



Office of the Provost

School of Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communication

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2023

Office of the Provost
James Madison University

MSC 7607
Alumnae Hall, Room 102
91 Alumnae Drive
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
540.568.3429

Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communication Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Revised Spring 2023

Table of Contents

Initial Evaluation.....1
Third Year Review.....2
Annual Evaluation Conferences.....4
Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.....5
Tenure-Track Faculty Members Promotion Guidelines.....9
Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion.....15
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Promotion Guidelines.....15
Non-Tenure-Track Rank Descriptions.....21
Appeals.....21
Purpose and Membership of AUPAC.....21

1. Initial Evaluation

The purpose of a faculty member’s Initial Evaluation is for the AUH and AUPAC to provide supportive feedback that helps new faculty understand their current performance and identify areas that might benefit from support and mentorship. The Initial Evaluation follows the Annual Evaluation categories and new faculty are expected to demonstrate progress in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

New faculty will meet with the AUH between the third and fifth week of the fall semester. During the conference, the AUH will provide the faculty member with current tenure and promotion guidelines and copies of annual evaluation materials (i.e., Annual Evaluation Worksheet, Annual Faculty Evaluation Template, and Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan). After the initial conference, the faculty member and AUH will determine a date for the AUH to visit one of the faculty member’s class sections. The purpose of the class visit is to gather information for the Teaching category of the Annual Faculty Evaluation.

Between the third and fifth week of the spring semester, newly hired faculty will meet with the AUH to discuss the Initial Evaluation. At least one week prior to the conference, the faculty member should submit to the AUH the following:

- Draft of the Annual Evaluation letter template, which highlights “fall semester only” accomplishments

- Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP), which should include tentative information about plans for the following fall as well as information about planned activities for the current spring semester

The AUH will submit to the faculty member their Initial Evaluation letter by the first Tuesday in February. The Dean will also receive a copy.

The faculty member will submit updated versions of the Annual Evaluation Worksheet, Annual Faculty Evaluation Template, and Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan as part of their regular annual review process.

2. Third-Year Review of Eligible Faculty (Eligible refers to full-time untenured and/or promotable)

It is recommended that regular and frequent conversations between new WRTC faculty begin during the first year of a faculty member's date of service. Such discussions should include senior faculty, members of the AUPAC, and the AUH, as necessary. It is also recommended that faculty regularly review the department's tenure and promotion criteria and discuss the department's criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service, with the AUH and AUPAC. At the time of annual evaluation, the AUH should give the faculty member a clear idea of progress toward a successful pre-tenure review, indicating specifically any performance areas in which the faculty member needs to improve.

Third-Year Review: Because the achievement of tenure and promotion is one of the most important milestones in a faculty member's career, faculty are required to complete an extensive review process during the third year of eligibility in a tenure-track or promotion-eligible position ("3rd- Year Review"). During this process, the faculty member submits materials demonstrating satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion. While the AUH and AUPAC's recommendations are based on the standards and procedures for promotion and/or tenure, the purpose of 3rd-Year Review is to provide promotable faculty with a useful, formative evaluation.

The AUH and AUPAC consult on procedures and conduct of the Third-Year Review; however, each party independently reviews the faculty member's materials and composes a cover memorandum review that goes directly to the faculty member.

PROCEDURE

Last Week of Fall Classes: The AUPAC Chair meets with candidates to go over procedures.

Third Monday in February: This is the deadline for the candidate to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, and professional service.

Note: While the Third-Year Review is submitted in lieu of a full annual review, the faculty member is still required to submit a one-page summary of that year's activities along with the Annual Evaluation Letter Template.

Materials should include separate narratives for contributions in areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.

1. The **teaching narrative** should refer to the candidate's philosophy of teaching, approaches in the classroom, specific syllabi, assignments, and course evaluations.
2. The **scholarship narrative** must describe achievements and projects in progress noting, as far as possible, the expected dates of forthcoming scholarly events.
3. The **service narrative** should refer to service to the academic unit, the college, the university, and the faculty member's professional community.

The faculty member must also provide:

- CV
- All syllabi
- Sample assignments from each course
- Samples of evaluated papers from a variety of courses
- Copies of all student evaluations for all courses
- Copies of all departmental annual evaluations
- All publications: books, journal articles, creative work, etc.
- Copies of all papers presented at panels, conferences, academic proceedings
- List of events, creative performances, readings, guest lectures with documentation • List of awards, honors, etc.
- Documentation of service to academic unity, college, university, professional and civic community

April 15: To provide a purposeful, formative evaluation, the AUH should give each person applying for promotion a cover memorandum specifying one of these four results and the reasoning behind the result:

- a) The faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and/or tenure and no specific recommendations for improvement are necessary.
- b) The faculty member is making progress towards promotion and tenure but it is recommended that improvements be made. (State specific recommendation.)
- c) The faculty member is not making progress towards promotion and/or tenure but improvements may yet be made. (State specific recommendation)
- d) The faculty member is not making progress towards tenure, and it is recommended that additional employment contracts not be issued.

Recommendation (a) and (b) correspond to a satisfactory result. Recommendation (c) and (d) correspond to an unsatisfactory result.

The AUH will meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her materials and the cover memos and to conclude by offering him or her an opportunity to provide a written response to be appended to the report. Copies of both cover memos go into the candidate's personnel file and to the Dean of the college.

Note: Pre-tenure review is to be candid, formative, and future-oriented. However, a positive pretenure review does not guarantee tenure or promotion.

3. Annual Evaluation Conferences for Returning Faculty (applies to ALL ranks)

All faculty beyond their first year in the department are encouraged—but not required—to meet with the AUH to discuss their annual evaluation letters and anticipated activity (FAAP) documents. Per the *Faculty Handbook*, the AUH distributes these letters to faculty by October 1. Evaluation Conferences (if requested by the faculty member) take place after the faculty member receives the evaluation letter. The *Faculty Handbook* also notes that, regardless of whether an Evaluation Conference was requested by the faculty member, there is “a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation” for a faculty member to appeal any evaluation decisions made by the AUH. See the *Faculty Handbook* for appeal information.

4. Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

The AUPAC and AUH evaluate the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching: Satisfactory

In their annual review, a faculty member should provide evidence in the categories below to support a satisfactory rating in teaching:

- Teaches relevant and well-prepared material
- Receives generally favorable student evaluations
- Works to improve teaching by attending conferences, courses, or workshops
- Responds appropriately to annual evaluations, providing evidence of change or satisfactorily addressing disagreement
- Meets the “working conditions” outlined in the university’s *Faculty Handbook*, including advising students, keeping office hours, and meeting classes as scheduled

Teaching: Excellent

In addition to the items listed under “Satisfactory,” a faculty member being evaluated for their annual review should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in two or more of the categories below to support an excellent rating in teaching. Evidence should demonstrate effectiveness and commitment beyond meeting course, mentoring or advising requirements:

- Receives favorable peer evaluations
- Receives generally superior student evaluations*
- Develops new courses or significantly revises existing courses
- Demonstrates an exceptional contribution to teaching through mentorship of teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and/or Writing Center tutors
- Chairs theses or practicums
- Conducts teaching-related workshops that have a significant impact on the work of other teachers
- Develops creative teaching methods, including (but not limited to) significant engagement in team or interdisciplinary teaching, or service as a guest lecturer or consultant. Other examples might include the innovative use of outside resources and instructional alternatives such as guest speakers, field trips, visiting artists and scholars

- Implements innovative technology in courses
- Demonstrates superior achievement in academic advising, directing internships, career counseling, independent studies, or mentoring students
- Enhances instructional development by securing university, state, or local grants in support of teaching
- Earns teaching awards or other recognition of excellence in teaching

*Teaching evaluations may be used in conjunction with other evidence to show satisfactory teaching or excellence in teaching, but they cannot be used as the sole measure of teaching.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: Satisfactory

A faculty member should provide evidence of at least one of the following to support a satisfactory rating in scholarship:

- Presentation or active participation in national or international program or conference
- Application for, or receipt of, a university-sponsored, internal, travel, or professional development grant
- Organizing a national or international research project
- Publication of podcasts, multimedia projects, technical communication documents, and similar projects
- Participating in community engagement projects. This could include (but is not limited to): organizing community workshops; creating educational materials or resources for use by community organizations; building archives, databases, displays, exhibits, or other materials that support community efforts; usability testing, development of training materials or programs, consulting work, social media, web design.

In all cases, faculty members should present accompanying evidence describing the impact and contribution such scholarly or professional work has in the discipline. Note that while the annual guidelines allow faculty members to earn satisfactory ratings *without* publication in an individual academic year, a faculty member cannot earn promotion and/or tenure without this cumulative evidence of scholarly productivity.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: Excellent

In addition to the items listed under “Satisfactory” above, a faculty member being evaluated for their annual review should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in two or more of the categories to support an excellent rating in professional and scholarly achievement:

- A published article, scholarly essay, or creative work in refereed or objectively evaluated journals or competitive, professional media. This includes book chapters, refereed online venues or recognized electronic publications, and juried or refereed competitions.
- A book published by a recognized press. (Book publications count for two years)
- An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field. (If the faculty member is both the editor and contributor, this counts for two years.)
- Presentations at a refereed/juried state, regional, national, or international conference, including recognized online conferences
- Significant participation in professional conferences (state, regional, national, or international) in the faculty member’s discipline. “Participation” may come in the form of a panel discussion, focus group, or other comparable activity
- Consultations to improve the faculty member’s academic discipline
- Serving on an editorial board of a leading state, regional, national, or international academic journal or serving as editor of an online journal
- Organizing or presenting at local, regional, national, or international workshops
- Publishing notes, reviews, or short entries in academic or professional journals, books, or reference publications
- Application or receipt of a significant research grant or funding
- Receiving awards or other honors for scholarship
- Editing technical manuals, instructions, or websites for professionals in the faculty member’s field

Professional Service: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for their annual review should provide evidence from the following items as appropriate to support a satisfactory rating in professional service:

- Participates in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at scheduled WRTC faculty meetings and activities
- Actively serves on at least two department, college, or university committees
- Service in comparable special assignments, either internally or externally, which may have been substituted for committee assignments

Professional Service: Excellent

In addition to the requirements for satisfactory, a faculty member should provide evidence as appropriate of one item or more from the categories below to support an excellent rating in professional service:

Internal Professional Service

- Directing multiple on-campus workshops
- Performing significant service on additional WRTC, college, university, or *ad hoc* committees
- Excellent performance as chair of a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Developing new on-campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of WRTC, the college, or the university
- Organizing on-campus activities that contribute significantly to the enrichment of WRTC's mission

External Professional Service

- Serving as reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, or a book
- Serving as program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference
- Serving as an officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

Community Service

- Participating on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Developing classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participating in service to the community

5. Tenure-Track Faculty Members Promotion Guidelines

Evaluation for promotion and tenure in Writing, Rhetoric & Technical Communication is considered in the three areas outlined in the *JMU Faculty Handbook: Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications*, and Professional Service.

The AUH and a subcommittee of the AUPAC review all applications for tenure and promotion. The AUPAC and the AUH make separate recommendations to the Dean on each application for promotion and/or tenure.

When a faculty member applies for Full Professor, a subcommittee of the AUPAC must include at least three Full Professors with consideration to the faculty member's area of expertise. If the AUPAC does not consist of three Full Professors, an *ad hoc* committee will be formed. The three Full Professors, working in concert with AUPAC, will come to a consensus about a candidate's application.

Tenure-track faculty are evaluated across a range of activities, contributions, and accomplishments, as outlined below. Evaluation criteria reflect the diversity of faculty interests and areas within WRTC.

When applying for tenure or promotion, faculty members submit a dossier that illuminates their progress in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Applicants should emphasize the value of their specific achievements and offer supporting documents in evidence of those achievements.

In addition to the dossier, the AUH and AUPAC consider "patterns of prior annual evaluations" in making promotion and tenure decisions, as prescribed by *The Faculty Handbook*. As such, WRTC uses a summative evaluation, wherein the preponderance of previous ratings from annual evaluations, along with the faculty member's promotion/tenure dossier, collectively determine the ratings for tenure and promotion. The ratings for tenure and promotion follow those articulated in the *Faculty Handbook* and are restricted to "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," and "excellent."

Tenure-Track Promotion

- Tenure and Assistant to Associate Professor: five years in rank, excellent rating in teaching or scholarship and at least satisfactory in the other two
- Associate to Full Professor: five years in rank, excellent rating in teaching and one other category, and at least satisfactory in the third

A tenure-track faculty member who applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank must present compelling evidence of accomplishment. The requirements in such cases are outlined in Section 7.

In making their evaluation for promotion or tenure, AUPAC and AUH are not limited to those materials submitted by the candidate and may conduct a review of a candidate's departmental file.

These policies can be modified with majority vote of promotion-track faculty.

PROMOTION GUIDELINES: Tenure-Track Faculty

The AUPAC and AUH evaluate the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence in the categories below to support a satisfactory rating in teaching:

- Teaches relevant and well-prepared material
- Receives generally favorable student evaluations
- Works to improve teaching by attending conferences, courses, or workshops
- Responds appropriately to annual evaluations, providing evidence of change or satisfactorily addressing disagreement
- Meets the "working conditions" outlined in the university's *Faculty Handbook*, including advising students, keeping office hours, and meeting classes as scheduled

Teaching: Excellent

In addition to the items listed under “Satisfactory,” a faculty member being evaluated for their promotion or tenure should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in two or more of the categories below to support an excellent rating in teaching. Evidence should demonstrate effectiveness and commitment beyond meeting course, mentoring, or advising requirements:

- Receives favorable peer evaluations
- Receives generally superior student evaluations*
- Develops new courses or significantly revises existing courses
- Demonstrates an exceptional contribution to teaching through mentorship of teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and/or Writing Center tutors
- Chairs theses or practicums
- Conducts teaching-related workshops that have a significant impact on the work of other teachers
- Develops creative teaching methods, including (but not limited to) significant engagement in team or interdisciplinary teaching, or service as a guest lecturer or consultant. Other examples might include the innovative use of outside resources and instructional alternatives such as guest speakers, field trips, visiting artists and scholars
- Implements innovative technology in courses
- Demonstrates superior achievement in academic advising, directing internships, career counseling, independent studies, or mentoring students
- Enhances instructional development by securing university, state, or local grants in support of teaching
- Earns teaching awards or other recognition of excellence in teaching

*Teaching evaluations may be used in conjunction with other evidence to show satisfactory teaching or excellence in teaching, but they cannot be used as the sole measure of teaching.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence of at least one of the following to support a satisfactory rating in scholarship:

1. A book published by a recognized press.
2. An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field.
3. At least three published articles, scholarly essays, or creative works in refereed or objectively evaluated journals or competitive, professional media. This includes book chapters, refereed online venues or recognized electronic publications, and juried or refereed competitions.
4. The receipt of a major grant or a participation in national or international program of recognized, organized research may also be considered.

Note that while the annual guidelines allow faculty members to earn satisfactory ratings *without* publication in an individual academic year, a faculty member cannot earn promotion and/or tenure without this cumulative evidence of publication.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: Excellent

In addition to the items listed under “Satisfactory” above, a faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in two or more of the categories to support an excellent rating in professional and scholarly achievement:

- A published article, scholarly essay, or creative work in refereed or objectively evaluated journals or competitive, professional media. This includes book chapters, refereed online venues or recognized electronic publications, and juried or refereed competitions.
- A book published by a recognized press.
- An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field. (If the faculty member is both the editor and contributor, this counts for two years.)
- Presentations at a refereed/juried state, regional, national, or international conference, including recognized online conferences
- Significant participation in professional conferences (state, regional, national, or international) in the faculty member’s discipline. “Participation” may come in the form of a panel discussion, focus group, or other comparable activity
- Consultations to improve the faculty member’s academic discipline

- Serving on an editorial board of a leading state, regional, national, or international academic journal or serving as editor of an online journal
- Organizing or presenting at local, regional, national, or international workshops
- Publishing notes, reviews, or short entries in academic or professional journals, books, or reference publications
- Application or receipt of a significant research grant or funding
- Receiving awards or other honors for scholarship
- Editing technical manuals, instructions, or websites for professionals in the faculty member's field

Please note that letters of acceptance for recent or forthcoming work may be submitted and evaluated in the promotion or tenure application.

Professional Service: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence from the following items as appropriate to support a satisfactory rating in professional service:

- Participates in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at scheduled WRTC faculty meetings and activities
- Serves actively on at least two department, college, or university committees
- Service in comparable special assignments, either internally or externally, which may have been substituted for committee assignments

Professional Service: Excellent

In addition to the requirements for satisfactory, a faculty member should provide evidence as appropriate of one item or more from the categories below to support an excellent rating in professional service:

Internal Professional Service

- Directing multiple on-campus workshops

- Performing significant service on additional WRTC, college, university, or *ad hoc* committees
- Excellent performance as chair of a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Developing new on-campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of WRTC, the college, or the university
- Organizing on-campus activities that contribute significantly to the enrichment of WRTC's mission

External Professional Service

- Serving as reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, or a book
- Serving as program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference
- Serving as an officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

Community Service

- Participating on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Developing classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participating in service to the community

6. Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion

If a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, they must present compelling evidence of accomplishment to be awarded promotion. WRTC follows the [Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion](#) guidelines outlined by the College of Arts and Letters regarding criteria for early tenure and promotion.

7. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Promotion Guidelines

The AUPAC and AUH evaluate the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Non-tenure-track faculty members must earn an excellent rating in teaching to be considered for promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer.

Non-Tenure-Track Promotion

- Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: five years in rank, excellent rating in teaching and at least satisfactory in the other two categories
- Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer: five years in rank, excellent rating in teaching and one other category, and at least satisfactory in the third

A non-tenure track faculty member who applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank must present compelling evidence of accomplishment. The requirements governing such cases are outlined separately.

PROMOTION GUIDELINES: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Teaching: Excellent

Non-Tenure-Track faculty members being evaluated for promotion should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in four or more of the categories below to support an excellent rating in teaching within the evaluation period (typically, the previous five years*). Evidence should demonstrate effectiveness and commitment beyond meeting course, mentoring, or advising requirements:

- Receives favorable peer evaluations
- Develops new courses (special topics, new curricula for major)
- Revises assigned courses, ensuring they are current in the discipline
- Improves teaching through participation in conferences, courses, or workshops (faculty members will need to demonstrate that they have applied this knowledge and/or new methodologies in their courses)
- Develops creative teaching methods, including (but not limited to) significant engagement in team or interdisciplinary teaching or the innovative use of outside resources and instructional alternatives such as guest speakers, field trips, or visiting artists/scholars
- Conducts teaching-related workshops at the departmental, university, or disciplinary level

- Makes contributions to assessment that impact teaching across the unit, college, and/or university
- Serves as a consultant or invited guest speaker on teaching or on areas of expertise
- Demonstrates significant, regular contributions to student consultation efforts (“tutoring”) through work at the Writing Center, Learning Centers, or Libraries (evidence may include student testimonials, peer and/or supervisor evaluations)
- Plays an active role in student success and achievement by writing letters of recommendation and/or nominating student work for conferences, publication, or awards
- Takes on teaching courses new to the faculty member
- Promotes equity, access, and inclusion in one’s teaching methods and/or course content
- Publishes pedagogical materials such as a teaching-related note, commentary, curricular material, or article in a refereed publication (may be used to support teaching or scholarship, but not both)
- Maintains a pattern of generally favorable student evaluations
- Contributes to teaching excellence through mentorship of teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and/or adjunct faculty
- Demonstrates achievement in academic advising, internship, career counseling, or independent studies
- Enhances instructional development by securing university, state, or local grants in support of teaching
- Earns teaching awards or other recognitions in teaching
- Chairs theses or practicums
- Serves as a reader for student theses, practicums, or graduate internships

*Note: Non-tenure-track faculty members whose hiring precedes JMU’s introduction of the RTA promotion path to Senior Lecturer may include evidence from the previous 10 years.

As non-TT faculty members are expected to devote the majority of their energies to teaching, there is no requirement or benchmark of peer-reviewed or otherwise objective publications to be considered for promotion. However, non-TT faculty must have earned annual ratings of satisfactory or excellent in scholarship in each of the previous five years leading to promotion.

Non-TT faculty members being evaluated for promotion must include a summary and evidence of continued scholarly and/or professional development in their application.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development: Satisfactory

A faculty member applying for promotion should provide evidence that they have actively kept abreast of current issues and best practices in teaching and in the discipline. This can include participation in a range of professional development activities, such as the following:

- Participates in and/or attends disciplinary conferences on the local, regional, national and/or international levels
- Participates in and/or attends workshops devoted to teaching or disciplinary content and/or methods
- Conducts research for creative or scholarly work
- Authors and submits proposals for conferences, workshops, or publications
- Develops teaching or disciplinary materials such as a teaching-related note, commentary, curricular material, or article in a refereed publication

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development: Excellent

A mainstay of the excellent rating in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development is the *production and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge*. Senior Lecturers who wish to apply for Principal Lecturer may provide evidence of at least one of the following to support an Excellent rating in scholarship within the evaluation period:

- Regular (at least three) presentations at regional, national, or international conferences
- Receipt/award of a research or teaching grant
- Creation of teaching or research materials or a creative work that is disseminated to a large audience
- Recognition as an expert in the field through interview requests, invitations to speak at professional events, and similar activities
- A book published by a recognized press

- An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing, or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field
- Publication of a scholarly article, book chapter, or longer creative/professional work in a refereed or objectively evaluated publication, including selective conference proceedings
- Publication of several (at least three) shorter academic, civic, or literary pieces in an objectively evaluated reputable online or print periodicals (to include letters to editors, commentaries, guest editorials, introductions to texts, etc.)
- Participation in a local, national, or international program of recognized, organized research/intellectual work

Note that letters of acceptance for recent or forthcoming work may be submitted and evaluated in the promotion or tenure application.

Professional Service: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence from the following items as appropriate to support a satisfactory rating in professional service:

- Participates in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at faculty meetings and activities
- Serves actively regularly on assigned department, college, or university committees
- Serves in comparable special assignments, either internally or externally, which may be substituted for committee assignments

Professional Service: Excellent

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in one or more of the categories below to support an excellent rating in professional service:

Internal Professional Service

- Directs on-campus workshops, brown bags, or related activities
- Make regular contributions to two department, college, or university committees as assigned
- Performs service on additional WRTC, college, university, or *ad hoc* committees

- Chairs a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Organizes on-campus programs or activities that contribute to the enrichment of WRTC
- Conducts peer evaluations, including class observations and consultations
- Advises majors as assigned
- Serves as adviser for new majors, minors, transfer, or first-year students
- Recruits students to the major through participation in open houses, CHOICES, and other recruitment activities

External Professional Service

Serves in a professional capacity for such activities as:

- Reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, a book, or competitions
- Reviewer or class-tester of texts and materials for a publisher
- Reviewer/evaluator of student-produced materials for competitions or course equivalency credit
- Program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference
- Officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

Community Service

- Participates on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Develops classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participates in service to the community

8. Non-Tenure-Track Rank Descriptions

Lecturer: Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers, participate in professional service activities, and engage in activities that support professional/scholarly 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 discipline, or related field, and have work experience and/or professional certifications that meet SACSCOC and other departmental/college accreditation requirements.

Senior Lecturer: The Senior Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of expert teaching and provide evidence of continued service and professional/scholarly development in their field of study. Scholarly achievement (e.g., scholarship and publication) is not a requirement, but such accomplishments may be considered as part of the evaluation for promotion. 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: The Principal Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and excellence in either service or professional/scholarly development in their field of study. In addition, a Principal Lecturer may be expected to have a considerable role in mentoring colleagues and graduate teaching assistants, leading course development or curricular changes, and guiding special instructional initiatives.

9. Appeals

If a faculty member is denied tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member can appeal the decision following the expectations articulated in *The Faculty Handbook* under Section III.E.7.f.(9-11).

10. Purpose and Membership of AUPAC

The Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) of the School of Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communication (WRTC) reviews faculty qualifications and helps maintain standards regarding performance of the School's faculty in tenure-track and renewable term appointment (RTA) positions.

The AUPAC is elected annually by all full-time members of the department, as stated in the *Faculty Handbook*. The AUPAC works independently of the AUH in conducting Third-Year Reviews and in reviewing applications and making recommendations for promotion and tenure. All decisions of the AUPAC require only a majority vote.

AUPAC consists of three tenured members, one tenured or tenure-track member, and one nontenure track member. A list of qualifying faculty in each rank is distributed in advance of a

vote so faculty can distribute nominations; members are determined by a majority vote, and each member serves a two-year term. AUPAC is accountable to both WRTC faculty and administration.

Eligibility, Election, and Terms

Members are elected by faculty to two-year terms. All full-time tenured, tenure-track and nontenure track faculty (RTAs) are eligible. Faculty occupying hybrid or shared positions with other units are also eligible, provided the voting faculty is informed of their status prior to election. The AUPAC should include at least three tenured faculty, the minimum necessary in order to carry out its responsibilities in tenure decisions. One position on the AUPAC is reserved for a non-tenured faculty member.

In cases where there are not enough tenured faculty on the AUPAC or within the department to carry out the AUPAC's duties in tenure decisions, candidates may nominate tenured faculty from other departments to serve on their tenure subcommittee. The AUH consults with the AUPAC on whether to accept this nomination or to seek another appointment.

Faculty members may be elected to consecutive terms. For reasons of continuity, no more than three AUPAC members should rotate out of the AUPAC at one time.

The AUH is not eligible to serve on the AUPAC.

The chair is elected by the members of the AUPAC and serves two years in that role. The chair then remains on the AUPAC for an additional year to advise the newly elected chair. Total service time on the AUPAC may not amount to more than three years (i.e., a person elected chair in their second year serves one year as chair, and then advises one year).

The AUPAC consists of five members plus the former chair (up to six). The former chair does not retain voting rights.

The AUPAC chair keeps track of members' terms and calls for election of new members in the spring. New AUPAC members are elected by a simple majority vote of full-time faculty. Fulltime faculty occupying hybrid or shared appointments with WRTC may also vote.

The AUH does not vote in AUPAC elections.

An incoming AUPAC chair is elected by the AUPAC at the end of spring semester. The chair must have tenure.

Confidentiality and Conduct

All members of the AUPAC are expected to adhere to the strictest code of professional ethics regarding the confidentiality of all their deliberations regarding individual faculty (e.g., performance evaluations and promotion decisions). Confidentiality restrictions do not apply to

deliberations about general policies and procedures. Failure to maintain confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the AUPAC or for a misconduct charge under *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.A.25.

The AUPAC may by majority vote of the committee as a whole remove a member of the committee for violation of AUPAC rules. Any such action is subject to review by the AUH and the dean.

AUPAC members may not participate in evaluations, recommendations, or decisions concerning family members, spouses, or domestic partners.

If for any reason a faculty member is unable to fulfill his or her duties, the chair will seek an immediate replacement by calling for nominations and holding a majority faculty vote.

Duties of AUPAC Members

1. AUPAC recommendations/decisions are required for the following: Third-Year Review, promotion and/or tenure evaluations, and appeals of annual reviews.
2. The AUPAC works independently of the AUH in reviewing applications and making recommendations for third-year review, promotion and/or tenure. All AUPAC members should observe as a group one class taught by faculty members under third-year review and candidates for promotion and/tenure before preparing recommendations.
3. The AUPAC advises faculty members in the preparation and submission of annual reviews to the AUH.
4. In addition, the AUPAC is responsible for hearing appeals of annual reviews made by faculty members. Faculty members have a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. In such cases, the AUPAC works with faculty members and the AUH to address disagreement. If necessary, the AUPAC conducts an independent review of the faculty member's materials utilizing the department's evaluation guidelines. The AUPAC may recommend that the AUH's evaluation be upheld or modified. This written recommendation is provided to the faculty member and the AUH, who may then alter the original evaluation or leave it unchanged. Both the AUH's evaluation and the AUPAC's written review are then forwarded to the dean and retained in the faculty member's personnel file.

Duties of Chair

1. The chair is responsible for meeting with all faculty who are candidates for Third-Year Review, promotion and/or tenure. This meeting is to familiarize faculty with the guidelines and procedures for the various evaluations as well as the relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty members are responsible for understanding these guidelines and procedures. The chair meets with upcoming candidates for promotion and/or tenure by the end of classes spring semester (The fall notification deadline is

September 1). The chair meets with candidates for Third-Year Review by the last week of classes in the fall.

2. AUPAC chairs will schedule AUPAC meetings in consultation with AUPAC members.