I. Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

I.A. Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC)

Composition
The full-time faculty of the academic unit, except the AUH, shall be responsible for determining
the composition and membership of the AUPAC. [JMU Handbook Section III.E.2.a]

I.A.1. The AUPAC consists of five members, at least two from Theatre/Musical Theatre and at
least two from Dance with each area selecting the members who will serve.

I.A.2. All members of the AUPAC shall have tenure.

I.A.3. AUPAC members serve two-year terms, with terms staggered for each area’s two
representatives. Terms may be repeated.

   I.A.3.a. The AUPAC will select a chairperson from among its tenured members. The
   chair will serve a one-year term, which can be repeated.

   I.A.3.b. The AUPAC for the academic year shall be selected no later than April 15 of the
   previous academic year, or as soon thereafter as possible.

   I.A.3.c. Areas must elect to the AUPAC members who will not be submitting a
   personnel action to the AUPAC.

   I.A.3.d. The AUPAC shall review these guidelines annually. The AUPAC shall meet with
   all junior faculty in the spring semester so as to review the process of promotion and
   tenure.

I.B. AUPAC Faculty Evaluations

STAD will follow the annual evaluation process outlined in the JMU Handbook section III.E.4.
All AUH and AUPAC evaluations of STAD faculty are guided by a shared set of criteria that is
outlined in the JMU Faculty Handbook. (See timelines of all faculty performance reviews at the
end of this Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure section.)

I.B.1. The AUPAC will conduct first year evaluations of new faculty as outlined in the JMU
Handbook.

I.B.2. The AUPAC will conduct third year faculty evaluations in the spring of a faculty member’s
third year.
I.B.3. The AUPAC will conduct faculty evaluations for faculty applying for tenure as outlined in the JMU Handbook.

I.B.4. The AUPAC will conduct faculty evaluations for faculty applying for promotion as outlined in the JMU Handbook.

I.B.5. The AUPAC will also conduct first, third, and sixth year evaluations of RTA faculty.

I.B.6. The AUPAC will conduct other evaluations as needed.

I.B.7. The minimum expectation for STAD for tenure and promotion to associate professor is at least “Excellent” in either Teaching or Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications and “Satisfactory” in the other two areas.

I.B.8. The minimum expectation for STAD for promotion to full professor is at least “Excellent” in two areas, one of which must be Teaching, and “Satisfactory” in the other area not rated as “Excellent,” either Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications or Professional Service.

I.B.8.a. “Outstanding professional accomplishment” [III.B.4.e] shall be defined as a significant number of those criteria listed at the level of “Excellent” in the “School of Theatre and Dance Criteria for the Evaluation of Faculty.” It shall be evaluated using the criteria of excellence in that document.

I.B.8.b. Activities and accomplishments since last promotion will be the primary focus of evaluation.

I.B.9. Pursuant to the JMU Handbook section III.E. Evaluation Fundamentals and Criteria: “All evaluations shall consider a faculty member’s performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Professional Service. Additionally, any aspects of the faculty member’s conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, should be addressed in the evaluation of these performance areas.”

I.B.10. AUPAC recommendations are submitted to the CVPA dean. The dean will request that the candidate submit an abbreviated dossier, the format of which will be clarified in a letter from the dean to be received early in the academic year. Questions regarding format or timing should be directed to the AUH or dean’s office.

I.C. Operating Guidelines
I.C.1. Initial first year review will be by AUPAC and the AUH. The deadline for receipt of review materials from the candidate is the first Monday following Spring Break. AUPAC review will be
completed no later than April 15. Classroom observations for first year reviews will be scheduled towards the end of the fall semester. The AUPAC will consult with the faculty member to determine the most appropriate dates.

I.C.2. Third year review will be by AUPAC and the AUH. The deadline for receipt of review materials from the candidate is the last day of the second week of the spring semester (or last day of the second week of the faculty member’s sixth semester at JMU). AUPAC review will be completed no later than the first day of April. Classroom observations for third year reviews may be scheduled for any time prior to the review deadline but during the faculty member’s third year of tenure-track employment at JMU.

I.C.3. Tenure and Promotion: Candidates who expect to be considered for promotion must notify the AUPAC chair no later than September 1. [III.E.6.b.(1)] The deadline for receipt of review materials from the candidate for promotion is October 1. [III.E.6.b.(1)]. “Failure by the faculty member to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments by the October 1 deadline shall constitute a refusal of a nomination or withdrawal of an application, and no consideration of promotion is required.” [III.E.6.b.(1)] If October 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadline for materials shall be the most immediately following business day during which the university is open.

I.C.4. Additions to submitted materials may be made only if they pertain to the following.

   I.C.4.a. A change in status of an originally submitted activity (e.g., a paper submitted for publication is accepted; a creative work submitted for performance is accepted; an award applied for is won; etc.).

   I.C.4.b. An unanticipated project or recognition such as an award, honor, or grant.

I.C.5. For all reviews, classroom observation will be a part of teaching evaluations.

I.C.6. The AUPAC may request relevant material from the candidate’s personnel file. (III.E.1.d.)

I.C.7. The AUPAC will inform the school faculty that they may provide input into the process by contacting a member of the AUPAC. AUPAC will announce the deadline for this input.

   I.C.7.a. The first step of this process would be for a non-AUPAC faculty member to direct verbal feedback to an AUPAC representative who would bring that information to the AUPAC during the committee’s regularly scheduled meetings.

   I.C.7.b. If a majority of the AUPAC believes that this information warrants further examination, the committee may ask the non-AUPAC faculty member to present the
I.C.7.c. After the meeting with the non-AUPAC faculty member, the AUPAC may elect to invite the candidate to an AUPAC meeting to respond to the information.

I.C.7.d. The AUPAC will neither accept nor consider unsolicited letters.

I.C.7.e. Pursuant to the JMU Handbook III.E.1.e – In the evaluation process, if documents are to be considered that were not submitted by the faculty member or contained in the faculty member’s personnel files, the faculty member shall promptly be given access to the documents and given an opportunity to respond to them. A faculty member may elect to waive his or her right to access specific documents.

I.C.8. The AUPAC will send a copy of any evaluation to the candidate at the same time that the evaluation is sent to the dean or AUH. [III.E.6.b.(5)] and [III.E.7.f.(5)].

I.C.9. Revisions to the AUPAC guidelines apply to faculty who are 36 months or more from a tenure or promotion decision date unless the faculty member informs the AUPAC chair and AUH in writing that they elect to use more recent, revised guidelines.

I.C.10. The AUPAC shall serve as the appeal body in the event that a faculty member appeals their annual evaluation by the AUH. Refer to the JMU Handbook III.E.4.g.

I.C.10.a. Before the AUH submits the official written evaluation to the dean, there must be an opportunity for the faculty member to review and appeal the evaluation to the AUPAC. The faculty member submits the appeal letter to the AUH. The AUH will provide the AUPAC with a copy of the faculty member’s annual report, the evaluation, and appeal letter from the faculty member. The faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. The AUPAC will make a recommendation to the AUH within two weeks but no later than October 21, and provide a copy to the faculty member. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available.

I.C.10.b. In considering an appeal, the crucial question for the AUPAC is whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH in accordance with evaluation criteria established by the academic unit. The recommendations of the AUPAC will be given to the AUH, with a copy to the faculty member and the dean. The AUPAC may recommend that the AUH's evaluation be upheld or modified. If the AUH agrees with the recommendations of the AUPAC, he or she will take the appropriate action to confirm or modify his or her original evaluation, and will notify the AUPAC, the faculty member and the dean of his or her decision. The appeal process in the academic unit must be
completed by October 21. The evaluation process is not final until any appeal has been completed. (In reference to III.E.4.h)


I.C.11. The number of performance levels, the manner of determining these performance levels, the manner of determining overall performance and the annual evaluation appeal procedure shall be developed by the full-time faculty members of each academic unit, approved by the AUH, dean and the provost, and distributed to the faculty of the academic unit. AUPAC Tenure and Promotion reviews will use the rating categories of “Unsatisfactory,” “Satisfactory,” and “Excellent.” AUH annual evaluations will employ a scale using “Unsatisfactory,” “Satisfactory,” “Very Good,” and “Excellent.” Existing evaluation guidelines may be modified by the AUPAC with the agreement of a majority of the academic unit’s full-time faculty members, if the AUH, dean and provost approve of the modifications. (III.E.4)

I.D. Guidelines for Review Materials
I.D.1. The candidate must submit all written materials in a standard-size (8 ½ x 11") ring binder. They must also place their name and statement of the personnel action(s) desired on the top cover of the binder. The packet will be organized in the following way:

- Cover Sheet – typed in accordance with university format and enclosed in a protective sheet.

- Narrative Statement by the Candidate – typed and enclosed in protective sheets, this statement must summarize the candidate’s accomplishments in the categories of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement/Professional Qualifications, and Service. The narrative statement may not exceed 20 single-spaced pages with normal font and margins.

- Vita – the candidate’s most recent Vita enclosed in protective sheets.

- Supporting Documentation Supplied by the Candidate – this is to be organized into three sections corresponding to the three categories for evaluation.

I.D.2. Teaching
The following materials shall be used as supporting documentation for Teaching:

I.D.2.a. Letters of recommendation and evaluation.

I.D.2.b. Syllabi, handouts and other course materials.
I.D.2.c. Copies of teacher evaluation printouts, including a copy of the questionnaire used and the dates when the evaluation was done and school-wide norms, if available.

I.D.2.d. Copies of written student evaluations. If a candidate submits student evaluations from a class, it is expected that all evaluations from that class will be submitted.

I.D.3. Scholarly Activity and Professional Qualification
The following materials shall be used as supporting documentation for Scholarly Activity and Professional Qualification:


I.D.3.b. Copies of reviews, critiques and written evaluations by peers of performances, designs, etc., which the candidate has listed as evidence of scholarly achievement.


I.D.3.d. Copies of journals or publications edited.

I.D.3.e. Copies of professional writing such as plays, convention presentations, scripts, reviews, etc.

I.D.3.f. Photographs when presented either as a visual record of an artistic event or as direct evidence of artistic expression, should be included in a notebook binder or provided in digital storage forms such as CDs, Flash Drives, or other digital forms as approved by the AUPAC.

I.D.3.g. Books, videotapes, CDs, DVDs and any other materials too bulky to be included in the packet should be handed to the AUPAC chair along with a brief typed statement in a protective sheet identifying the material.

I.D.3.h. Letters from those attesting to the candidate’s performance in this area.

I.D.3.i. Any other materials deemed appropriate by the candidate.

I.D.4. Service
The following materials shall be used as supporting documentation for Service:

I.D.4.a. Any letters attesting to the type and quality of the candidate’s service work.
I.D.4.b. Any other materials deemed necessary by the candidate.

I.D.5. Definitions
The candidate shall identify something as a “paper” if the document or material is written in the form of a completed, academic style paper, made available to the members of the audience in written form or presented at a recognized professional convention.

When the candidate appears on a conference program as a panelist or presents remarks given from notes, the candidate should identify that as a presentation. The candidate will also specify whether papers, presentations, demonstrations and performances were selected by jury, invitation, competitive submission or other means.

When listing plays and dances as scholarly achievement, the candidate will state clearly what his or her role in the production was (e.g., director, choreographer, dancer, designer, actor, etc.) The candidate will list a performance under Scholarly Activity when they have performed artistic work that was produced in a scholarly or professional setting or evaluated in writing by professional peers (copies of which should be supplied to the AUPAC).

If the candidate believes work produced in a service or community setting represents an act of scholarship, they must present a convincing case that suggests why the work in question was not an act of service.

In addition to submitting supporting documents and evidence in the forms outlined, it is incumbent upon the candidate to qualify the activity the organization’s relative significance to and stature in the field and to make a case for its being considered in the category of Teaching, Scholarly and/or Creative Achievement and Professional Qualification, or Service.

Any questions about other activities to be included in one’s report, and which category they might best be placed for consideration, can be resolved by consulting the STAD Handbook or the AUPAC chair.

I.E. Compelling Case for Early Tenure
STAD accepts applications for early tenure and promotion only if the faculty member can make a compelling case for exceptional professional service, scholarly and/or creative achievement and teaching. A faculty member whose application for early tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor is denied will receive a terminal contract for the next academic year. A faculty member whose application for early promotion to the rank of full professor is denied may not reapply for promotion during the following academic year.

To present a compelling case for early tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor a faculty member must demonstrate a level of achievement of “Excellent” in the AUPAC and the AUH reviews for promotion and tenure in the two categories of teaching and scholarly and/or
creative achievement and professional qualification and at least a “Satisfactory” in the category of service. To present a compelling case for early promotion to the rank of professor a faculty member must demonstrate a level of achievement of “Excellent” in the AUPAC and the AUH reviews for promotion and tenure in all three categories. The PAC and AUH will determine whether the levels of achievement in each area and the overall level of accomplishment are sufficient to warrant an affirmative recommendation for early promotion and/or tenure.

Any faculty member contemplating early application for tenure and/or promotion must first submit a preliminary dossier including the CV and other supporting documents to the AUH before consideration by the AUPAC or external letter writers. External writers of letters must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. The AUH and the AUPAC must also specifically address this issue in their letters that accompany the application.

I.F. Review Process for RTA (Renewable Term) Appointments
Annual reviews by the AUH become part of the record considered by the AUPAC. In addition, dossier materials are submitted for review to the AUH and AUPAC in the first, third and sixth years. (An Appendix to this document includes a timeline of all faculty performance reviews.)

I.F.1. The initial first year evaluation will be by AUPAC and AUH. The AUPAC review will be completed no later than the end of the fifth week of the second full semester. (III.E.3.d.)

I.F.2. The third year review is conducted by the AUPAC and AUH. The AUPAC review will be completed no later than the end of the fifth week of the sixth full semester. This is a comprehensive review and should address any problems, since continued renewal is making the faculty member a long-term member of the school. The minimum expectation for STAD is “Satisfactory” in each category.

I.F.3. The sixth year review is conducted by the AUPAC and AUH. This is a comprehensive review, since continued renewal is making the faculty member a long-term member of the school. The minimum expectation is “Excellent” in either Teaching or Scholarly Activity and Professional Qualification and “Satisfactory” in the other two areas. [III.D.3.] and [III.E.5.a.(2)].

I.F.4. To pass the sixth year review, the faculty member must receive evaluations with at least an “Excellent” in either Teaching or Scholarly Activity and Professional Qualification and “Satisfactory” in the other two areas by both the AUPAC and AUH.

I.F.5. After passing the sixth year review, the AUPAC will review the faculty member only if one of the following criteria is met:

I.F.5.a. The faculty member is up for promotion.

I.F.5.b. The AUH requests a “Post Sixth Year Review” from the AUPAC.
I.F.5.c. The AUPAC initiates a “Post Sixth Year Review” or

I.F.5.d. Despite a continuing need for the position to be filled, the AUH wishes not to recommend an additional contract extension, in which case AUPAC and the AUH would both have to evaluate the faculty member as not satisfactory.

I.F.6. A post sixth year review would be conducted under guidelines similar to a post tenure review.

I.F.7. If a faculty member does not pass the sixth-year review, the faculty member’s contract would not be extended beyond current obligations. No further AUPAC review would occur.

I.G. Review Process for FTA (Fixed Term) Appointments
I.G.1. The initial first year review of faculty on FTA appointments will be handled using the same guidelines as RTA appointments. The AUPAC review will be completed no later than the end of the fifth week of the second full semester. (III.E.3.d.)

I.G.2. If the faculty member is awarded a new contract in subsequent years, review will be conducted by the AUH annually. Review by the AUPAC is not standard following the first year of employment, but may be determined appropriate by the AUH on a case-by-case basis. If an AUPAC review is requested, it will be completed no later than the end of the fifth week of an even numbered semester of employment.

I.G.3. Because the service requirement for FTA appointments is low or nonexistent, service will typically have little to no consideration in the evaluation. Reviews should be conducted with close reference to the FTA faculty member’s contract and relative weighting of the three areas of evaluation.

I.H. Review Process for Adjunct Faculty
The AUH, in consultation with the Major Coordinators, will facilitate all adjunct instructor evaluations in addition to overseeing and maintaining the process and schedule of adjunct evaluations. AUPAC is not required to conduct adjunct evaluations.

It is recommended that, unless deemed an extenuating circumstances, part-time faculty be observed no more frequently than twice per academic year. All observations should be completed by week nine of the given semester, barring unforeseen circumstances. Adjunct faculty members will be observed in their initial semester of appointment and then at a minimum of once every two years of consecutive employment. If an adjunct faculty member is teaching a new course or prep, then the adjunct faculty member will be observed in the first semester of teaching the new course or prep. STAD shall provide timely, written feedback from the classroom
observation to the adjunct faculty member. If the instructor teaches more than one course instead of more than one section of the same course, the scheduling and process may run parallel for each course. Adjunct faculty members shall be provided written notice of any guidelines developed in accordance with classroom observation and shall be provided written feedback regarding their performance in relation to those guidelines. STAD full-time faculty and the AUH may observe an adjunct faculty member’s teaching performance at any time. The AUH will put forth their best efforts to assign an observer in the adjunct instructor’s area or closely related therein.

The following are the proper steps taken in the observation process.

**Pre-observation Scheduling**
The first step is for the observer to contact the adjunct instructor requesting to schedule an observation. The adjunct instructor is to return the contact by offering at least two potential date and time options for the observation. The observer will notify the adjunct instructor of which day they have chosen. The adjunct instructor is to forward a copy of the syllabus and, if possible, a breakdown of the daily schedule to the observer. The observer will meet with the respective Major Coordinator to discuss the syllabus prior to the observation.

**Observation**
The next step is for the observer to visit the class and carefully observe the adjunct instructor. It is highly recommended that detailed notes be taken to support the final evaluation. An Adjunct Evaluation form may be completed, or the observer may elect to use a narrative letter to discuss areas of evaluation included on the Adjunct Evaluation form (form available in the School’s storage drive). In either case, the evaluation will include comments on existing strengths and suggested improvements.

**Post-observation Meeting**
Feedback regarding the observation will be given no more than two weeks after the observation. Upon completion of the observation and written report, the observer will provide two hard copies of the observation in the adjunct instructor’s mailbox or via email. The adjunct instructor is encouraged, but not required, to contact the observer to schedule an in-person meeting to discuss the details of the observation.

If both parties are in agreement with the content of the evaluation, the adjunct instructor will sign the evaluation, and it will be forwarded to the AUH. If the adjunct instructor disagrees with any aspect of the evaluation, and those concerns are not mediated in the meeting with the observer, then the adjunct instructor can decide to write a response. This response will be included with the evaluation and delivered to the AUH. The AUH will contact either the adjunct instructor, the observer or both to complete the process. A final signed copy of the observation, and possibly the response, will be filed in the adjunct instructor’s permanent file.
I.I. Criteria for Evaluation of All STAD Faculty

Pursuant to the guidelines of evaluation, promotion and tenure in the JMU Faculty Handbook, the following items exemplify the kinds of activities appropriate for “Satisfactory” and “Excellent” performance. In presenting this list, the school recognizes that each faculty member will possess a unique set of talents and accomplishments. The school also understands the open-endedness of the term “Excellent;” excellent behavior finally cannot be predicted any more than can the outcome of the honest inquiry that is the basis of the university. The school is content to assert that in its pursuit of faculty excellence, it supports and seeks to reward those individuals whose achievements significantly exceed the “Satisfactory.”

I.I.1. Teaching

Consideration of teaching performance may include, but not be limited to, self-evaluation, student evaluations, peer evaluations and school head evaluations. Additionally, consideration should be given to a faculty member’s commitment to student advising and innovations in teaching methodology. Teaching performance is understood to include the instructional components of activities for which release time is given and job performance for non-teaching faculty. It is also understood that the variety of courses taught is affected by the amount of assigned release time activity.

*Satisfactory Rating*

For satisfactory performance in teaching, evaluation is reviewed in the following areas:

- Meets class as scheduled, teaches appropriate and well-prepared materials.
- Receives positive student evaluations.
- Receives positive peer evaluations.
- Is accessible to students outside of class.
- Keeps abreast of developments in field and reflects them in classes.
- Is available to work with students on productions or provide advising or coaching on performances.
- Demonstrates effective academic advising.

*Excellent Rating*

For excellent performance in teaching, evaluation is reviewed in the following areas:

- Teaches a wide variety of courses.
- Originates courses.
- Undertakes major and innovative revision to course materials.
- Receives exceptional student evaluations.
- Receives exceptional peer evaluations.
- Receives JMU or external grant for instructional development.
- Undertakes special assignments, honors projects, internships, independent projects.
- Demonstrates effective teaching as evidenced by superior work of students.
- Demonstrates exceptional participation or supervision of production work.
- Exceeds expectations in academic advising.
I.I.2. Scholarly and/or Creative Achievement and Professional Qualification
Consideration in this area may include, but not be limited to, publications of scholarly works, presentations at professional conferences and achievements through performance in the arts.

Engaging in recognized research, obtaining of research grants and continuing professional development through formal course work is also included. In addition, faculty may have publications of education materials and consultative service as well as administrative leadership that represents synthesized knowledge and practice.

**Satisfactory Rating**
For satisfactory performance in scholarly and/or creative achievement, evaluation is reviewed in the following areas:
- Undertakes course work beyond appropriate degree.
- Receives JMU or external research or related grants.
- Gives formal presentations at local, state and regional conventions.
- Publishes non-juried articles in local, state, regional or national publications.
- Publishes juried articles in local, state or regional academic journals.
- Edits a local, state or regional academic journal.
- Is a member of an editorial board for local, state or regional academic journal.
- Participates in consulting work.
- Meets agreed upon deadlines and demonstrates full participation in collaborative process in work where release time is given.
- Directs, performs, designs, etc. with quality evaluated by professionals and peers on campus,
- Publishes or distributes scripts or plays on state, regional, national, international level.
- Choreographs, designs, directs, performs, etc. with quality evaluated by professionals and peers on campus, state or regional level.
- Maintains consistent and continued direction of a resident performing company.
- Presents workshops, residencies requiring original scholarly creative work in preparation.
- Receives honors/awards on local, state or regional level.
- Attends professional meetings, classes, etc. to stay current in field and increase expertise.

**Additional Criteria**
Additional criteria for Theatre faculty include to direct and perform in or otherwise contribute creatively to artistic performances that demonstrate quality as deemed by professionals and peers on a campus, state or regional level. Theatre faculty may also publish or otherwise distribute works including scripts or plays on a local, state or regional level.
Additional criteria for Dance faculty include to choreograph, direct and perform in or otherwise contribute creatively to performances that demonstrate quality as deemed by professionals and peers on a campus, state or regional level. They may maintain consistent and continued direction of a resident performing company and attend professional meetings, concerts, workshops and classes in order to stay current in the field and increase their knowledge and expertise. Dance faculty may also conduct or present workshops, consultantships or residencies that require original scholarly/creative achievement in their preparation. They may also receive honors and awards on a local, state or regional level.

**Excellent Rating**

For excellent performance in scholarly and/or creative achievement, evaluation is reviewed in the following areas:

- Completes program of course work beyond appropriate degree.
- Receives research or related grant of state, regional, national or international significance.
- Gives formal presentations at state, regional, national and international conventions.
- Publishes juried articles in leading state/regional/national/international academic journals.
- Publishes monograph, book, or other highly significant work.
- Edits leading state, regional, national or international academic journal.
- Serves on editorial board for leading state, regional, national or international academic journal or book publisher.
- Develops knowledge or expertise through consulting work.
- Exceeds expectations for collaborative work for which release time is given.
- Publishes or distributes scripts or plays on state, regional, national or international level.
- Choreographs, designs, directs, performs, etc. in performances that demonstrate quality as evaluated by peers and professionals on state, regional, national or international level.
- Consistently and continually directs a resident performing company that exhibits substantial increases in artistic quality as evaluated by professionals and peers.
- Conducts or presents significant workshops, consultantships or residencies.
- Receives special honors/awards on state, regional, national or international level.

**Additional Criteria**

Additional criteria for Theatre faculty include to direct and perform in or otherwise contribute creatively to artistic performances on a state, regional, national or international level. Theatre faculty may also publish or otherwise distribute works including scripts or plays on a state, regional, national or international level.
Additional criteria for Dance faculty include choreograph, direct and perform in or otherwise contribute creatively to performances that demonstrate quality as deemed by professionals and peers on a state, regional, national or international level. They may maintain consistent and continual direction of a resident performing company that exhibits substantial increases in artistic quality as evaluated by professionals and peers on a state, regional, national or international level. Dance faculty must also conduct or present significant workshops, consultancies or residencies that require original scholarly/creative achievement in preparation as attested to by professionals and peers on a state, regional, regional, national or international level. They must also receive special honors and awards on a state, regional, national or international level.

I.I.3. Professional Service
Evaluation in this area will be based on service and leadership on committees at the school, college and university levels; service to and leadership in professional or educational organizations at the regional, state or national level; or contribution that brings positive recognition to JMU.

Satisfactory Rating
For satisfactory performance in professional service, evaluation is reviewed in the following areas:
- Serves on school college and university committees.
- Administers or coordinates programs within the school.
- Advises student organizations beyond those related to teaching duties.
- Serves on panels or gives presentations at local, state, regional or national conferences.
- Holds office in state, regional, academic or professional organizations.
- Designs or redesigns campus facilities.
- Initiates/Administers campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of school or university.
- Develops classes and workshops for groups outside the university.
- Establishes relationships with theatre or dance professionals.
- Serves on editorial board of local, state or regional publication.
- Founders or establishes local, state or regional publication or organization.
- Acts as consultant to local, state or regional media or other professional organization.
- Contributes to development of the school in fundraising, recruitment or promotions.
- Conducts master classes, etc., for groups outside the university.
Additional Criteria
Additional criteria for Dance faculty include to conduct master classes, residencies and performances for groups outside the university.

Excellent Rating
For excellent performance in professional service, evaluation is reviewed in the following areas:

- Chairs school, college or university committees and makes significant contributions.
- Directs the administration or coordination of major components with the school.
- Holds major office in state, regional, national or international academic/prof. organization.
- Serves on editorial board of state, regional, national or international publication.
- Initiates, administers and/or supervises guest residencies of extended scope and outreach.
- Holds major responsibility in the design or renovation of new or existing facilities.
- Founds or establishes state, regional, national or international publication or organization.
- Serves as consultant to state, regional, national or international media or other organization.
- Serves as judge, critic or reviewer on state, regional, national or international level.
- Significantly contributes to school or college in fundraising, recruitment, promotions.
- Develops and/or advances dynamic partnerships with local, regional, or international programs.
- Conducts significant master classes, etc., for groups outside the university.

Additional Criteria
Additional criteria for Dance faculty include to conduct significant master classes, residencies and performances for groups outside the university.

I.J. Merit Pay Policy
By the consent of the faculty, it is the AUH who makes merit pay decisions, not the AUPAC or a special merit committee. The AUH uses the general criteria for evaluation of faculty, which were created for tenure and promotion procedures. However, the evaluation may also place special values on those things which have little built-in reward, such as administrative functions, program coordination, or important and time-consuming committees.

STAD is highly production-oriented, so almost everyone is actively involved in school events throughout the year. Each faculty member has specific functions, although they may change from
year to year. Therefore, there must also be some flexibility in merit evaluations. Many activities
do not fit neatly in the traditional areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

I.J.1. The school has a document for weighting the traditional three areas of faculty evaluation.
This reflects expected activities in both volume and quality.

I.J.2. The Annual Faculty Evaluation Form is submitted in May by each faculty member.

I.J.3. The categories relate to the school Tenure and Promotion document and end with a
proposed Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP). These are reviewed during the summer by the
AUH.

I.J.4. The volume and quality of activities by individual faculty members are compared to each
other for relative merit. Current evaluations are compared to past performance of individual
faculty members to examine individual and professional growth or lack thereof.

Judgments are then made regarding weighted intentions versus actual performance. An attempt
to define “Excellence” is made from the criteria set in the Tenure and Promotion document, with
the expectation that “Excellent” is a rating applied only in truly exceptional years. In other words,
it is an annual evaluation, not a cumulative one.

I.J.5. The rating in each area is given as score based on these guidelines: Excellent (3), Very Good
(2), Satisfactory (1), Unsatisfactory (0). The score is then weighted from the previously approved
FAAP. The overall score is totaled.

I.J.6. A pay percentage increase (equal to 50 percent of the merit pool allocation) will be given
to all faculty who are rated as satisfactory in their annual evaluation. The remaining 50 percent
of the total merit pool will be divided into merit units of fixed dollar amounts. Each faculty
member scoring a “Very Good” in an evaluation area will receive one merit unit for that category.
Each faculty member scoring an “Excellent” in an evaluation area will receive an additional merit
unit for that category. Therefore, the maximum number of merit units that any faculty member
could receive would be six, (three areas multiplied by two units). The minimum number of
additional merit units that a faculty member could receive would be zero (by receiving all
“Satisfactory” ratings). The number of units and thus their value will depend upon the overall
scores of the faculty.

I.J.7. Ultimately, any faculty member may dispute their merit pay award to the dean of the
college.
## I.K. Promotion Timelines

### I.K.1. Promotion to Tenure Timeline for Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Submit to</th>
<th>Conducted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial Evaluation</td>
<td>The deadline for receipt of review materials from the candidate is the first Monday following Spring Break.</td>
<td>AUPAC</td>
<td>AUPAC and AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Academic Year</td>
<td>AUH</td>
<td>AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annual Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Academic Year</td>
<td>AUH</td>
<td>AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Year Evaluation</td>
<td>The deadline for receipt of review materials from the candidate is the last day of the second week of the spring semester.</td>
<td>AUPAC</td>
<td>AUPAC and AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Academic Year</td>
<td>AUH</td>
<td>AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annual Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Academic Year</td>
<td>AUH</td>
<td>AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Annual Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Academic Year</td>
<td>AUH</td>
<td>AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tenure Evaluation</td>
<td>Fall Semester - Oct. 1</td>
<td>AUPAC</td>
<td>AUPAC and AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion Evaluation</td>
<td>Fall Semester - The dean will request that the candidate submit an abbreviated dossier, the format of which will be clarified in a letter from the dean to be received early in the academic year.</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I.K.2. Promotion to Full Professor Candidate Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Submit to</th>
<th>Conducted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Promotion Evaluation</td>
<td>Fall Semester - A written nomination must be made by Sep. 1 to the AUH; proper materials must be submitted by Oct. 1.</td>
<td>AUPAC</td>
<td>AUPAC and AUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Promotion Evaluation</td>
<td>Fall Semester - The dean will request that the candidate submit an abbreviated dossier, the format of which will be clarified in a letter from the dean to be received early in the academic year.</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>