

Department of Philosophy and Religion

Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Approved: 2016

Department of Philosophy & Religion

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Revised and Approved April 2016

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, candidates for tenure and promotion in academic rank are evaluated on the basis of performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. In each of these three areas, the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory by the academic unit head (AUH) and the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC), which submit independent recommendations to the Dean.¹

A recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor requires an excellent rating in either teaching or research, and at least satisfactory ratings in the other two areas.

A recommendation for promotion to full professor requires excellent ratings in two areas and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area. When applying for full professor, activities conducted during the year in which one applied for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor WILL COUNT when promotion to full is being considered.

The following lists of indicators are not necessarily ranked in order of importance and are not considered exhaustive, but they constitute activities, accomplishments and items that will normally be considered in evaluating faculty performance.

Teaching²

A. Indicators of satisfactory performance

1. Fulfilling basic teaching duties, which include meeting classes as scheduled, being well-prepared, holding regular office hours, grading in a timely fashion, and assigning course grades that are reasonably distributed, given the types of courses taught, etc.
2. Being rated satisfactory or better based on class observations or other peer review conducted by the PAC, AUH or other qualified observers.
3. Consistently earning approximately average scores on each of the questions on the multiple-choice portion of the student evaluation

¹ JMU Faculty Handbook (July 2012) Section III.E.6-7.

² These guidelines for the evaluation of teaching are taken, with modifications, from the guidelines for the annual evaluation of teaching that the Department of Philosophy & Religion approved in April 2008.

questionnaire.

4. Consistently principally garnering positive and/or neutral comments on students' written evaluations, such that negative comments are outweighed, in quantity and/or quality, by positive or neutral ones.
 - a. Student evaluations, both numerical and written, are to be interpreted in a way that controls for the type of course in question (required GenEd course vs. upper-level elective, for example). The evaluator can also take into account extenuating factors affecting students' numerical evaluations including, but not limited to, students' anticipated grades, course difficulty, and students' expectations. Accordingly, taken by themselves, largely favorable student evaluations will not absolutely guarantee a satisfactory performance rating, nor will largely unfavorable evaluations automatically entail an unsatisfactory one.
 - b. Whether positive, negative, or neutral, written comments that clearly address questions of pedagogy (such as overall organization, day-by-day preparation, clarity of delivery, quality of feedback, and so on) will be counted at a premium. Comments that are comparably inarticulate, or that focus instead on more superficial or peripheral matters (such as an instructor's overall personability or a student's own attitudes on course content) will be given less weight. Outliers will not be given undue weight for purposes of overall assessment.
5. Submitting additional teaching-related materials of good or better quality; for example, syllabi are duly clear concerning course objectives and organization, grading standards and other policies; assignments or exams contain clear directions and an appropriate level of difficulty; or instructor-authored teaching materials clearly supply aids to understanding, fodder for discussion, or good guidelines for completing assignments.

B. Indicators of excellent performance

1. Being rated excellent, or otherwise much better than simply satisfactory, based on class observations or other peer review conducted by the PAC, AUH or other qualified observers.
2. Consistently earning superior scores (i.e., scores that are better than the department average) on each of the questions on the multiple-choice portion of the student evaluation questionnaire.
3. Consistently garnering strongly positive substantive comments, with appreciable frequency, on students' written evaluations.
4. Receiving or being a finalist for a teaching award.

5. Attending or giving a presentation at a conference, institute, etc., on college or university teaching.
6. Designing and delivering a new course or program, or making substantial changes to an existing course or program.
7. Submitting additional teaching-related materials of very high quality, such as instructor-authored teaching materials that are exceptionally thorough, clear, and/or numerous, assignments or exams that are exceptionally well-conceived and carefully constructed, comments on students' work that are exceptionally thorough and pedagogically apt, for example.
8. Acting as reader or director on an honors thesis or otherwise supervising student research.
9. Teaching an independent study, especially one that goes beyond what one usually covers in the classroom.
10. Teaching in extra-departmental contexts, e.g., study abroad, seminars for the public, guest lecturing in colleagues' classes, or outreach programs

Research/Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

I. Scholarly achievement

A. Indicators of satisfactory performance:³

1. An original scholarly monograph published by a recognized academic press (i.e., not an edited volume, critical edition or translation); **or**
2. Three original scholarly essays published in refereed journals, refereed electronic publications or anthologies

B. Indicators of excellent performance

1. Substantial published or forthcoming work(s), beyond the scholarly achievements needed for a rating of satisfactory, including but not necessarily limited to:

³ The tenure and promotion guidelines of the College of Arts and Letters indicate that publishing a book or three articles is of primary importance in satisfying the standards of the College in the area of scholarly achievement. Items of secondary importance—among which the Dean names conference presentations, organizing or presiding at panels at professional meetings, refereeing research manuscripts, book reviews, seminar participation, or writing a published study guide—cannot outweigh or take the place of items of primary importance, no matter the quantity of items of secondary importance. See pp. 2-3 of the CAL guidelines, available at http://www.jmu.edu/cal/wm_library/TenurePromotionGuidelines.pdf

- a. Books published by a recognized academic press, including monographs, edited volumes,⁴ book-length translations, critical editions, and textbooks;
- b. Scholarly essays in refereed journals, referred electronic publications or anthologies, including essays with original theses, review articles, encyclopedia entries and essay-length translations;
- c. Book reviews, annotated bibliographies, articles in the popular press, book notes, discussion notes and encyclopedia notes.

In making a case for excellence in scholarship, *ceteris paribus*:

- i. Scholarly books (as listed in I.B.1.a) are most valuable, followed by scholarly essays (as listed in I.B.1.b), followed by items in I.B.1.c.
 - ii. The higher the quantity of published or forthcoming works, the stronger the case for excellence in scholarship;
 - iii. The higher the quality of published or forthcoming works, the stronger the case for excellence in scholarship;
 - iv. Original work makes a stronger case for excellence in scholarship, in comparison with work without an original thesis and in comparison with editorial work;
 - v. Scholarly research makes a stronger case for excellence in scholarship, in comparison with pedagogical work;
 - vi. The more prestigious the venue in which work appears, the stronger the case for excellence in scholarship;
 - vii. Work that makes an influential contribution to a field of study (such as by shaping a field or by being utilized or cited frequently) makes a strong case for excellence in scholarship.
2. Honors, awards, grants or fellowships for scholarly work.
 3. A consistent record of conference papers, invited lectures, colloquium papers or presentations, and/or scholarly interviews.

⁴ Edited volumes with more original scholarly content by the candidate are more valuable than those with less original scholarly content by the candidate, and edited volumes with more original scholarly contributions by others are worth more than those with more content that has already appeared elsewhere. For example, an edited volume with a substantial original introductory essay by the candidate, a paper by the candidate, and/or substantial introductions to each chapter would be worth more than an edited volume of previously-anthologized essays with no substantial scholarly contributions by the editor.

4. Letters of recommendation from external reviewers showing esteem of the faculty member's scholarly work.
5. Evidence of works in progress, showing a continuing scholarly agenda and a promise of future productivity.

Regarding both I.A and I.B (indicators of satisfactory performance and indicators of excellent performance in scholarly achievement):

1. For purposes of tenure and promotion to associate professor or to full professor, forthcoming scholarly work (i.e., work that is accepted and in press) can count toward demonstrating scholarly achievements, if candidates supply evidence that work is forthcoming. This evidence can include (but is not necessarily limited to) page proofs, copies of book contracts, contributor agreements or acceptance letters from publishers or editors.
2. For purposes of tenure and promotion to associate professor, scholarly work published by a faculty member prior to starting his or her tenure-track appointment at JMU can count toward demonstrating scholarly achievements, and toward negotiating a shortened tenure clock. The extent to which such work counts toward satisfying tenure and promotion requirements and toward shortening a candidate's tenure clock will be discussed among the AUH, the PAC, the Dean, and the incoming faculty member and will be clearly stated in the faculty member's Letter of Offer. Normally work published more than seven years prior to the end of the standard probationary period (i.e., the year of tenure review) will not count towards a candidate's tenure and promotion. Notwithstanding these provisions, faculty members with existing agreements on their promotion and tenure may opt to be governed by those agreements.
3. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to demonstrate – and are evaluated on the basis of – ongoing and active productivity while on the tenure-track.
4. For purposes of promotion to full professor, a faculty member must publish work while an associate professor, demonstrating a continuing scholarly agenda and activities. For example, to achieve a satisfactory performance in scholarly achievements for promotion to full professor, a faculty member must publish three scholarly articles or a book during the time that he or she is an associate professor.
5. There is a presumption that non-academic work does not count towards scholarship. But faculty may, in specific instances, attempt to make a case for non-academic publications counting towards scholarship. The PAC decides.

6. In order to earn a satisfactory rating in scholarship when applying for tenure, each faculty member must publish either three scholarly articles or a scholarly monograph in the faculty member's stated area(s) of specialization (as specified in the job description) or in a scholarly area with cognate content. The defined area(s) of specialization may be modified if so approved by the AUH at the time of hire. Additional publications outside of the area(s) of specialization may potentially count towards a rating of excellent, at the PAC's discretion. Faculty are encouraged to seek a written determination of the status of such publications from the PAC.

II. Professional qualifications

The faculty member holds the appropriate terminal degree, i.e., the Ph.D.

Professional Service

A. Indicators of satisfactory performance

1. Attendance at departmental faculty meetings
2. Participation in departmental discussions concerning curriculum and instruction, hiring and departmental policy changes, etc.
3. Student advising
4. Participation in some of the following:
 - a. Service as a member of committees
 - b. Service as chair of routine departmental committees
 - c. Service as a departmental liaison, colloquium organizer, webpage curator or Blackboard curator
 - d. Sponsorship of student organizations
 - e. Service as a coordinator of a major or minor program
 - f. Service as an officer of a professional organization
 - g. Organizing or chairing panels for professional meetings

- h. Refereeing research manuscripts
- i. Professional consultations (such as for humanities related education and non-profit public service organizations)
- j. Service to the community in one's capacity as a faculty member

B. Indicators of excellent performance

1. Substantial or sustained service to the department, college, university or profession; service beyond the basic duties of every departmental citizen
2. Service as chair of college or university committees or of time-consuming or demanding departmental committees
3. Especially demanding or impactful special service assignments, such as conducting a departmental self-study, drafting departmental policy, or writing or compiling lengthy reports

C. Compensated Service

Service duties that are compensated either by extra pay or by reduced teaching loads are considered to be "compensated service". Such compensated service CANNOT count towards earning a rating of Satisfactory in Service, but it can be counted towards a rating of Excellent in Service.

In other words, compensated service can serve as a supplement to the rating of someone who has otherwise earned a rating of Satisfactory through uncompensated service, but such compensated service CANNOT substitute for one's duty to perform regular, uncompensated departmental service.

Personnel Advisory Committee

A. Composition of the committee

The PAC shall be composed of 5 members—2 from Religion, and 3 from Philosophy—to reflect the relative percentages of faculty in the department in each field.

Members shall serve for one-year terms, and all tenured faculty except the AUH will be rotated sequentially into the PAC. If a faculty member cannot serve for a year when his or her turn comes up (e.g., if up for promotion, on academic leave, etc.), he or she will instead serve the following year, assuming no similar impediments to service exist.

In cases where the candidate would come under the guidelines of affirmative action (e.g., being a woman or a member of a minority group), every effort will be made to include a representative from the appropriate group on the PAC, even if it means going outside the department to do so. If said candidate prefers, she or he can opt-out of this accommodation.

B. Voting percentages

Tenure recommendations will be made by tenured members of the PAC, at least seventy-five percent of whom shall agree affirmatively before tenure can be recommended. For example:

1. If the PAC consists of four members, a recommendation for tenure shall require that at least three out of four committee members agree that tenure should be recommended.
2. If the PAC consists of five members, a recommendation for tenure shall require that at least four out of five committee members agree that tenure should be recommended.
3. If the PAC consists of six members, a recommendation for tenure shall require that at least five out of six committee members agree that tenure should be recommended.

The spirit of the percentage recommendation is to require a strong majority but not necessary unanimity.

C. Procedures

1. As stated by the Dean of the College of Arts & Letters, faculty members who intend to become candidates for tenure or promotion should give written notice to the department head by September 1 of the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The faculty member will receive a letter written by the Dean indicating how their tenure and/or promotion materials should be organized.⁵ The faculty member shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments and supporting materials in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional

⁵ CAL Tenure and Promotion guidelines (p.1), available at http://www.jmu.edu/cal/wm_library/TenurePromotionGuidelines.pdf

qualifications, and professional service to the department head and the PAC by October 1.⁶

2. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, PAC and department head evaluations shall be submitted to the Dean by November 15 with copies to the candidate. After the Dean has received both the PAC and department head recommendations, a copy of the PAC recommendation shall be provided to the department head, and a copy of the department head's recommendation shall be provided to the PAC.⁷
3. Voting will take place by cast ballot, unless the PAC chooses another method of determining its recommendations, e.g., clear deliberative consensus.
4. All members of the PAC will adhere to a strict code of professional ethics regarding the confidentiality of deliberations on all matters under their consideration.

⁶ Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.6.b.(1)

⁷ Faculty Handbook, Sections III.E.6.b.(5) and III.E.7.f.(5).