/or tenure they are directed to the following sections of the Faculty Handbook for guidance on the appeal process:

- [Denial of Tenure III.E.7.f.\(9\), III.E.7.f.\(10\), III.E.7.f.\(11\)](#)
- [Denial of Promotion III.E.6.b.\(9\), III.E.6.b.\(10\), III.E.6.b.\(11\)](#)
- [Faculty Appeals Committee III.L.](#)

4.6 Post-Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Annual evaluation of faculty is conducted each year by the AUH. If a tenured faculty member's overall annual performance is judged unsatisfactory, then a development plan shall be designed and the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook ([sections III.E.4.k and III.E.8](#)) shall be followed. Annual evaluations of tenured faculty will be the basis for determining the necessity of post-tenure evaluation by the AUH and the AUPAC.

Section 5. Faculty Performance Criteria and Qualifications

5.1 Performance Criteria of Faculty

Qualitative and holistic assessments of performance are the foundation of faculty performance evaluation; quantitative assessments are secondary. Therefore, the performance criteria enumerated here are not to be considered as a "check-list" of duties, but as activities for which a faculty member may provide evidence supporting the quality of their performance in evaluation categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. This is not a complete list, and other activities not explicitly included here could be counted in each category.

Teaching Performance Criteria. It is the intent of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science to acknowledge and reward all forms of effective and impactful teaching. We recognize that teaching that supports engaged learning can occur in diverse settings (classroom, lab, field, professional short courses, etc.) and can be accomplished in a variety of ways (lecture, one-on-one/group interaction, online, etc.). Physical evidence (e.g., course evaluations, TAP evaluations, other CFI feedback on teaching, assessment of student learning outcomes, etc.) of Teaching Performance is the responsibility of the faculty member.

- Competent presentation of material and coverage of course content are mandatory elements of teaching performance.
- Other areas in which a faculty member may provide evidence of the quality of their teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Development, dissemination, and/or evaluation of innovative teaching procedures, innovative applications of technology, web-based content to support classes, etc.
- Development, dissemination or delivery of online or technology-enhanced classes.
- Design and implementation of new courses or the effective revision of existing courses.
- Develop and/or apply effective measures to support diversity and inclusion in teaching.
- Letters of evaluation from faculty colleagues.
- Curriculum development.
- Writing grant proposals and/or obtaining funding with a primary focus on curriculum development.
- Mentoring student research or independent study projects.
- Engaging in professional development (e.g. short-courses, workshops, field trips, equipment training, etc.) that enhances teaching activities.
- Use of student assessment data to develop / improve effective and impactful teaching practices.
- Professional recognitions or honors in teaching.
- Academic advising of students.

Scholarship Performance Criteria. It is the intent of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science to acknowledge and reward the process, practice, and products of scholarship. Scholarship may be in many forms. The books *Scholarship Reconsidered; Priorities of the Professoriate* (Boyer, 1990) and *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (Boyer, 1996) serve as good guides for how one may define scholarship and how one's scholarship may be assessed. It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate that their activities are scholarly, and to document their scholarly activity. Evidence of Scholarship may include, but are not limited to:

- Publications (peer-reviewed articles, books, field guides, and other media, etc.) in the geosciences or related areas. To advance to full professor, the faculty member must demonstrate that their scholarship has meaningful impact in their discipline.
- Writing proposals and/or obtaining research funding. To advance to full professor, the faculty member must secure external funding to support scholarly activities.
- Presentation of scholarship at local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Engaging in professional development (e.g. short-courses, workshops, field trips, equipment training, etc.) that enhances scholarly activities.
- Conducting regional, national, or international faculty development workshops or short courses.
- Publication of online material for classes in the geosciences, or related areas, and the documentation of the use of that material to support classes at other universities.

- Professional consulting done for the advancement of the scholarly mission of the department, college, or university.
- Professional recognition of scholarship.

Professional Service Performance Criteria. It is the intent of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science to acknowledge and reward the many different ways that faculty provide leadership and interact with others in Service to the Department, University, local community, and our professions at large. Service is recognized in four areas. Examples of service in each of these four areas are:

- Departmental Engagement:
 - Active service on department committees; effective leadership when serving as an officer.
 - Participation in ad-hoc assignments for the department.
 - Attendance at and participation in departmental and committee meetings.
 - Engaging in efforts to recruit and support a diverse student population in the majors.
 - Sponsorship and/or advising student organizations.
 - Leading a faculty development workshop.
 - Developing instructional resources for use by departmental faculty.
 - Mentoring new faculty in the department.
- College and University Engagement:
 - Active service on College and University Committees; effective leadership when serving as an officer.
 - Active participation in college and university assemblies or councils.
 - Leading a faculty development workshop for college or university faculty.
 - Placing instructional resources online that are used by college or university faculty.
 - Professional recognitions or honors in service to the college or university.
 - University planning/governance committees and task forces.
 - College or university-level search committees.
- Community / Civic Engagement:
 - Professional involvement in developing and / or continuing community engagement opportunities as a representative of the University.
 - Presentations to community groups of non-specialists.
 - Development and / or presentation of workshops for the community in areas related to the Geosciences.
 - Publication of publicly available and accessible materials that increase the awareness and appreciation of the geosciences among non-specialists (e.g. pamphlets, online resources, interpretive signage, etc.).
 - Museum outreach to K-12, community groups, and professional societies / clubs (e.g., professional mineral societies).
 - Professional recognitions or honors in service to the community.
- Engagement with the Profession:

- Activity in professional geoscience organizations; leadership when holding office, serving on committees or boards.
- Serving as a peer reviewer for a professional journal or granting agency.
- Conducting regional, national or international workshops for professionals in areas related to the Geosciences.
- Chairing a session at a professional meeting.
- Serving as an Editor or Associate Editor for a professional discipline publication.
- Participation in professional meetings, organizations, seminars, or symposia.
- Professional recognitions or honors in service to the discipline.
- Professional consulting done for industry or for professional organizations in the geosciences or related areas.

5.2 Qualifications for Rank and Tenure

The qualifications for each tenure-track rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor) are given in terms of the three evaluation categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. The qualifications for each RTA rank (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer) are given in terms of teaching, service, and scholarship. In accordance with [Faculty Handbook III.E.6.a](#), the AUPAC and the AUH will independently evaluate the faculty member as Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in each of these areas, respectively. As described in Section 4, this evaluation shall be based on the evidence presented in the promotion and/or tenure dossier submitted to the AUPAC and AUH. Note, this is different from the evaluation by the AUH that is done annually and is based on the faculty members annual activity report (see Section 4). Both for initial appointments and in the promotion process, evidence that the qualifications have been met should be given in terms of the Performance Criteria described above and in relation to Performance Levels (Section 4). *See Section 4 for the relationships between Performance Level (e.g., Satisfactory) and Performance Criteria.*

Tenure. Qualifications for granting tenure include evidence of the following:

- Excellence in one area, typically either teaching or scholarship during the probationary period.
- At least satisfactory in the remaining two categories of teaching, scholarship, and service during the probationary period.
- A positive working relationship with faculty members in the Department.
- Favorable reference letters from outside evaluators.

TT Ranks. The responsibilities of a faculty member appointed to one of the tenure-track ranks are focused on teaching, scholarship, and service.

Instructor. Faculty with the rank of Instructor will typically be those faculty members who are pursuing a terminal degree. Faculty with a master's degree and who are not pursuing a terminal degree will be at the RTA rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer. Qualifications of rank include evidence of:

- A master's degree in geoscience or a related field.
- Satisfactory teaching or the potential thereof.
- Scholarly activities at the level agreed upon by the instructor and AUH, or potential thereof.
- Service at the level agreed upon by the instructor and AUH, or potential thereof.

An Instructor may be promoted to Assistant Professor.

Assistant Professor. In addition to the qualifications for Instructor (excluding the Master's degree requirement), qualifications of rank include evidence of:

- An earned doctorate in Geoscience or a related field.
- Satisfactory teaching, or the potential thereof.
- Satisfactory scholarship, or the potential thereof.
- Satisfactory service to the university, community and profession, or the potential thereof.

Associate Professor. In addition to the qualifications for Assistant Professor, qualification of rank include evidence of:

- At least satisfactory Teaching while at the rank of Assistant Professor.
- At least satisfactory Scholarship while at the rank of Assistant Professor.
- Excellence in one area, typically Teaching or Scholarship while at the rank of Assistant Professor.
- At least satisfactory Service to the university, community, and discipline while at the rank of Assistant Professor.
- A positive working relationship with faculty members in the Department.
- Favorable reference letters from outside evaluators.

Full Professor. In addition to the qualifications for Associate Professor, evidence of rank includes evidence of:

- Impact on the geoscience discipline at a regional, national, or international level.
- Excellence in Teaching while at the rank of Associate Professor.
- Excellence in Scholarship or Service while at the rank of Associate Professor.
- A positive working relationship with faculty members in the Department.
- Favorable reference letters from outside evaluators.

RTA Ranks. The responsibilities of a faculty member appointed to one of the lecturer ranks are focused on undergraduate education, with an expectation that the faculty member has at least a 60% (or some other percentage determined by department and the faculty member) teaching appointment. Lecturer appointments may include expectations for student advising, departmental service related to their instructional role, and/or scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. The evaluation and promotion process will consider their contributions and achievement in light of the expectations set forth in the appointment. There is no expectation or maximum timeline for a Lecturer to be promoted to Senior Lecturer/Principal Lecturer. Applying for such promotions is not required by the Lecturer. Should a Lecturer choose to pursue this option, they should discuss it with the AUH and the AUPAC Chair. The minimum timeline to apply is 6 years (similar to TT faculty, unless a compelling case can be made, see below). RTA faculty interested in considering promotion must undergo mid-probationary evaluation as described in Section 4.

In the case where an RTA is in the Assistant Professor through Full Professor progression, the qualifications for rank advancement are parallel to lecturer to Senior Lecturer progression, as described below.

Lecturer (or RTA Assistant Professor). The rank of lecturer is used for individuals within the academic unit whose primary responsibility is teaching. Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers, participate in professional service activities, and be engaged in activities that support professional development. Lecturers may perform other tasks as required by the department including, but not limited to: student advising, revising courses and curricula, and other administrative duties. Lecturers must have earned a minimum of a master's degree in the geosciences or a related field, and have work experience and/or professional certifications that meet SACSCOC and other departmental/college accreditation requirements. RTA Assistant Professor rank must have an earned doctorate in a Geoscience field

Senior Lecturer (or RTA Associate Professor). In addition to the requirements of Lecturer, the rank of Senior Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of mastery teaching and service performance, and provide evidence of continued professional development in their field of study. Scholarly achievement (e.g., scholarship and publication) are not typically an expectation of a lecturer, but such accomplishments may be considered as part of the evaluation for promotion. In addition, Senior Lecturers may be tasked with mentoring colleagues and undergraduate students, assisting with the development of courses or curricula, and have a sustained record of external outreach.

Principal Lecturer (or RTA Full Professor). In addition to the requirements of Senior Lecturer, the rank of Principal Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and service performance, evidence of recognition (e.g., awards, etc.) in the areas of teaching and/or professional service, and evidence of continued professional development in their field of study. In addition, a Principal Lecturer may be expected to have a considerable role in

departmental leadership in areas such as mentoring colleagues and teaching assistants, leading course development or curricula changes, and/or guiding special instructional initiatives.

5.3 Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion. It is not commonly advisable for a faculty member to apply for tenure and/or promotion ahead of the schedule that was agreed upon when they were hired. However, in very rare instances it may be possible to do so. Such instances will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and it is incumbent upon the faculty member to put forward a compelling case.

At a minimum, to achieve early tenure and/or promotion a tenure track faculty member's compelling case must include the following:

- Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and/or Tenure
 - Minimum of four years in full-time academic position.
 - Excellent in two categories, but one must be in teaching.
 - Proof of exemplary scholarship continuing at JMU, including letters of support from colleagues familiar with the candidate's work (may be internal or external to JMU).
 - The AUH will consult with the Dean of the College prior to submission of materials. These consultations shall occur mid-late spring semester prior to the academic year that the candidate would be submitting their application.
- Associate Professor to Full Professor
 - Minimum of four years since last promotion.
 - Excellent in all three categories.
 - Proof of exemplary scholarship continuing at JMU, including letters of support from external colleagues familiar with the candidate's work (may be internal or external to JMU).
 - The AUH will consult with the Dean of the College prior to submission of materials. These consultations shall occur no later than April 15th prior to the academic year that the candidate would be submitting their application.


At a minimum, to achieve early promotion a RTA track faculty member's compelling case must include the following:

- Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
 - Minimum of four years in full-time academic position.
 - Excellent in teaching.
 - Proof of leadership in departmental curriculum and instruction initiatives.
 - Proof of exemplary outreach continuing at JMU, including letters of support from colleagues familiar with candidate's work (may be internal or external to JMU).

- The AUH will consult with the Dean of the College prior to submission of materials. These consultations shall occur no later than April 15th prior to the academic year that the candidate would be submitting their application.
- Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer
 - Minimum of four years since last promotion.
 - Excellent in two areas (teaching, service or research).
 - Proof of leadership in curriculum and instruction initiatives beyond the department level.
 - Proof of exemplary outreach continuing at JMU, including letters of support from colleagues familiar with candidate's work (may be internal or external to JMU).
 - The AUH will consult with the Dean of the College prior to submission of materials. These consultations shall occur no later than April 15th prior to the academic year that the candidate would be submitting their application.

All contractual agreements supersede the above policy. Time in rank plus achieving the appropriate recommendations by the Dean and AUH does not guarantee the granting of early tenure or promotion, as decisions ultimately lie with the Provost, President, and Board of Visitors, in sequence.

Approval by the Dean of CSM:

 8/23/2023

Approval by the Provost: 1/8/2024