

Department of Psychology
Promotion and Tenure Evaluation
Guidelines

Approved: 2022

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Evaluation Procedures and Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Foreword

Faculty members in the Department of Psychology reflect the diversity of the field of psychology in their expertise, scholarship, and service. Our faculty members serve in different roles at different levels of the Department's operation. Our unit works hard to develop a shared departmental vision and common mission. Our approach to faculty evaluation identifies and honors the work conducted by the faculty with diverse responsibilities, and we especially value faculty who collaborate, cooperate, and contribute to our shared mission. The procedures described in this document are consistent with the policies and procedures mandated in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

Department of Psychology Annual Evaluation Protocol

OVERVIEW FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Faculty members will compile relevant information about their activities in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service on an annual basis in the Faculty Annual Summary (FAS). The Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Department Head will evaluate the faculty member based on the FAS and other relevant information to assign a performance rating in each area and an overall rating based on the criteria described in this document. The PAC's role in this process is advisory, and the Department Head will make the final decisions regarding annual evaluation ratings. For purposes of annual evaluations, faculty will receive a designation in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service, an overall rating (unsatisfactory or satisfactory), and a merit pay classification. All performance designations will be made in a qualitative, holistic manner, taking into account such factors as level of involvement, amount of time committed, and the value of contributions. The PAC or the Department Head may request additional information or evidence to assist them in making their judgments.

OVERALL EVALUATION RATINGS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook (Section III.E.4), faculty will receive overall evaluations of either unsatisfactory or satisfactory. Overall ratings are based upon the separate evaluations in each of the domains of faculty work: teaching, scholarship and service. Generally, faculty will receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory only when they are rated as unsatisfactory in one or more of the evaluated domains or if their conduct is egregious. An unsatisfactory overall evaluation is expected to be rare. Its occurrence should be interpreted by faculty as substantive concern for success in the faculty role. Designations in this category may result in nonrenewal of the faculty member's contract, jeopardize future tenure or promotion, or may initiate post-tenure review processes. The procedures for post-tenure review are described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

MERIT PAY INCREMENTS

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook (Section III.i.2.c), as part of the annual evaluation process, each faculty member will receive a rating based on overall performance that will be used to determine merit pay when available. Merit pay increments are based on the evaluation of faculty in the domains of teaching, scholarship and service as well as any aspects of a faculty members conduct that impacts performance (*Faculty Handbook* III.A.; III.E.1.a; III.E.2.b). The PAC will share their merit increment recommendations for each faculty member with the Department Head during the annual faculty evaluation process. The Department Head will take these recommendations into account when determining merit increments and decisions will be included in each faculty member's annual evaluation letter.

The methodology for determining faculty salary increases is typically determined by university and college guidelines. If as a component of those increases the department is asked develop a scheme for differentiating among faculty based on merit, Department of Psychology faculty will receive merit increases according to the following criteria:

Merit Increment	Criteria
0% of potential merit increment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsatisfactory performance in at least one area
33% of potential merit increment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent in one domain. • Satisfactory in the remaining domains. • No significant concerns regarding their conduct.

67% of potential merit increment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent in at least two domains or substantially exceeds departmental expectations for ratings for excellent performance in one domain. • Satisfactory in the remaining domains. • No significant concerns regarding their conduct.
100% of potential merit increment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantially exceed departmental expectations for ratings for excellent performance in at least one domain. • Excellent in one or both of the other domains. • Ratings that are not less than satisfactory in any domain. • No significant concerns regarding their conduct.

PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Annual Review

1. Prior to the beginning of each academic year, the faculty member and the Department Head shall determine the relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. (See *JMU Faculty Handbook*, III.E.4.a. Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan.) It is assumed that PAC members will weight the three performance areas equally when determining the overall evaluation. If the faculty member wants to change the weights for each performance area used to determine the faculty member's overall evaluation, he/she will discuss a differential weighting with the Department Head during the annual evaluation meeting. If the Department Head gives approval to move forward with a proposal, at the beginning of the academic year the faculty member will submit a proposal to the Department Head and PAC outlining the differential weighting, the anticipated activities in the area that would warrant greater weighting, and an evaluation plan that could be used for the annual evaluation. If the Department Head approves the proposal, the Department Head will sign off on the proposal and inform the PAC of this arrangement. The faculty member will submit this approved plan with his/her FAS for the annual evaluation and note the differential weighting on the FAS.
2. Faculty members in the Department of Psychology will submit their FAS to the Department Head by the date specified by the PAC each year and not later than June 1. This summary will cover the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in the teaching and professional service areas during the previous 12 months (i.e., summer, fall, and spring semesters) and in the scholarly achievement and professional qualifications area for the previous 36 months. The Department Head and PAC will conduct independent reviews of the FAS during the summer. The PAC will review all performance areas for all full-time faculty members in the department, including other members of the PAC. An exception to this process is the procedure for the Assistant Department Heads. In this case, in the area of professional service, the PAC will not review or evaluate service related to their duties as assistant department heads but the PAC will review all other service activities for these individuals. The Department Head will be responsible for evaluating the professional service activities of Assistant Department Heads related to their duties in this position.
3. The PAC will rate each performance area of each faculty using the evaluation rating categories of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. In addition, the PAC will rate the overall performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory and make a merit increment recommendation. The Department Head will assign his or her independent ratings for each faculty member. The PAC and Department Head will discuss their ratings with one another. The Department Head will make the final decision regarding the ratings for each area, the overall evaluation, and the merit increment. The Department Head's decisions will be forwarded to the PAC. The PAC will treat this information confidentially.

Annual Evaluation Letter and Conference

4. The Department Head will write a preliminary evaluation letter and give the letter to the faculty member at least one day prior to the faculty member's annual evaluation conference as stipulated in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*, III.E.4.c. Preliminary Evaluation. The Department Head and faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty member's accomplishments during the previous year, the annual evaluation ratings, and the faculty member's goals for the next year as stipulated in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*, III.E.4.d. Conference. If after the conference the Department Head feels no revision of the letter is necessary, the preliminary evaluation letter will be considered to be the final letter. If after the conference the Department Head agrees to revise the evaluation letter, the final letter will be delivered to the faculty member by October 1, as stipulated in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*, III.E.4.f. Deadline.
5. If the faculty member concurs with the Department Head's annual evaluation ratings, the faculty member will sign the final evaluation letter and return it to the Department Head within seven days of receipt of the final letter. No further

action is required by the faculty member. The Department Head will forward the final evaluation letter with the faculty member's signature to the Dean of the College by October 28, as stipulated in the JMU Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.i. Final Evaluation.

6. If the faculty member does not concur with the Department Head's annual evaluation ratings, but does not wish to appeal the ratings, the faculty member will return the letter unsigned. The Department Head will forward the final evaluation letter without the faculty member's signature to the Dean of the College by October 28.

Appeals Procedures

7. If the faculty member does not concur with the Department Head's annual evaluation rating, the faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the final letter to appeal in writing. The entire appeal process must be completed by October 21. The basis and general procedures for an appeal is specified in the JMU Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.h. Review Criteria.
 - a. To initiate the appeal, the faculty member must write the appeal letter outlining the area(s) of disagreement and send the letter to the Department Head with a copy to the PAC Chair.
 - b. Within seven days of the receipt of the appeal letter, the Department Head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the appeal and consult with the PAC about the appeal. The Department Head will decide either to keep the original evaluation letter or to write a new evaluation letter. The Department Head must notify the faculty member of his or her decision within seven days and if a revised letter is written, must give the letter to the faculty member during this period.
 - c. If the faculty member still disagrees with the Department Head's final evaluation ratings, within seven days of the receipt of the final reissued or revised evaluation letter, the faculty member may write an appeal letter outlining the area(s) of disagreement and send the letter to the Department of Psychology Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee with a copy to the Department Head and the PAC Chair. The Department of Psychology Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee will be comprised of three people. These individuals will be former PAC members who completed their term the previous year. The members will include one currently non-tenured faculty member and at least one currently tenured faculty member. In the event that only two people completed their term in a given year, the third person will be the most senior faculty member who served on the PAC two years ago.
 - d. The Appeals Committee must adhere to the appeals policy outlined in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*, III.E.4.h. Review Criteria: "In considering an appeal, the crucial questions for the reviewing body are whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the academic unit head (AUH), and whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment." The Department Head will provide the Appeals Committee with the FAS for all faculty members, a list of the ratings for all faculty members, and a copy of all appeal letters and recommendations. The Appeals Committee will report its findings in writing to the faculty member and the Department Head and PAC within seven days of receiving the appropriate documents.
 - e. Within seven days of the receipt of the Appeals Committee letter, the Department Head and faculty member will meet to discuss the evaluation. The Department Head will decide either to keep the most recent evaluation letter or to write a new evaluation letter and will send the reissued or revised evaluation letter to the faculty member within seven days of the meeting.
 - f. If the faculty member agrees with the reissued or revised final evaluation letter, the faculty member will sign the letter and return it to the Department Head within seven days of receipt of the letter. If the faculty member does not agree with the evaluation letter at this point, the faculty member will inform the Department Head of this disagreement in writing and indicate if he or she would like the documentation of the appeal sent to the Dean along with the unsigned evaluation letter. The Department Head will forward the final evaluation letter without the faculty member's signature, and if requested the appeal documentation, to the Dean of the College by October 28.

The time periods noted in this process are highly recommended but changes in these time periods can be negotiated among the parties involved to accommodate other commitments.

Department of Psychology Protocol for Promotion and Tenure

The Department of Psychology's procedures regarding promotion and tenure are based on the procedures described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook 2004*.

EVALUATION RATINGS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

PROMOTION

The promotion standards used are taken from the *JMU Faculty Handbook*, III.E.6.a. Standards The *Faculty Handbook* states that “the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.”

The following are the standards for promotion in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*:

- **Lecturer**
Appointment at the rank of lecturer normally carries with it primarily teaching and service responsibilities, and a graduate degree in a relevant discipline.
- **Senior Lecturer**
An excellent rating in teaching and at least satisfactory ratings in the second and third areas are required for promotion to senior lecturer (note the unique criteria for what defines satisfactory and excellent in scholarship in the relevant section below).
- **Principal Lecturer**
An excellent rating in teaching and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to principal lecturer (note the unique criteria for what defines satisfactory and excellent in scholarship in the relevant section below).
- **Assistant Professor**
At least satisfactory ratings in all areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.
- **Associate Professor**
An excellent rating in at least one area and satisfactory ratings in the other areas are required for promotion to associate professor.
- **Professor**
Excellent ratings in at least two areas and a satisfactory rating in the other are required for promotion to professor.

TENURE

The *JMU Faculty Handbook* III.E.7.e. states that 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.”

“Length of service is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for tenure. 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. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate for tenure. Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service shall be used in evaluating the performance of a candidate for tenure. 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.”

EARLY CONSIDERATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Faculty Handbook requires that each academic unit define what is required for a faculty member to make a “compelling case” for early consideration for promotion (Faculty Handbook III.E.6) or tenure (Faculty Handbook III.E.7.b). The requirements for making a compelling case in the Department of Psychology are as follows:

The Department of Psychology will consider candidates for promotion one year prior to their scheduled date for promotion consideration, and tenure one-year prior to the candidate's penultimate year, when the faculty member has had a consistent work record that far exceeds expectations for an excellent rating in at least two out of three performance areas (teaching, scholarship, and service), and an excellent rating in the third area. Candidates may also be considered for promotion or tenure after a minimum of 1 year at JMU if their performance in all domains has been excellent and they have completed work of such outstanding quality and impact that they can make a compelling case that they have a national reputation and are a leader in their field. For recently hired faculty, the dossier may include accomplishments at other colleges or universities. Faculty seeking early consideration must prepare dossiers that present a compelling case for promotion and/or tenure. Accomplishment

reviews by scholars or faculty from other institutions is a recommended mechanism for demonstrating that the faculty member has a national reputation.

To be eligible for early tenure/promotion, a faculty member must provide a compelling case that far exceeds the Academic Unit's standard normally required for tenure/promotion. A faculty member who wishes to apply for early consideration must request that the Department Head and PAC provide him or her with feedback regarding early consideration when they submit their FAS for the prior year. Additional supporting documents may optionally be included with their FAS to assist the Head and PAC with this request. The Department Head and PAC will review the materials, and after consulting with each other, will make an independently recommendation regarding whether the faculty member's application presents a compelling case. The Department Head and the PAC will separately determine if the early application presents a compelling case for tenure and/or promotion and will provide that feedback directly to the faculty member no later than September 1. The Head and PAC will inform each other of their recommendations. If either the Department Head or the PAC determines that the application does not present a compelling case, the faculty member will be advised early application will not be considered. If the Head and the PAC evaluate the faculty member as eligible for early promotion, then the faculty member can apply. Endorsement by the Head and PAC does not guarantee that the faculty member will be promoted.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATION REVIEW

Mid-Tenure Review

For midpoint of the probationary period, at a minimum, faculty should submit all previous FASs (typically from the past 3 years) with a reflection on progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion on teaching, scholarship, and service. The reflection can be modeled after the CHBS tenure/promotion guidelines. Faculty have the option to submit supporting materials as outlined in the CHBS tenure/promotion guidelines. Midpoint review materials are due October 1. Faculty will receive independent feedback from the AUH and AUPAC by November 30.

The Promotion and Tenure Dossier

A faculty member who applies for promotion or tenure completes a Professional Dossier according to the current CHBS guidelines posted at <http://chbs.jmu.edu/facultydevelopment.html>. The dossier should also conform to the additional documentation requirements and suggestions posted on Sharepoint for faculty in the Department of Psychology.

In both promotion and tenure decisions, the PAC and the Department Head will consider the quality of performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service over the previous five years or since the last promotion.

DECISION PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

The university procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook* in sections III.E.6. and III.E.7.

Criteria Used by the Department of Psychology for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Below are the criteria that the Department Head and the Department of Psychology Personal Advisory Committee (PAC) will use to evaluate the performance of faculty members in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service for the purpose of annual evaluations and tenure and promotion decisions. Recognizing that there are unique features to the activities of each faculty member, both the PAC and the Department Head will use professional judgment in evaluating the merits of each application. The applicants must assume responsibility for providing the necessary documentation regarding these criteria. This information should be submitted with the Faculty Annual Summary (for annual evaluations) or with the professional dossier (for promotion and tenure evaluations). Performance will be considered unsatisfactory if it does not meet the criteria for either satisfactory or excellent in any area.

Individuals nominated or considered for an award by PAC and/or Department Head in the domain(s) of teaching, scholarship, and/or service will receive a rating of exceed excellence. Individuals who are considered for an award, but not nominated, may include those who are technically not eligible for an award (e.g., due to having recently won the award) but otherwise meet criteria for an award nomination. For examples of what is considered 'exceeds excellence' see prior nomination letters (posted

on SharePoint) and/or Department Head. Note, the category of “exceed excellence” is for annual evaluation purposes only: A rating of “exceed excellence” does not necessarily imply that the faculty member will be eligible for early tenure/promotion.

TEACHING

As the Department Head and PAC evaluate teaching performance, they will stay mindful of the fact that teaching responsibilities differ according to the nature of the faculty member’s assignment. As such, they will take into account the difficulty level of the course, the intrinsic appeal of the course, and other relevant factors.

Satisfactory Performance

To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Teaching, faculty will show evidence in *all* of the following:

1. **Fulfill the assigned teaching responsibilities.**
 - a. These can include course assignments, reassigned time for special projects or administration, or special contract arrangements.
 - b. If independent study is part of the course load, faculty should show learning objectives and a description of how students met those objectives.
2. **Provide evidence of satisfactory course evaluations on the department’s standard student evaluation instrument.**
 - a. Mean of required course evaluations during the evaluation period greater than 3.0 on a 5 point scale. (This is intended as a mean of average course ratings, which would be computed separately across individual items for each course. Thus, each course will be equally weighted). This criterion may be impacted by taking into account other information (e.g., course difficulty, grade distribution, complaints from individual students, etc.). Individual written comments from student evaluations of teaching also may be considered. These can either be provided directly by the faculty member or requested by the department head or the PAC (e.g., for any course receiving particularly a low average or high variability across ratings).
 - b. All faculty members must obtain course evaluations in all classes taught during Fall and Spring semester except for the following courses: PSYC 290, PSYC 402, PSYC 499, PSYC 680, PSYC 698, PSYC 699, PSYC 700. Evaluations in these seven courses are optional. Course evaluations are required during Summer sessions, but inclusion of summer course evaluations in the Faculty Annual Summary is optional.
 - c. Peer evaluations may be submitted in the event of problematic student evaluations.
3. **Provide selected evidence of consistently satisfactory teaching, including**
 - a. A representative syllabus that states course objectives and reflects up to date information, inclusive of diversity when relevant
 - b. Sample assignments that reflect appropriate design for course level and size and that promote intellectual ability development (e.g., writing, critical thinking) and high-quality student assessment.
4. **Active involvement in curriculum development in department**
 - a. Participate in discussion of curriculum issues at department meetings
 - b. Provide feedback on curriculum issues
 - c. Participate in discussions with other faculty about shared courses
5. **Advise undergraduate and / or graduate psychology major advisees.**
Note: Adherence will be assumed unless otherwise indicated (e.g., substantiated concerns brought to the department head or the PAC).
6. **Adhere to other reasonable expectations about the teaching role, such as observing office hours, maintaining accessibility, effective communication, effective collaboration, appropriate treatment of individual students, etc.**
Note: Adherence will be assumed unless evidence suggests otherwise (e.g., substantiated concerns brought to the department head or the PAC).

Excellent Performance

To receive a rating of “Excellent Performance” in Teaching, faculty must meet the criteria described for the rating of “Satisfactory Performance”. In addition, there should be clear evidence of having met additional criteria. The following are all potential additional criteria that may lead to a rating of “Excellent Performance.” In most cases it will require additional criteria to receive a rating of excellent. In rare instances a person may have involvement in only one, but the involvement might be extensive.

1. **Provide selective, evaluative evidence of high-quality teaching in the classroom.**

Evidence might include

- Sustained excellence in a given course assignment over a minimum of 3 semesters of teaching
- Peer evaluations
- Mean of course evaluations during the evaluation period greater than or equal to 4 on a 5-point scale.

2. **Provide selective evidence of significant course development or otherwise developing innovations to further improve teaching effectiveness.**

Evidence might include the following (accompanied by a rationale for change)

- new and innovative assignments
 - implementation of new grading/teaching technique
 - substantial course revision
 - development of instructional technology
3. **Provide selective evidence of applying effective principles from the scholarship of teaching or evidence-based strategies to course assignments or design.**
 4. **Demonstrate active mentoring of students in independent directed reading, research projects and/or applied experiences.** Evidence might include:
 - Evidence that students learned/gained valuable training that will be useful in future research, graduate school, or community work experiences
 - Making high quality contributions to honors theses, master's theses, specialist projects, or doctoral dissertations through chairing or actively interfacing with the committee and the student.
 - acceptance for publication or conference presentation of a research project
 - letters from students and/or other supervisors or other evidence regarding effective supervision
 5. **Integrate issues of diversity/multiculturalism into coursework whenever possible as demonstrated by actively doing some of the following:**
 - Encouraging critical thinking in regard to the influence of culture on the content area
 - Including diversity content that is relevant to the area of study whether research or practice-based
 6. **Provide selected evidence of high quality advising or advising students who are not your advisees.**
 7. **Active role beyond that required for satisfactory in curriculum development at JMU and/or beyond JMU.**
 - Design and implement new course.
 - Work on new concentrations or new programs.
 8. **Applied for and/or received grant funding to support teaching activities (cannot be listed as a research grant as well). Grant can be submitted to the PAC for evidence that it was substantial work.** (Externally funded grants represent a higher level of achievement and are highly valued accomplishment.)
 9. **Nominated for or received award for teaching.**

SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

The Department of Psychology values an inclusive definition of scholarly achievement as outlined by the way scholarship is defined at JMU (see “Scholarly Activity at James Madison University: Seeking A Common Understanding – A Report from the Role of Research Subcommittee”). JMU endorses the recommendations of the Boyer commission, which supports a broad conceptualization of what should be recognized and rewarded as scholarly achievement in higher education.

One major component of scholarly achievement is the creation of scholarly products, works that are shared with and evaluated by other professionals (i.e., work that is peer-reviewed or invited). For our department, these typically involve presentations at professional meetings, journal articles, books, book chapters, book reviews, computer software, grant activities, consulting activities, or scholarly products shared through other media. A special class of scholarly products is scholarly publications, a document that expands the impact of the scholarly product by making the work continuously available to a wide audience (e.g., a journal article, book chapter, or book; in print and/or online). Both the overall number of scholarly products and scholarly publications are considered in evaluations, and target numbers are provided below on how many products/publications need to be produced to be rated Satisfactory or Excellent in a given evaluation period. For annual evaluations, scholarly achievement in the past three prior years is considered. For promotion evaluations, scholarly achievement in the past five prior years is considered.

Our department considers the quality, impact and/or influence of scholarly work, not just quantity. Our department values collaboration. Our department also appreciates that scholarship in different areas of psychology can require different levels of investment in order to produce a single scholarly product. During the evaluation process, the Department Head and PAC will not simply count the number of items listed, but must consider quality, impact and influence indicators when evaluating scholarship. These indicators include but are not limited to:

- The potential of the work to have a significant impact on theory, practice, or teaching;
- The level of peer review and selectivity necessary to present or publish the work;
- The prestige of the conference at which a presentation is made or the impact factor of the journal in which the work is published.
- The level of complexity, innovation, and work volume required to complete the scholarship;

- The independence of listed work from another. (Repetition of the same presentation at multiple conferences should not be counted as multiple independent works. Progressive work that builds on prior activities, may be presented at various conferences over time, and can be considered to be multiple independent presentations.)
- The role of the faculty member in completing collaborative work.

When a faculty member considers a particular product to be an especially significant achievement, in the narrative section of the Faculty Annual Summary, faculty should describe these products in such a way that the Department Head and PAC can fairly evaluate the quality, impact, and influence of their scholarly contributions, and any special circumstances applicable to their scholarly work during the evaluation period (e.g., special effort required). The Department Head and PAC may also ask that additional materials be submitted for review and/or submitted for evaluation by professionals more familiar with the specialty area of the work. It should also be noted that our department values both single-author and collaborative scholarship, especially collaborative work with students. No special meaning is attributed to the order of authorship.

Although we value contributions to the JMU community, presentations to student and campus organizations are more appropriately described as service and will not be considered scholarship. Examples of such products include presentations to student organizations, JMU faculty, and classes. Faculty presentations or authorship on posters only presented on campus is valued as service rather than scholarship.

Satisfactory Performance

To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, faculty will show evidence of *all* of the following:

1. **Demonstrate involvement in scholarly activities during the current academic year.**
2. **Produce a minimum number of high-quality scholarly products during the evaluation period.**
 - Annual Evaluation: At least three scholarly products during the three-year period.
 - Promotion/Tenure: At least eight scholarly products during a five year period, two of which must be peer reviewed scholarly publications.
3. **Engage in professional development related to one’s area of teaching or scholarship or other aspects of the faculty role.** (These may include attending professional meetings, taking courses/workshops related to one’s area of research, teaching, or other aspect of the faculty role, or engaging in an organized program of reading).

For promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a rating of satisfactory requires evidence of being an *active consumer of scholarly knowledge*, such as by engaging in activities outlined in points 1 and 3 above, but only as a participant/consumer. To achieve a rating of excellent in scholarship, evidence should be provided of being an *active producer of knowledge and/or facilitator of others’ knowledge-production efforts* (including students and colleagues). Evidence could include products, such as those outlined in point 2 above, or facilitating activities discussed in points 1 or 3 above for others.

Excellent Performance

For a rating of “Excellent Performance” in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, the applicant meets all the standards for “Satisfactory Performance” and submits materials showing evidence of the production a greater number of high-quality scholarly products than described above for a rating of satisfactory. As described above, during the evaluation process the PAC and Department Head will not simply count the number of items listed, but will also consider quality, impact and influence indicators as well as the effort required to produce the work. Specifically,

1. **Produce high quality scholarly products during the evaluation period.**
 - Annual Evaluation: At least six products in the three-year period, and evidence of exceptional accomplishment during the prior academic year such as completion of one scholarly publication or acquisition of a substantial externally funded grant. Faculty who have completed four or more publications during the period of evaluation may receive a rating of excellent even if they don’t publish an additional work during the prior year if they demonstrate that they made substantial progress on future products during that year.
 - Promotion/Tenure: In most cases, at least fifteen products in a five-year period, four of which must be scholarly publications.

In addition, faculty must show evidence of **one or more** of the following:

1. **Engage in high quality research projects** (e.g., Involvement in research projects with potential for significant impact on theory, practice, and/or teaching; Development of comprehensive research strategies to address a particular important research question; Well-managed pursuit of multiple research questions; particularly innovative research strategies; or research that fosters multidisciplinary approaches)

2. **Provide students with opportunities to participate in scholarly activities.** Including students in high-level scholarly activities, such as helping them author or co-author conference presentations and publications is particularly valued.
3. **Apply for and/or receive grant funding to support scholarly activities.** (Externally funded grants represent a higher level of achievement and are highly valued accomplishments.)
4. **Engage in systematic professional development that involves substantial retooling of skills.**
5. **Receive a nomination or award for scholarly achievement.**

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

As the Department Head and PAC evaluate professional service performance, they will stay mindful of the fact that possibilities for faculty service are quite broad. Some faculty may concentrate their service in more narrowly defined areas while other faculty may render service broadly across many domains.

Satisfactory Performance

Faculty in the Department of Psychology will be expected to demonstrate departmental, college and university citizenship by being respectful of others, representing the organization well, and contributing to the common good. To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Professional Service, faculty must act as good departmental and university citizens by participating in cooperative efforts to foster the well-being of the organization. To receive a rating of “Satisfactory Performance” in Professional Service, faculty will show evidence of *all* of the following:

1. **Regularly attend and participate in departmental, college, and university meetings.**
2. **Participate in several student-focused activities (e.g., Commencement, Department of Psychology Awards Ceremony, Psychology Symposium, meetings of student organizations, program assessment reception, etc.)**
3. **Contribute to activities that directly benefit the department (including General Education and/or Psychological Sciences, as appropriate) and help us meet our College and University obligations.**

Excellent Performance

To receive a rating of “Excellent Performance” in Professional Service, faculty must meet the criteria described for the rating of “Satisfactory Performance” and submit materials showing evidence of substantial activity or activities, such as the following:

1. **Substantially contribute to the collective service activities of the department by completing work that has significant impact and/or requires great effort.**
2. **Demonstrate leadership by serving as chair for a productive faculty committee or as the departmental representative for a busy college or university committee or task force.**
3. **Participate in service that has substantial impact on the lives of faculty and/or students.**
4. **Take an active role in curriculum development and/or program assessment.**
5. **Complete substantial advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students in addition to assigned academic advisees.**
6. **Serve on college or university committees or taskforces or in other service roles at JMU that are additional to obligations of the department.**
7. **Make contributions to the community external to JMU that make appropriate use of one’s expertise.**
8. **Provide effective service to professional organizations.**
 - These may include:
 - serving as an officer of a professional organization
 - serving as a journal editor
 - reviewing books or manuscripts for publishers and professional journals
 - serving on a committee or chairing a conference session
9. **Make outstanding contributions to the development of other faculty.**
10. **Apply for or receive grant funding to support service activities.** (Externally funded grants represent a higher level of achievement and are highly valued accomplishment.)
11. **Be nominated for or receive an award for professional service.**