

**THE HART SCHOOL
OF
HOSPITALITY, SPORT AND RECREATION
MANAGEMENT
JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS
AUGUST 2019**

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT	4
HART SCHOOL MISSION STATEMENT	4
I. AUPAC COMPOSITION AND ROLE	5
A. COMPOSITION OF THE AUPAC	5
B. ROLE OF THE AUPAC	5
C. AUPAC CHAIR	6
D. ROLE OF THE AUPAC CHAIR	6
II. AUPAC PROCEDURES	6
A. VOTING	6
B. MEETING NOTES	6
C. REVISIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE HART SCHOOL AUPAC DOCUMENTS	7
III. PROMOTION AND TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE (PTS) COMPOSITION AND ROLE	8
A. COMPOSITION OF THE PTS	8
B. ROLE OF THE PTS	8
C. PTS CHAIR	8
D. ROLE OF PTS CHAIR	9
IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE (PTS) PROCEDURES	9
A. VOTING	9
B. MEETING NOTES	9
C. CONFIDENTIALITY	9
D. DISCUSSIONS WITH FACULTY APPLICANTS	9
E. ABSENT MEMBERS	10
F. PTS MEMBER RELATIONSHIPS TO APPLICANTS	10
V. EVALUATIONS	10
A. EVALUATION FUNDAMENTALS	10
B. INITIAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES	10
C. ANNUAL EVALUATION	11
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE	11
A. THIRD YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURES	11
B. JOINT APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	12
C. APPLYING FOR PROMOTION IN RANK	12

D. TENURE APPLICATIONS	15
E. EARLY PROMOTION/TENURE	17
F. PROMOTION AND TENURE PTS/AUH COLLEGIALITY AND FACULTY MEMBER MEETING.....	18
VII. COLLEGIALITY AND CONDUCT	19
ADDENDUM A: ANNUAL EVALUATION DOCUMENT	20
ADDENDUM B: PROMOTION AND TENURE AREAS OF EVALUATION AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE ...	33
ADDENDUM C: PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE STANDARDS OF EVALUATION.....	36

THE HART SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY, SPORT AND RECREATION MANAGEMENT FACULTY GOVERNANCE PRODECURES

(Adopted April 13, 2010; Revised August 2017, July 2018, January 2019, June 2019)

INTRODUCTION

The Hart School values teaching, scholarship and service activities that support the goals and objectives of the Hart School, the College of Business and James Madison University altogether as one.

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

James Madison University is a community committed to preparing students to be educated and enlightened citizens who lead productive and meaningful lives. The university strives to be the national model for the engaged university: engaged with ideas and the world.

HART SCHOOL MISSION STATEMENT

We are a community in creating an environment of quality education that integrates philosophy, theory, and practice while enhancing professional and personal growth of our students.

The purpose of evaluation of faculty members at James Madison University is to promote professionalism, to encourage performance at the highest levels and to indicate areas in which improvement is needed. Evaluations are also used in making personnel decisions, including allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review. (Faculty Handbook, III. E.)

This document is designed to guide the Academic Unit Head (AUH), the Hart School's Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC), and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (PTS) in the evaluations of the Hart School Faculty. There are four (4) types of evaluations: 1) Initial Evaluation; 2) Annual Evaluation; 3) Third Year Review (tenure-track faculty); and 4) Evaluation of Promotion and Tenure Applications (tenure-track faculty). Copies of all evaluations are maintained in a faculty member's personnel file (Faculty Handbook, III. E. & G.)

Additionally, as required in the JMU Faculty Handbook, this document provides information regarding the procedures and function of the Hart School AUPAC. This document is available to all Hart School faculty in electronic form on the Hart School common drive (N:\COB\SHSRM-Common\HART SCHOOL AUPAC\Promotion and Tenure Documents), and is provided to new faculty by the Hart School AUH upon completion of the hiring process. All Hart School faculty members are responsible for reading and making sure that they understand the information contained in this document, as well as all relevant material related to evaluation contained in the most recent revision of the JMU Faculty Handbook.

(<http://www.jmu.edu/facultyhandbook/index.shtml>)

I. AUPAC COMPOSITION AND ROLE

A. COMPOSITION OF THE AUPAC

- 1.** The Hart School Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (hereinafter “AUPAC”) shall consist of all full-time tenure-track faculty in the Hart School with the exception of the Academic Unit Head (hereinafter “AUH”). However, any faculty member who has not served as a full-time faculty member within the Hart School for at least one (1) complete academic year shall be entitled to attend all AUPAC meetings and be involved in all discussions, but shall not be entitled to vote on any AUPAC matters until he/she has completed one (1) academic year.
- 2.** Full-time faculty who hold Renewable Term Appointments (hereinafter “RTA”) shall only be entitled to be a part of AUPAC meetings and decisions when issues involving the RTA positions are on the agenda, such issues include but are not limited to the Annual Evaluation document and Student Course and Teaching Evaluations.
- 3.** AUPAC members on voluntary academic leave or otherwise unable to be physically present for any AUPAC meeting may participate and vote in those meetings via a mutually-agreed-upon alternative method.

B. ROLE OF THE AUPAC

- 1.** The Hart School Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) shall advise the AUH and make recommendations on personnel matters in the academic unit, and shall create and revise AUPAC Documents (Promotion and Tenure document, Third Year Review document, Annual Evaluation document and Student Course and Teaching Evaluation document).
- 2.** The promotion and tenure criteria contained in Addendums B and C may be modified by the AUPAC with the approval of a majority of the full-time faculty members in the academic unit, the AUH, dean and provost. (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.b.(4)/III.7.F.4)
- 3.** The AUPAC is responsible to the academic unit faculty and to the AUH for conducting its functions, and the Dean shall provide oversight of the work of the AUPAC to determine if it has followed appropriate procedures (Faculty Handbook III E.2.a). Matters related to promotion and tenure applications and annual evaluation appeals will be handled by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (PTS) described in Section III of this document.
- 4.** All members of the AUPAC must respect and maintain strict confidentiality of deliberations on all matters under their consideration. Failure to maintain confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the AUPAC and/or for a misconduct charge under Faculty Handbook, Section III.A.25.

C. AUPAC CHAIR

1. **CRITERIA:** The AUPAC Chair must be a tenured faculty member in the Hart School.
2. **LENGTH OF SERVICE:** The term of the AUPAC Chair is for a period of three (3) years. There is no limit on the number of terms, consecutive or non-consecutive, a faculty member may serve as Chair.
3. **SELECTION:** During the last sixty (60) days of the spring semester of the Chair's third year, a new Chair shall be chosen by AUPAC. Any tenured faculty member, including the outgoing Chair, may be nominated or may self-nominate for the position. The outgoing AUPAC Chair shall conduct a confidential vote, which may be by Qualtrics, email, or similar methods. The Chair shall tabulate and announce the result. If the outgoing AUPAC Chair is among those being voted on, or is unavailable for any reason, then the process and tabulation shall be conducted by another member from the AUPAC who is not nominated. The specifics of the voting, i.e. who voted for whom, shall be confidential and not be disclosed unless there is a challenge by one of the nominees.

D. ROLE OF THE AUPAC CHAIR

1. **AUPAC MEETINGS:** The Chair shall schedule and facilitate all AUPAC meetings, and shall create and maintain an accurate written account of the proceedings of the meetings, especially those which concern decisions of the AUPAC. The Chair shall conduct voting procedures.
2. **PARTICIPATION AND VOTING:** The Chair shall participate in all discussions and shall be entitled to vote on all matters decided by the AUPAC.

II. AUPAC PROCEDURES

A. VOTING

For any decisions to be made by the AUPAC, there must be a quorum of two-thirds (2/3) of the members present at the meeting for a vote to be called. Decisions shall be made by a majority vote. The results of all AUPAC votes will be recorded and maintained in hard copy by the AUPAC Chair for a period of one (1) year.

B. MEETING NOTES

The meetings may be recorded digitally to assist the Chair in compiling the information needed to write the decision letters. These recordings are to be maintained in strict confidence by the Chair for a period of one (1) year.

C. REVISIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE HART SCHOOL AUPAC DOCUMENTS

1. **REVISION SUBMISSIONS:** Revisions may be proposed to the AUPAC by any full-time faculty member in the Hart School, including the AUH. The proposal must be made in writing and submitted to the AUH and each AUPAC member by the end of the fall semester of the academic year.
2. **REVISION PROPOSAL CONTENTS:** The proposal for revision shall include the following:
 - a. The exact language which the member proposes to be changed, and the changes which are suggested to be made, if applicable;
 - b. The exact language or provision(s) which the member proposes to be inserted or included, if applicable;
 - c. The date on which the revision(s) should become effective; and
 - d. A statement as to why the member feels the revision(s) and effective date are warranted.
3. **DISCUSSION AND VOTING ON REVISION PROPOSAL:** No earlier than three (3) weeks after the last faculty member has received the proposed revision, the AUPAC Chair shall schedule a meeting of AUPAC members to discuss the proposal. At this meeting, there shall *not* be a vote on the proposal, but rather a discussion as to the merits of the proposal. At that meeting, the Chair shall schedule another meeting no earlier than one (1) week thereafter and no later than two (2) weeks thereafter, at which time further discussion will be had and a confidential vote taken on the proposal. However, if, at the first meeting, there is a quorum of two-thirds (2/3) of the members, the second meeting may be canceled and a confidential vote on the proposal may be held. Results will be based on majority vote. If the revision is submitted within a week of a holiday break, the deadlines above will be adjusted by the Chair accordingly.
4. **AUH INVOLVEMENT IN AUPAC DOCUMENT REVISION PROCESS:**
 - a. If the proposed revision(s) are approved, they shall be submitted to the AUH. The Chair shall be responsible for drafting a letter to the AUH which includes the proposed revision(s) and the results of the voting. The AUH shall then have one (1) week to either approve or disapprove the proposed revision(s) by notifying the Chair in writing or by email.
 - b. If the AUH approves the revision, the AUPAC Chair shall submit the new document, with the proposed revisions, to the Dean for approval. The Chair shall regularly keep members apprised of the status of the proposed revision(s). If approved by the Dean, the revision(s) will become

effective as of the date of the AUPAC vote. These changes will not be imposed on those who are at present in the tenure and promotion process.

- c. If the AUH disapproves the revision, the AUPAC Chair may request that the Dean resolve the differences between the AUPAC and AUH.

III. PROMOTION AND TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE (PTS) COMPOSITION AND ROLE

A. COMPOSITION OF THE PTS

There shall be a subcommittee of the AUPAC (Faculty Handbook III.E.2.a) designated as the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (hereinafter “PTS”). The Hart School PTS shall consist of all tenured faculty. However, any tenured faculty member may elect to abstain from the review of a particular application for promotion and/or tenure upon a showing of reasonable cause. Such “reasonable cause” shall be communicated to all PTS members who thereafter shall vote as to whether to grant the request for abstention. Having abstained from any review shall not disqualify the faculty member from reviewing any other or future applications for promotion and/or tenure.

B. ROLE OF THE PTS

1. Review all Hart School faculty applications for promotion and/or tenure;
2. Review and provide feedback, as herein further described, on all Third Year Review documents for tenure-track faculty;
3. Establish the procedures for promotion, tenure and Third Year Review. Unless circumstances require otherwise, the procedures for promotion, tenure, and Third Year Review shall be the same for purposes of consistency. These procedures will include deadlines for, and formats and expected contents of, the application and/or Third Year Review packet. These procedures will only apply to the timing, format, and process for the application and review which are not otherwise covered by this document and/or the Faculty Handbook. These procedures may change from year to year as decided by the PTS in order to address more efficient and/or appropriate methods.
4. Serve as the reviewing body for all appeals of annual evaluations.

C. PTS CHAIR

1. **SELECTION:** The AUPAC Chair shall also serve as the PTS Chair.

2. **LENGTH OF SERVICE:** The term of service shall be the same three (3) year period as he/she is the AUPAC Chair.

D. ROLE OF PTS CHAIR

1. **PTS MEETINGS:** The Chair shall schedule and facilitate all PTS meetings and shall create and maintain an accurate written account of the proceedings of the meetings, especially those which concern decisions of the PTS.
2. **PARTICIPATION AND VOTING:** The Chair shall schedule and facilitate PTS discussions. The Chair will lead the voting procedure. The Chair shall be entitled to participate in all discussions and to vote on all matters decided by the PTS.
3. **PTS CHAIR MEETINGS WITH NEW FACULTY MEMBERS:** The Chair shall meet individually with newly hired tenure-track faculty member within the first two months of the member's first semester in the Hart School. At that meeting, the Chair shall explain the Hart School promotion/tenure process and ensure that the member has a copy of this document and any accompanying documentation. The Chair shall also explain the Third Year Review process and provide the member with a copy of the procedures.

IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE (PTS) PROCEDURES

- A. **VOTING:** For any decisions to be made by the PTS, there must be a quorum of two-thirds (2/3) of the members in attendance, and decisions shall be made by a majority vote. The results of all AUPAC votes will be recorded and maintained in hard copy by the PTS Chair for a period of one (1) year.
- B. **MEETING NOTES:** The meetings may be recorded digitally to assist the Chair in compiling the information needed to write the decision letters. These recordings are to be maintained for a period of one (1) year in strict confidence by the Chair.
- C. **CONFIDENTIALITY:** All deliberations, discussions, conversations, information, and decisions which occur or are disclosed with regard to any promotion and tenure application, Third Year Review, or any other personnel matter deemed necessary for PTS review are strictly confidential. This includes prohibiting any communication to the applicant him/herself about the meetings or discussions, conversations, etc. therein. Failure to maintain this confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the PTS and AUPAC and/or for a misconduct charge under Faculty Handbook, Section III.A.25.
- D. **DISCUSSIONS WITH FACULTY APPLICANTS:** Notwithstanding the confidentiality provision above, PTS members may individually, i.e. in one-to-one meetings, answer procedural questions asked by an applicant whose application for promotion and/or tenure or Third Year Review is pending, but under no circumstances shall that discussion include, or relate to, the substance or merits

of the application and/or the deliberations, discussions, conversations, information and decisions of the PTS.

- E. ABSENT MEMBERS:** PTS members on voluntary academic leave or otherwise unable to be physically present at any PTS meetings may participate and vote in those meetings via a mutually agreed upon alternative method.
- F. PTS MEMBER RELATIONSHIPS TO APPLICANTS:** A member of the PTS shall not be allowed to attend or participate in meetings where his/her family member's, or a closely associated member's application for promotion and/or tenure is being discussed, considered, or decided. For purposes of this section, "family member" and "closely associated member" shall include a spouse, a domestic partner (i.e. anyone living together within the same household in a relationship similar to a marriage, whether same sex or not), any person related by second degrees of kinship or the third degree of lineage, and any person otherwise involved in a relationship that a reasonable person would see as having potential to limit the objective evaluation of the faculty member applying for promotion and/or tenure. In the event there is any disagreement or uncertainty as to whether or not a member is disqualified under this section, the AUPAC shall make the final decision through a confidential vote administered by the Chair.

V. EVALUATIONS

- A. EVALUATION FUNDAMENTALS:** The general considerations provided in the Faculty Handbook Section III.E.1 and its subsections are hereby incorporated into this document and made a part of hereof by this reference.
- B. INITIAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES:**
 - 1. GENERAL:** The policies and procedures which apply to the Initial Evaluation are found at FH III.E.3 et seq., and those policies and procedures are hereby adopted and incorporated herein and made a part hereof by this reference. The AUH shall provide a new faculty member with information concerning the Initial Evaluation, including the procedures and criteria during the first two months of the faculty member's first semester.
 - 2. TIMING OF INITIAL EVALUATION:** For the timing of the initial evaluation, please refer to the Faculty Handbook, III.E.3.
 - 3. AUPAC/PTS INVOLVEMENT IN INITIAL EVALUATION:** Neither AUPAC nor the PTS shall be involved in the Initial Evaluation, except, that the PTS shall review any faculty member for whom the AUH recommends non-renewal of appointment. (Faculty Handbook III.E.1.c).
 - 4. NON-RENEWAL AT INITIAL EVALUATION:** For more information on non-renewal at the initial evaluation stage, please refer to Faculty Handbook Section III.E.3.f.

C. ANNUAL EVALUATION

Annual Evaluation procedures and evaluation criteria are detailed in Addendum A, attached hereto and titled “Annual Evaluation Document”.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. THIRD YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. **PURPOSE OF THE THIRD YEAR REVIEW:** The Third Year Review, conducted as an independent evaluation by the PTS and the AUH is concerned with giving the faculty member constructive feedback on his/her body of work at the midpoint of the probationary period with the Hart School. The review should focus on evaluating the faculty member’s progress toward achieving promotion and tenure; however, it is not intended to be, and will not be, used as an indication of any kind as to whether the member will ultimately be promoted and/or be awarded tenure.
2. **SUBMISSION AND REVIEW DATES FOR THIRD YEAR REVIEW:** The faculty member being reviewed shall submit his/her Third Year Review packet to the PTS Chair and the AUH on or before January 10 of his/her third academic year. The PTS and AUH shall provide the faculty member with their written evaluation on or before March 1 of that same academic year. The directions for developing a packet for the Third Year Review can be found in Hart School AUPAC folder on the “N” drive.
3. **MEETING WITH PTS CHAIR REGARDING THIRD YEAR REVIEW:** During the first month of the academic year, the PTS Chair shall schedule a meeting with any member who is scheduled for a Third Year Review. The PTS Chair shall give the member a copy of the procedures for the Third Year Review packet and explain the procedures and process to the member during that meeting.
4. **THIRD YEAR REVIEW**
 - a. The review will address the criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in this document (See Addendum B) and will be a part of subsequent Tenure and Promotion application packets. The document is considered to be developmental in nature. The written evaluations must contain language stating that the results of the Third Year Review are in no way to be considered as an indication as to whether the faculty member is or is not likely to receive tenure and/or promotion. It is possible that a faculty member could receive excellent feedback in the third year evaluation, but then fail to be promoted and/or receive tenure due to a change in performance and/or expectations in subsequent years.
 - b. The PTS and AUH shall evaluate the work of the candidate in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional

service. The information to be shared with the candidate in the evaluation developed by the PTS will be approved by majority vote of this committee (See IV.A). The PTS Chair will then prepare a letter summarizing this feedback which includes any aspects of the candidate's work in which improvement is needed in order to be on course to receive tenure and/or promotion. The written evaluation should include any issues of concern as well as recognition of relevant accomplishments. Before the PTS Chair shares the letter with the faculty member, it will be submitted for approval by the PTS. The AUH will also create an evaluation letter for the faculty member. The letters will be given to the faculty member at the same time by the AUH and PTS Chair.

5. **MEMBERSHIP OF THIRD YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE:** All members of the PTS will participate in the Third Year Review process unless granted abstention for reasonable cause consistent with the procedure for abstention on promotion/tenure reviews. If there exists a disqualifying relationship as described in part IV (Promotion & Tenure Subcommittee Procedures), Section F of this document the PTS member will be granted abstention.
6. **FUTURE USE OF THIRD YEAR REVIEW:** Although the Third Year Review written evaluation reports by the PTS and the AUH are confidential, they may, and should, be used by the PTS and AUH in evaluating the member's future application(s) for promotion and/or tenure.
7. **POST REVIEW ELECTIVE MEETING:** After the written Third Year Review documents are given to the candidate, that faculty member, AUH, and/or PTS may request a meeting to discuss the review. In the event that a request is made to the AUH and/or the PTS Chair, the AUH and entire PTS shall be informed of such request. Both the AUH and the PTS Chair must be present at any meeting with the faculty member regarding the Third Year Review. Any other PTS member may also be present if he/she so desires, or the Chair or AUH deems it necessary.

B. JOINT APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

If a faculty member applies for both tenure and promotion in academic rank, the procedures and standards to be used are the tenure procedures and standards. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.a)

C. APPLYING FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DEADLINES:

The general considerations and deadlines concerning responses to an application for promotion are contained in Section III.E.6. et seq. of the Faculty Handbook. That section and its subsections are hereby incorporated into this document and made a part hereof by this reference. Refer to that section and its subsections for more information.

The promotion of a Hart School faculty member shall be determined by merit regardless of the distribution of faculty by academic rank within the academic unit. A faculty member may apply for promotion or may be nominated by the AUPAC or AUH. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for a recommendation for promotion.

- 2. NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY/NOMINATION FOR PROMOTION IN RANK:** Any faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion in rank shall give written notice of his/her intent to the AUPAC/PTS Chair and the AUH. This writing may be made via hard copy or through electronic means, such as email, and must be delivered to the AUPAC/PTS Chair and AUH on or before September 1 of the academic year in which he/she wishes to be considered for promotion (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.b.(1)). In the event the AUPAC, PTS or AUH wishes to nominate a faculty member, such nomination must be made in writing, with a copy provided to the non-nominating entities and to the member being nominated, by September 1. The faculty member shall have the option to accept or decline the nomination without prejudice.
- 3. SUBMISSION OF PROMOTION APPLICATION:** The application for promotion shall be submitted to the PTS Chair and AUH by October 1. The application shall comply with the procedures established by the PTS and shall include a summary of activities and accomplishment in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. Failure of the faculty member to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments by the October 1 deadline shall constitute a refusal of nomination or withdrawal of an application, to be considered for promotion, and no consideration of promotion is required. (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.b.(1))
- 4. AUH PROMOTION APPLICATION:** If an AUH applies for promotion in faculty rank, or is nominated for promotion, the AUH shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments, in all three (3) performance areas to the Dean and the PTS. The PTS will evaluate the performance of the AUH and make its recommendation to the Dean. All further procedures and policies concerning an AUH application are located in Faculty Handbook III.E.6.b, and those sections are hereby adopted and incorporated as a part of this Document and made a part hereof by this reference. (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.b.(1)).
- 5. COLLABORATION AND INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS FOR PROMOTION:** For faculty member applications for promotion, consultation between the PTS, AUH, and Dean is encouraged; however, the AUH and the PTS shall make independent evaluations of the facts and make independent recommendations concerning the application for promotion. (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.b.(3))

6. PTS COMPOSITION:

- a. **COMPOSITION:** There must be a minimum of three (3) Hart School tenured faculty members who hold an equal or higher rank as referred to above, to evaluate an application for tenure.
- b. **EXIGENCY:** In the event there is an application for promotion and there are not three (3) tenured faculty members in the Hart School at the rank or higher for which an applicant is applying, then the applicant will provide the AUH with a list of faculty members of the appropriate number to fill the empty seats on the committee. This will include a justification for why they are qualified to consider the application. These faculty members may be selected from any discipline at JMU. The AUH will approve the individuals or request additional faculty members for consideration.
- c. **NOTIFICATION:** The PTS Chair, or AUH, in the event that that the PTS Chair is the applicant, will contact those faculty members identified above to request participation on this committee.

7. PROMOTION STANDARDS:

In evaluating a faculty member for promotion in academic rank the following standards apply (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.a):

- a. To Assistant Professor: At least satisfactory ratings in three areas.
- b. To Associate Professor: An excellent rating in one area and at least satisfactory ratings in two areas.
- c. To Professor: Excellent ratings in two areas and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area.

Ratings will be determined by majority vote of the PTS (See IV.A of this document).

8. PROMOTION APPLICATION REVIEW AND CRITERIA UTILIZED:

- a. Recommendations on promotion in academic rank shall be justified by evaluating the faculty member in the three separate areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Professional Service. In each of these areas, the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate for promotion in academic rank. (Faculty Handbook III.E.6.a)
- b. To assist in guiding the PTS and AUH in evaluating an application for promotion and tenure, The Hart School AUPAC has developed general criteria. The criteria for evaluating Teaching, Scholarly Activities and

Professional Qualifications, and Service are set forth in two addendums attached hereto, namely: Addendum B: Areas of Evaluation and Possible Sources of Evidence; and Addendum C: Standards of Evaluation.

- c. In reviewing an application for promotion, a faculty member's pattern of prior Annual Evaluations, along with the Third Year Review, should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application or nomination for promotion, but the AUH and PTS should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion, and should clearly indicate a positive or negative recommendation on the promotion. (Faculty Handbook III.E.6) Although prior Annual Evaluations and the Third Year Review are to be considered, the PTS shall make its own independent evaluations of the member, and the PTS is not required to arrive at the same conclusions as did the AUH in his/her Annual Evaluations or Third Year Review. Thus, for example, it is possible that a faculty member may have received consistent ratings of "excellent" on his/her Annual Evaluations and Third Year Review from the AUH, but yet the PTS, after its review, may arrive at a different assessment of performance. It is hoped that the Third Year Review will aide in resolving any potential conflicts between the Annual Evaluations and the PTS determination.

D. TENURE APPLICATIONS

1. **GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DEADLINES:** The general considerations and deadlines concerning responses to an application for tenure are contained in Section III.E.7 of the Faculty Handbook. That section and its subsections are hereby incorporated into this document and made a part hereof by this reference. Refer to that section and its subsections for more information.
2. **PURPOSE OF TENURE:** Tenure is intended to protect academic freedom, provide a reasonable measure of employment security, and enable the University to retain a permanent instructional faculty of distinction. If an application for tenure also includes an application for promotion, the procedures and standards to be used are the tenure procedures and standards. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.a.)
3. **NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY FOR TENURE:** Any faculty member going into his/her penultimate year of the probationary period is not required by the Faculty Handbook to provide notice of his/her intent to apply for tenure; however, as a matter of courtesy, it is strongly encouraged that the faculty member send a written notice to the AUH and the Chair of the PTS on or before September 1 of his/her penultimate year. The written notice may be a hard copy or sent through electronic means such as email.
4. **PTS MEMBERS FOR TENURE REVIEW:** All tenured faculty members shall be members of the PTS for the purpose of evaluating an application for

tenure (Faculty Handbook III.E.2.a). A faculty member may request to serve while on leave or abstain from service see Section IV. E & F of this document.

5. SUBMISSION OF TENURE APPLICATION:

a. A faculty member must submit an electronic application for tenure to the PTS Chair and AUH on or before October 1 of his/her penultimate year of the probationary period. The application shall comply with the procedures established by the PTS, and shall include a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.f.(1)).

b. If a faculty member in his/her penultimate year of the probationary period fails to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments by the October 1 deadline, it shall be considered a resignation effective at the end of the probationary period, and no further applications for tenure may be submitted in the Hart School. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.a/III.E.7.f)

6. TENURE APPLICATION MEETING WITH PTS CHAIR: Within two (2) weeks of receiving the notice of intent to apply for tenure, the PTS Chair shall hold a meeting with any faculty member who has submitted notice of intent to apply for tenure, shall answer any questions about the procedures document, and shall answer any questions about the tenure application and/or review process.

7. COLLABORATION AND INDEPENDENT TENURE EVALUATIONS: Consultation between the PTS, AUH, and Dean is encouraged, however the AUH and the PTS shall make independent evaluations of the facts and make independent recommendations concerning the application for tenure. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.f.(3))

8. AUH TENURE APPLICATION: If an AUH applies for tenure, the AUH shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in all areas to the Dean and the PTS. The PTS will evaluate the AUH's performance and make a recommendation to the Dean. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.f.(1))

9. TENURE STANDARDS:

a. The award of tenure is based on the qualifications, performance, and conduct of individual faculty members and the long-term needs, objectives, and missions of the academic unit, college and university. To be awarded tenure, the faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for promotion to Associate Professor and should enhance the academic environment of the academic unit and the university. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e)

- b. Notwithstanding any other provision herein, candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall be evaluated pursuant to the criteria and procedures set forth herein at the time of his/her being hired; and candidates for promotion to professor shall be evaluated pursuant to the criteria and procedures set forth herein at the time he/she was promoted to Associate Professor. However, candidates may elect to use the most recent Hart School Promotion and Tenure procedures.
- c. Length of service is not a sufficient basis for a recommendation of tenure (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e).
- d. Tenure may be denied on any legitimate grounds, including the lack of need for a faculty member in the particular academic unit or academic specialization, program reduction or elimination, financial exigency, or conduct (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e).
- e. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate from tenure (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e).
- f. Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Professional Service shall be used in evaluating the performance of a candidate for tenure (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e).
- g. A faculty member's pattern of prior Annual Evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application for tenure, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on tenure (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.e).
- h. Recommendations on tenure shall be justified using the academic unit criteria and based on the standards for promotion to associate professor as set forth in Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.6.a. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.f.(4)). The PTS shall also take into consideration the respective weights/time allotted by the faculty member to each of the three areas being evaluated.

E. EARLY PROMOTION/TENURE:

1. **APPLICATION FOR EARLY PROMOTION/TENURE:** A faculty member may apply for tenure prior to the penultimate year of his/her probationary period and/or may apply for promotion prior to having completed five (5) years in academic rank, however any such application(s) will receive favorable review only if the faculty member presents *compelling evidence of accomplishment*. (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.b.)
2. **“COMPELLING EVIDENCE” FOR EARLY PROMOTION/TENURE:** Compelling evidence shall be defined as being rated “excellent” in all three of the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity and Professional Qualifications, and

Professional Service. Applications for early promotion/tenure are NOT encouraged.

3. **APPLICATION PROCEDURES FOR EARLY PROMOTION/TENURE:** All procedures, dates, and deadlines regarding an early application for promotion/tenure shall be consistent with an application for tenure in the penultimate year of the probationary period as described herein and within the Faculty Handbook.
 4. **DENIAL OF EARLY TENURE APPLICATION:** Faculty members on tenure-track who are denied tenure at any point during the probationary period shall remain employed for the duration of the probationary period, but they may not apply for tenure again in the academic unit. (Faculty Handbook III.7.f.11)
 5. **WITHDRAWAL OF EARLY TENURE APPLICATION:** An applicant for early tenure may withdraw his/her application at any time without prejudice, as long as he/she has not been officially notified of either the AUH's or PTS's recommendation.
 6. **ROLE OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS IN EARLY TENURE APPLICATIONS:** The PTS shall consider the member's Annual Evaluations; however, the PTS shall make its own independent assessment of the member. The PTS is not required to reach the same findings as did the AUH in the Annual Evaluations. For example, the AUH may have assessed the member as "excellent" consistently in the Annual Evaluations while the PTS may conclude that the member did not merit an assessment of "excellent" in any of the three areas being evaluated.
- F. PROMOTION AND TENURE PTS/AUH COLLEGIALITY AND FACULTY MEMBER MEETING:**
1. **COLLEGIALITY AND REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR CLARIFICATION:**
Although the faculty member is solely responsible for submitting a thorough and complete application, including all areas of evaluation and all sources of evidence which he/she feels is necessary, the AUH and PTS may, as a matter of collegiality, reasonably request additional information/materials from the faculty member if they have questions as to any factual matter within the application or feel there was additional evidence which the faculty member could have provided. This does not impose any obligation on the PTS, but rather serves to notify all of the Hart School members that there is an expectation that all members reasonably work together to assist one another in attaining their academic goals.
 2. **REQUEST FOR MEETING WITH PTS/AUH:** The PTS and AUH shall submit a copy of their final evaluation/recommendation letters to the faculty member in a timely manner which will allow for the following time periods to occur

prior to submitting the letters to the Dean. The faculty member may, within three (3) business days after receipt of such letters, request a conference with the PTS and the AUH in order to clarify any factual issues raised by the letters and/or to submit evidence which the PTS and/or AUH may have referenced as missing or unclear. This conference must be held within five (5) business days following the receipt of the request for a conference. The conference is limited only to those issues of fact which the member feels the PTS and/or AUH misstated and/or missing evidence which the member reasonably can supply. The conference shall *not* be an opportunity for the faculty member to protest or question any subjective or qualitative decisions or statements of the evaluation and/or recommendation. In the event that the faculty member does not request a conference within the three (3) day period, he/she shall be deemed to have waived the opportunity for a conference, and the PTS and AUH shall formalize their evaluation/recommendation and proceed as directed by the Faculty Handbook.

- a. **POST CONFERENCE ACTIONS:** After any such conference referred to above, the PTS and AUH may, but are not required to, revise their letters of evaluation and recommendation.

VII. COLLEGIALITY AND CONDUCT

Concerns regarding a candidate's collegiality should be shared with any member as soon as such concerns arise; but, they should certainly be addressed in the initial evaluation, annual evaluation, the third-year review and/or the promotion and tenure process. Any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, should be addressed in these evaluations (Faculty Handbook III.E.1.a).

ADDENDUM A

ANNUAL EVALUATION DOCUMENT

THE HART SCHOOL

OF HOSPITALITY, SPORT & RECREATION MANAGEMENT

James Madison University

Approved by Hart School Faculty February 2017, Revised July 2018, January 2019, June 2019

The following document is designed to guide the Academic Unit Head (AUH) in the annual evaluation of the individual faculty within the Hart School of Hospitality, Sport & Recreation Management (HSHSRM) at James Madison University. The annual evaluation shall consider the performance of the faculty member both inside and outside of the academic unit in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. Additionally, any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impact performance, positive or negative, may be addressed through objective measures and feedback in these evaluations. The AUH will solicit input from appropriate individuals outside the academic unit when the faculty member has assignments outside of the academic unit. The AUH may solicit information from the AUPAC according to academic unit procedures (Faculty Handbook, III. E. 4).

Please note that this document is independent from, but yet interdependent with the *HSHSRM Promotion and Tenure Document*. While there may be some differences between the two documents, it is important to keep in mind that a faculty member's pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application or nomination for a promotion and/or tenure [Faculty Handbook, III.E.6].

I. POSITION CLASSIFICATIONS

AUH and faculty will determine departmental needs and position classification will be determined before the position is posted.

A. SCHOLARLY ACADEMIC

1. Appointment: Tenure Track
2. Qualifications: The faculty member must meet one of the following conditions: Ph.D., Ed.D., or highest terminal degree in the discipline in which he/she teaches (or in closely related field) –**or-** A candidate who is ABD, with an approved dissertation proposal and is scheduled for a final defense within the first year of employment.
3. Weights: Teaching–50%, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications–30%, Service–20%.
4. Course Load: 3/3 course load –**or-** Reduced load due to significant administrative responsibilities as approved by AUH; for example: 3/2 + 1 course release or 2+1 course release/2+1 course release.

B. PRACTITIONER ACADEMIC

1. Appointment: Tenure Track
2. Qualifications: At a minimum, the faculty member must meet both of the following conditions: Ph.D., Ed.D. or highest degree in the discipline in which he/she teaches (or in closely related field) **–and–** must possess at the time of the appointment significant substantive non-academic work experience within the past five years that is relevant to the teaching assignment.
3. Weights: Teaching–70%, Scholarly and Professional Qualifications–20%, Service–10%.
4. Course Load: 4/4 course load **–or–** Reduced load due to significant administrative responsibilities as approved by AUH; for example 4/3 + 1 course release or 3+1 course release/3+1 course release.

C. PRACTITIONER INSTRUCTOR

1. Appointment: Renewable Term
2. Qualifications: The faculty member must, at a minimum, meet both of the following conditions: A master’s degree in a discipline that is relevant to the teaching assignment **–and–** must possess at the time of the appointment significant and substantive non-academic work experience within the past five years that is relevant to the teaching assignment.
3. Weights: Teaching–80%, Scholarly and Professional Qualifications–10%, Service–10%.
4. Course Load: 4/4 course load **–or–** Reduced load due to significant administrative responsibilities as approved by AUH; for example 4/3 + 1 course release or 3+1 course release/3+1 course release.

D. CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS

Any tenure track faculty member hired before the start of the 2018 academic year may work with the AUH and AUPAC Chair to determine his/her classification.

II. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES**A. FACULTY ANTICIPATED ACTIVITY PLAN AND WEIGHTS:**

1. Prior to the start of classes of the fall semester of each year, each faculty member shall enter into Digital Measures a Faculty Anticipated Plan (hereinafter “The Plan”) which describes his/her anticipated activities for the coming year. The Plan shall address each of the following [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.a., and Digital Measures format]:
 - * Teaching Goals and Strategies
 - * Intellectual Contributions Goals and Strategies
 - * Service Goals and Strategies

The specific date by which this plan shall be completed shall be established by the AUH and communicated to the faculty member in a timely manner. In addition, the AUH will communicate approval of the plan to the faculty member by October 1.

2. Additionally, prior to the start of classes for the fall semester of each year, the relative weights for Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications and Professional Service for an individual faculty member shall be determined by the individual faculty member and the AUH. The agreement shall be shared with the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC). The agreement on weights may be renegotiated during the year under appropriate circumstances. [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.a.]. In the absence of a specific agreement deviating therefrom, the following shall be the default weights assigned to each of the three (3) areas:
 - a. Tenure-Track Faculty:
 - i. Scholarly Academic- Teaching: 50%; Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: 30%; and Professional Service: 20%.
 - ii. Practitioner Academic- Teaching 70%; Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: 20%; and Professional Service: 10%.
 - b. Renewable Term Appointment Faculty:
 - i. Practitioner Lecturer-Teaching 80%; Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: 10%; and Professional Service: 10%.

B. ANNUAL FACULTY REPORT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES:

1. At the conclusion of each academic year, the faculty member will be evaluated by the AUH by comparing his/her anticipated activities with the actual activity of the faculty member throughout that past year. The annual evaluation shall consider the performance of the faculty member both inside and outside of the academic unit in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. Additionally, any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, should be addressed in these evaluations. The AUH will solicit input from appropriate individuals outside of the academic unit when the faculty member has assignments outside of the academic unit. The AUH may solicit information from the AUPAC according to academic unit procedures [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4].
2. The AUH shall use only the information and supporting evidence/documentation entered by the faculty member into Digital Measures to make his/her evaluation. It shall be the *sole responsibility and obligation* of the faculty member to include and describe all activities, and provide supporting evidence thereof, which he/she wishes to be considered in the Annual Evaluation. Therefore, it is *critical* that the faculty member be reflective and thorough, and err in favor of including too much information in Digital Measures.
3. Faculty members shall be evaluated as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent in each of the three performance areas, i.e. Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications and Professional Service. [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4] The AUH shall score faculty in each of the three areas on a scale of 0-9. Alignment of the numerical score with the designated ratings shall be: 0-3 shall be unsatisfactory, 4-6 shall be satisfactory, and 7-9 shall be excellent.

4. The information and supporting documentation which is expected to be included and addressed in Digital Measures shall be submitted and entered no later than the deadline set forth by the AUH each year. Details regarding this information and supporting documentation is provided in the Digital Measures site. In the event, that the faculty member has problems with including such supporting evidence/documentation, he/she shall immediately notify the AUH to arrange for an alternative method of conveying the supporting evidence/documentation to the AUH.
5. Following the AUH's deadline, but prior to October 1, the AUH shall schedule an annual evaluation conference with each faculty member in order to provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as (perceived by both the faculty member and the AUH). The conference may be cancelled by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the AUH, if both agree to the terms of the preliminary evaluation [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.d].
6. A preliminary written evaluation is to be given to each faculty member by the AUH prior to the regular annual evaluation conference. The preliminary evaluation shall be given to the faculty member at least one day prior to the scheduled conference. [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.c.].
7. The official written evaluation shall not be finalized until after the evaluation conference, unless the faculty member and AUH determine that no conference is required [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.e].
8. 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 [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.f.].
9. Faculty members may appeal the official written evaluation in the time and manner provided in Sections III.E.4.g and III.E.4.h of the Faculty Handbook. Appeals of annual evaluations will be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (PTS).
10. Annual salary adjustments for faculty members are dependent on, but not guaranteed by, the results of the annual evaluations. Determination of the faculty salaries in the academic unit for the upcoming year shall not be made until the annual evaluation of each faculty member in the academic unit has been completed by the AUH [Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.j.].
11. Procedures related to any tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance is evaluated by the AUH as "unsatisfactory" are found in Section III.E.4.k of the Faculty Handbook.
12. The provisions of this Annual Evaluation Document are intended to clarify and supplement the provisions of the Faculty Handbook, and are specifically *not* intended to replace or supersede them. The relevant provisions of the Faculty Handbook,

specifically those contained in Section III.E.1, et seq., are hereby adopted and made a part of this Annual Evaluation Document by this reference. Any reference to any specific section of the Faculty Handbook shall hereby act as an incorporation of that section into this document. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to review all of the procedures, rights, and obligations contained in those provisions. *In the event that any provision of this document conflicts with the Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Handbook provisions shall take precedent.

III. ANNUAL EVALUATION AREAS OF EVALUATION AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

A. TEACHING

Possible Areas of Evaluation	Possible Sources of Evidence May include, but are not limited to
<p>Learning/Value Added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level • Stimulating student learning and interest in the subject matter • Serving as a faculty advisor for one independent studies per semester <p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being well prepared for class • Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures • Conducting the class in a well-organized manner • Communicating the subject matter clearly <p>Interaction With Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining scheduled office hours • Treating students with courtesy and respect • Providing career advising to students <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards • Providing timely feedback on progress <p>Experiential Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing student opportunities for “hands on” learning • Creating opportunities for student/industry interactions • Curriculum and course content • Staying current with the subject matter • Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum <p>Instructional Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of appropriate technology in the classroom • Use of case studies • Use of class size appropriate student learning techniques • Exemplifies discipline-based instruction 	<p>Learning/Value Added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Examples of student work • Course syllabi • Letters and comments from former and current students • Incorporation of industry-critical technologies in instruction <p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Course syllabi • Peer evaluation of instruction <p>Interaction with Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Letters and comments from former and current students <p>Advising Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Course materials (e.g. presentation material, assignments, rubrics, assessments) • Examples of student work <p>Experiential Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Incorporation of industry speakers in class • Use of experiential activities in the classroom • Domestic and international experiences <p>Curriculum and Course Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Self-reflective evaluations (tied to the annual plan) • Teaching analysis polls • Moving learning objectives forward based on assessment findings • Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials <p>Instructional Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of appropriate technology to improve learning (i.e. clickers, video, conference calls, field trips, lecture techniques, discussion, case studies, etc.) <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants to support teaching and/or course development • Publication or presentation of widely adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials • Development of new courses • Major revision of existing courses • Teaching awards • Continued professional development for teaching (on and off campus workshops i.e. CFI, CIT, etc.) • Collaboration in development, delivery, or assessment of student learning

B. SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Possible Areas of Evaluation	Possible Sources of Evidence May include, but are not limited to
<p>Discipline Based Scholarship: contributions to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member's field</p> <p>Contributions to Practice: influence professional practice in the faculty member's field</p> <p>Learning and Pedagogical Research: contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the field</p>	<p>SCHOLARLY ACADEMIC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed journal acceptance or publications • Peer-reviewed national or international presentation or poster presentation • Non-peer-reviewed publication and/or presentation • Invited presentations • Published textbook • Published book chapter • Published research of learning improvement initiatives and/or pedagogy • Accepted grant-funded projects • Dissemination of own scholarship related to grant-funded award for scholarly activities • Award for scholarly activities • Professional development in scholarly related activities • Leading professional development in scholarly related activities • Chair or member of Graduate Thesis or Honors Capstone Project <p>PRACTITIONER ACADEMIC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of continuing education requirement of professional qualifications as required by licensing or certifying body, where applicable • Peer-reviewed journal publication • Peer-reviewed or industry/practice conference presentation and/or poster presentation • Invited presentations • Published textbook • Published book chapter • Published research of learning improvement initiatives and/or pedagogy • Publication in practice-oriented journals, textbooks, trade books, or book chapter • Accepted grant-funded projects • Award for scholarly activities • Utilization of content from professional development and/or continuing education in scholarly activities or industry practice • Professional development in scholarly related activities • Leading professional development in scholarly related activities • Chair or member of Graduate Thesis or Honors Thesis Committee <p>PRACTITIONER LECTURER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of continuing education requirement of professional qualifications as required by licensing or certifying body, where applicable • Peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed article • Publication in practice-oriented journals, textbooks, trade books, or book chapter • Presentation and/or poster presentation at an industry/practice conference • Invited presentations • Utilization of content from professional development and/or continuing education in scholarly activities or industry practice • Member of Graduate Thesis or Chair or Member of Honors Capstone Project

C. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Possible Areas of Evaluation	Possible Sources of Evidence May include, but are not limited to
<p>Definition of Level 3 Service: Level 3 service is defined as participation in program, college, and university events of which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or afterwards.</p> <p>Definition of Level 2 Service: Level 2 service is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, the profession and the community that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category.</p> <p>Definition of Level 1 Service: Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high level of personal responsibility • Involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the program, college, university, or professional organization • Distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed • Serving, with distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that utilizes one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents • "Making a difference" in those areas in which one has chosen to serve • Being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty 	<p>Evidence of Level 3 Service May Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having lunch with potential employers, students, or parents • Attending graduation ceremonies, Family Day Open House, awards ceremonies, program meetings, school meetings, program seminars, school seminars, etc. • Participating in any program assessment efforts requiring universal faculty involvement • Participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate seminars, etc) • Attending career fairs or internship fairs • Attending senior project presentations • Other participatory activities at the school, college, university, and community level <p>Evidence of Level 2 Service May Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active member of program, school, or university committees, Faculty Senate or local boards or community service organizations • Proceedings editor for a regional, national or international conference • Reviewer for a journal • Conference planning committee member for a state, regional or national conference • Active participation in curriculum development • Participation in university-sponsored programs • Actively engaging the industry in program activities • Alumni and industry relations (newsletter, social media, fundraising, etc) • Awards • Freshman advising • Community service learning • Student advising <p>Evidence of Level 1 Service May Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editor of a peer-reviewed journal or industry/practice oriented journal • Chair of an important committee • Responsibility for significant curriculum reform or department assessment efforts • Leadership role in Faculty Senate • Faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization • Chair of a conference planning committee member for a state, regional or national conference • High level office in a prestigious community, state, regional, national or international organization involving a significant time commitment • Coordinator for undergraduate or graduate program • School director

IV. STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

According to Section III.E.4 of the Faculty Handbook, the annual evaluation shall consider the performance of the faculty member both inside and outside of the academic unit in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. In each of the three performance areas, a faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Evaluations are based on feedback from student evaluations, faculty self-reflection, and the assessment of the faculty member by the AUH. The Faculty Handbook states that an academic unit may employ a scale using more than three levels of performance evaluation ratings. The Hart School of Hospitality, Sport & Recreation Management will employ a 10-point scale for the purpose of spreading the variance between annual performance of individual faculty members, and to assist the AUH in allocating merit pay. In this regard, assessment will be based on the following ratings from highest to lowest: Excellent (7-9); Satisfactory (4-6); and Unsatisfactory (0-3). See Standards of Evaluation below.

The examples within the performance evaluation ratings in the table below are provided solely to give faculty members ideas as to what types of activities would be considered for evaluation in teaching, scholarly and professional qualifications, and service and to give some guidance as to how those activities would be ranked. It is NOT to be considered a complete list of activities, and faculty members are strongly encouraged to discuss any ideas for an activity in each area he/she may have with the Director of the Hart School at the beginning of the academic term to determine whether such activity would be considered worthy of evaluation.

Faculty members are also strongly urged to keep in mind that fulfilling one activity within any given category of performance evaluation will NOT necessarily result in the member being assessed annually at the same level. Faculty members are expected to engage in more than one activity and will be evaluated, annually and for promotion and tenure, based upon his/her complete body of work during the period of which he/she is being evaluated. As an example, simply because the faculty member may have had a non-peer reviewed article accepted in a year, which would be ranked as “satisfactory”, he/she may have done little to nothing else in the scholarship or professional qualification, and therefore may receive an overall scholarship and professional qualification assessment lower than “satisfactory”.

STANDARDS OF EVALUATION BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION			
	Excellent (7-9)	Satisfactory (4-6)	Unsatisfactory (0-3)
Teaching Scholarly Academic, Practitioner, Practitioner Lecturer	<p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations well above average with proof of academic course rigor • Substantial course design or redesign attached to course, school, or program objectives • Appropriate effect pedagogical course innovation • New course developed and approved through C & I • Continuing education relative to pedagogy • Student feedback regarding the impact of the instructor or the course 	<p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average student evaluations with proof of academic course rigor • Keeping the topic current and relevant • Efforts to measure effectiveness and improve pedagogy (e.g. CFI Teaching Analysis Polls or Teaching Consultations) • Continuing education relative to pedagogy 	<p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well below average student evaluations with no proof of academic course rigor • Limited to or no evidence of keeping the topic current and relevant • Limited to or no evidence of efforts to measure effectiveness and improve pedagogy • Limited to or no evidence of continuing education relative to pedagogy
Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification Scholarly Academic	<p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed journal acceptances or publications • Peer-reviewed national or international presentation or poster presentation • Published textbook • Published book chapter • Published research of learning improvement initiatives and/or pedagogy • Accepted grant-funded projects • Dissemination of own scholarship related to grant-funded award for scholarly activities • Significant involvement with student research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chair or committee member of Graduate Thesis or Honors Capstone Project -Conference presentations -Publications • Award for scholarly activities • Leader of professional development for scholarly related activities for students and/or faculty 	<p>Evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An organized plan for scholarship <p>-and-</p> <p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-peer-reviewed journal acceptance or publications • Significant progress toward fulfillment of disseminating own peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed scholarship (e.g. manuscript under review) • Significant progress toward fulfillment of dissemination of own scholarly activity in learning improvement activities and/or pedagogy • Peer-reviewed state, regional, national, or international conference proposal or poster presentation acceptance • Submission of grant-funded project proposals • Participation in student research efforts as a consulting committee member or outside reader • Professional development in scholarly related activities 	<p>No evidence of an organized plan for scholarship</p> <p>-and/or-</p> <p>Limited or no evidence of disseminating scholarly work</p>

	Excellent (7-9)	Satisfactory (4-6)	Unsatisfactory (0-3)
Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification Practitioner Academic	<p>Evidence of completion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing education requirements of professional qualifications as required or approved by licensing or certifying body <p>-and-</p> <p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer-reviewed journal publication Peer-reviewed or industry/practice conference presentation and/or poster presentation Published textbook Published book chapter Published research of learning improvements initiatives and/or pedagogy Publication in practice-oriented journals, textbooks, trade books, or book chapters Grant-funded project accepted Award for scholarly activities Significant involvement with student research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair or committee member of Graduate Thesis or Honors Capstone Project Conference presentations Publications Leader of professional development for scholarly related activities for students and/or faculty Utilization of content from professional development and or continuing education in scholarly activities or industry practice. 	<p>Evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in industry/practice-related professional development and continuing education requirements of professional qualifications as required or approved by licensing or certifying body <p>-and-</p> <p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organization plan for scholarship and professional qualifications Submission of publication in practice-oriented journals Submission of peer-reviewed journal article Submission of conference proposal or poster presentation Submission of grant-funded project Publication of own discipline-based practice tools Published reports on consulting Dissemination of own scholarly activity in learning improvement activities and/or pedagogy Dissemination of own written case with instructional materials. Industry consulting and creation of industry consulting reports. Participation in student research efforts as a consulting committee member or outside reader Participation in industry/practice-related professional development and/or continuing education, preapproved by the AUH Professional development in scholarly activities 	<p>No evidence of an organization plan for scholarship</p> <p>-and/or-</p> <p>Limited or no evidence of disseminating scholarly work and/or participation in and/or completion of continuing education and professional development in scholarly activities or area of professional qualification</p>

	Excellent (7-9)	Satisfactory (4-6)	Unsatisfactory (0-3)
Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification Practitioner Lecturer	<p>Evidence of completion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing education requirements of professional qualifications as required or approved by licensing or certifying body <p>-and/or-</p> <p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant progress towards or publication of a peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed article (e.g. manuscript under review) Significant progress towards or publication in a practice-oriented journal, textbook, trade book, or book chapter Presentation and/or poster presentation at an industry/practice conference Utilization of content from professional development and/or continuing education in scholarly activities or industry practice. Significant involvement with student research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Graduate Thesis committee member or Chair of Honors Capstone Project -Conference presentations -Publications 	<p>Evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in industry/practice-related professional development and continuing education requirements of professional qualifications as required or approved by licensing or certifying body <p>-and-</p> <p>Evidence of a portfolio of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organization plan for scholarship and professional qualifications Contribution to a scholarly publication Contribution to a practice-oriented publication Contribution to a presentation at an industry/practice conference Creation and delivery of executive education courses Distribution of scholarly materials for use in courses Creation of published teaching aids Published or presented research in pedagogy Published or presented research in industry/practice Creating industry consulting reports Participation in industry/practice-related professional development or continuing education, preapproved by AUH Participation in professional development in scholarly activities Participation in student research efforts as a consulting committee member or outside reader 	<p>No evidence of an organization plan for scholarship</p> <p>-and/or-</p> <p>Limited or no evidence of disseminating scholarly work and/or participation in and/or completion of continuing education and professional development in scholarly activities or area of professional qualification</p>
Service	<p>Evidence of substantial contribution of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 or more level 1 service and/or Substantial contribution of 1 or more level 2 service and/or Substantial contribution of 1 or more level 3 service 	<p>Evidence of contribution of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 or more level 1 service and/or 1 or more level 2 service and/or 1 or more level 3 service 	<p>Limited to no evidence of contribution to any service level</p>

V. ANNUAL EVALUATION MERIT PAY PROCEDURES

Salary adjustments that reflect merit will be dependent on annual evaluations and will be allocated by the AUH [Faculty Handbook, III.I.2b]. Below are guidelines for calculating merit pay.

1. Faculty members receive an overall annual performance rating between 0 and 9. This rating is derived by summing the weighted scores (0-9) for each of the three performance areas:
 - a. Scholarly Academic:
 - * Teaching 50%
 - * Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications 30%
 - * Professional Service 20%
 - b. Practitioner Academic:
 - * Teaching 70%
 - * Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications 20%
 - * Professional Service 10%
 - c. Practitioner Lecturer:
 - * Teaching 80%
 - * Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications 10%
 - * Professional Service 10%

These scores in each performance area are based on the guidelines expressed in this document.

2. The average performance rating for the Hart School is calculated.
3. Each faculty member's rating is divided by the mean score to arrive at the amount by which that faculty member's score differs from the mean.
4. The calculation from the preceding step (rating/mean) is multiplied by the merit allocations % (i.e., .04 (4%) for the year).
5. The figure resulting from the previous step is then used as a multiplier of the faculty member's current salary, which determines the dollar amount of merit pay.

*Example:

1. Sam receives a rating of 7 in teaching, 5 in scholarly achievement and professional qualification, and a 5 in professional service.
2. If Sam were in a Scholarly Academic position, the weighted score would equal 6 with the ratings calculated as follows:
 - a. $(7 \times .5 - \text{teaching}) + (5 \times .3 - \text{scholarship achievement and professional qualifications}) + (5 \times .2 - \text{professional service})$.

If Sam were in a Practitioner Lecturer position, the weighted score would equal 6.6 with the ratings calculated as follows:

 - a. $(7 \times .8 - \text{teaching}) + (5 \times .1 - \text{scholarly achievement and professional qualifications}) + (5 \times .1 - \text{professional service})$.
3. Using the Scholarly Academic for Sam, the overall annual performance rating equals 6.0. The average performance rating for the Hart School is 4.5. Sam's score differs from the mean by 1.33 ($6.0/4.5=1.33$). ($1.33 \times .04=.053$). Sam's current salary is \$50,000. Sam's merit increase in dollars is $\$50,000 \times .053 = \$2,650.00$. The method takes into account individual performance compared to the Hart School mean, as well as difference in current salary level.

ADDENDUM B
PROMOTION AND TENURE
AREAS OF EVALUATION AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
Approved by Hart School Faculty February 2017, Revised April 2018, January 2019

I. TEACHING

Possible Areas of Evaluation	Possible Sources of Evidence May include, but are not limited to
<p>Learning/Value Added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level • Stimulating student learning and interest in the subject matter • Serving as a faculty advisor for one independent studies per semester <p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being well prepared for class • Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures • Conducting the class in a well-organized manner • Communicating the subject matter clearly <p>Interaction With Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining scheduled office hours • Treating students with courtesy and respect • Providing career advising to students <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards • Providing timely feedback on progress <p>Experiential Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing student opportunities for “hands on” learning • Creating opportunities for student/industry interactions • Curriculum and Course Content • Staying current with the subject matter • Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum <p>Instructional Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of appropriate technology in the classroom • Use of case studies • Use of class size appropriate student learning techniques • Exemplifies discipline based instruction 	<p>Learning/Value Added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Examples of student work • Course syllabi • Theses that were directed or served on • Incorporation of industry-critical technologies in instruction <p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Course syllabi • Peer evaluation of instruction <p>Interaction with Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Letters and comments from former and current students <p>Advising Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Course materials (e.g. presentation material, assignments, rubrics, assessments) • Examples of student work <p>Experiential Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Incorporation of industry speakers in class • Use of experiential activities in the classroom • International experiences <p>Curriculum and Course Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student course evaluations • Self-reflective evaluations (tied to the annual plan) • Teaching analysis polls • Moving learning objects forward based on assessment findings • Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials <p>Instructional Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of appropriate technology to improve learning (i.e. clickers, video, conference calls, field trips, lecture techniques, discussion, case studies, etc.) <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants to support teaching and/or course development • Publication of widely adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials • Development of new courses • Major revision of existing courses • Teaching awards • Continued professional development for teaching (on and off campus workshops i.e. CFI, CIT, etc.) • Collaboration in development, delivery, or assessment of student learning

II. SCHOLARLY ACHEIVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Possible Areas of Evaluation	Possible Sources of Evidence May include, but are not limited to
<p>Discipline Based Scholarship: contributions ass to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member’s field</p> <p>Contributions to Practice: influence professional practice in the faulty member’s field</p> <p>Learning and Pedagogical Research: contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the field</p>	<p>SCHOLARLY ACADEMIC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed journal acceptance or publications • Peer-reviewed national or international presentation or poster presentation • Non-peer reviewed publication and/or presentation • Invited presentations • Published textbook • Published book chapter • Published research of learning improvement initiatives and/or pedagogy • Accepted grant funded projects • Dissemination of own scholarship related to grant funded award for scholarly activities • Award for scholarly activities • Professional development in scholarly related activities • Leading professional development in scholarly related activities • Chair or member of Graduate Thesis or Honors Capstone Project <p>PRACTIONER ACADEMIC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of continuing education requirement of professional qualifications as required by licensing or certifying body, where applicable • Peer-reviewed journal publication • Peer-reviewed or industry/practice conference presentation and/or poster presentation • Invited presentations • Published textbook • Published book chapter • Published research of learning improvement initiatives and/or pedagogy • Publication in practice-oriented journals, textbooks, trade books, or book chapter • Accepted grant funded projects • Award for scholarly activities • Utilization of content from professional development and/or continuing education in scholarly activities or industry practice • Professional development in scholarly related activities Leading professional development in scholarly related activities • Chair or member of Graduate Thesis or Honors Capstone Project

III. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Possible Areas of Evaluation	Possible Sources of Evidence May include, but are not limited to
<p>Definition of Level 3 Service: Level 3 service is defined as participation in program, college, and university events of which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or afterwards.</p> <p>Definition of Level 2 Service: Level 2 service is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, the profession and the community that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category.</p> <p>Definition of Level 1 Service: Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high level of personal responsibility • Involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the program, college, university, or professional organization • Distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed • Serving, with distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that utilizes one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents • "Making a difference" in those areas in which one has chosen to serve • Being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty 	<p>Evidence of Level 3 Service May Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having lunch with potential employers, students, or parents • Attending graduation ceremonies, Family Day Open House, awards ceremonies, program meetings, school meetings, program seminars, school seminars, etc. • Participating in any program assessment efforts requiring universal faculty involvement • Participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate seminars, etc) • Attending career fairs or internship fairs • Attending senior project presentations • Other participatory activities at the school, college, university, and community level <p>Evidence of Level 2 Service May Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active member of program, school, or university committees, Faculty Senate or local boards or community service organizations • Proceedings editor for a regional, national or international conference • Reviewer for a journal • Conference planning committee member for a state, regional or national conference • Active participation in curriculum development • Participation in university-sponsored programs • Actively engaging the industry in program activities • Alumni and industry relations (newsletter, social media, fundraising, etc) • Awards • Freshman advising • Community service learning • Student advising <p>Evidence of Level 1 Service May Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editor of a peer-reviewed journal or industry/practice oriented journal • Chair of an important committee • Responsibility for significant curriculum reform or department assessment efforts • Leadership role in Faculty Senate • Faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization • Chair of a conference planning committee member for a state, regional or national conference • High level office in a prestigious community, state, regional, national or international organization involving a significant time commitment • Coordinator for undergraduate or graduate program • School director

ADDENDUM C

PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE STANDARDS OF EVALUATION

Approved by Hart School Faculty February 2017

I. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND/OR TENURE

Satisfactory for Promotion and/or Tenure	Excellence for Promotion and/or Tenure
<p>Teaching Evidence of satisfactory teaching as exhibited by a representative sample of sources of evidence.</p>	<p>Teaching Evidence of excellent teaching as exhibited by a representative sample of many areas of evaluation AND going beyond the norm to improve the education and learning of student within the classroom, program, school, college, university, or discipline.</p>
<p>Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications Evidence of satisfactory body of work in quality meritorious outlets as exhibited by representative sample of sources of evidence.</p>	<p>Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications Evidence of excellent body of work in quality meritorious outlets as exhibited by representative sample of sources of evidence AND the achievement should go beyond the norm in quantity, OR quality, OR merit.</p>
<p>Service Evidence of satisfactory leadership in one or more areas in addition to active participation and membership in the program, school, college, university, community, and/or discipline as exhibited by representative sample of sources of evidence.</p>	<p>Service Evidence of substantial leadership in one or more areas in addition to active participation and membership in the program, school, college, university, community, and/or discipline as exhibited by representative sample of sources of evidence.</p>

II. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Satisfactory for Promotion to Professor	Excellence for Promotion to Professor
<p>Teaching Evidence of satisfactory teaching as exhibited by a representative sample of sources of evidence. AND Developing quality course or courses for the overall improvement of the program, school, college, or university.</p>	<p>Teaching Evidence of excellent teaching as exhibited by a representative sample of many areas of evaluation AND going beyond the norm to improve the education and learning of student within the classroom, program, school, college, university, or discipline. Teaching should reach beyond the single classroom and build the program, school, university, or disciplines overall quality.</p>
<p>Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications Continued evidence of excellent body of work in quality meritorious outlets as exhibited by representative sample of sources of evidence AND has established a regional reputation.</p>	<p>Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications Evidence of excellent body of work in quality meritorious outlets as exhibited by representative sample of sources of evidence AND the achievement should go beyond the norm in quantity, OR quality, OR merit AND has established a national or international reputation.</p>
<p>Service Evidence of satisfactory leadership in one or more areas in addition to active participation and membership in the program, school, college, university, community, and discipline AND Service should be beyond the expectations of an associate professor.</p>	<p>Service Evidence of substantial leadership in one or more areas in addition to active participation and membership in the program, school, college, university, community, and discipline.</p>