



Office of the Provost

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Approved: 2015

Office of the Provost
James Madison University

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

Department of Sociology & Anthropology

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

On 21 April, 2006 the Department Head and all tenure-track/tenured departmental faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved guidelines pertaining to promotion and tenure. On 4 September, 2009 the Department Head and all tenure-track department faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved an amendment to the composition of the PAC. In addition, guidelines pertaining to other official evaluations of faculty members including the Initial Evaluation and Annual Evaluations were approved. On 16 March, 2012 the Department Head and tenure-track/tenured departmental faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved amendments regarding the composition of the PAC and voting procedures for electing the PAC. In addition, the process for soliciting outside letters by the PAC was approved. On March 27, 2015, the Department Head and tenure-track/tenured department faculty approved an amendment to more closely align the stated role of the Annual Evaluation in our PAC document with language in the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty members must be knowledgeable of these guidelines and procedures when preparing for various evaluations and when serving on AUPAC and/or the annual evaluation committee.

The following evaluations are mandated by the Faculty Handbook:

1. Initial Evaluation of new full-time faculty (Attachment 1)
2. Annual evaluations of all full-time faculty (Attachment 2)
3. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Attachment 4)

In addition to these evaluations the Department requires faculty on a normal 6-year tenure-track stream to undergo a pre-tenure review (Attachment 3).

Guidelines and procedures for serving on the AUPAC as well as the duties of the AUPAC Chair are contained in Attachment 5. These attachments direct faculty to the relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook which is online at <http://www.jmu.edu/fs>. All faculty are responsible for understanding the policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure as these are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Questions concerning these guidelines and procedures should be directed to the Head of the department and, if applicable, to the AUPAC Chair of your program.

Attachment 1 – Initial Evaluation

Section III.E.3. of the Faculty Handbook (p. 37) outlines the policies and procedures governing the Initial Evaluation.

Comments:

The Initial Evaluation is the responsibility of the Department Head. Since our department has two distinct programs and two different AUPACs, the Department Head will consult with the AUPAC Chair of the faculty member's program for input regarding the Initial Evaluation. It is expected that the AUPAC Chair will solicit comments from her/his faculty regarding the performance of first year faculty. This review will be conducted early in the second semester.

Example:

Jane Doe is a first-year full-time tenure-track faculty member in anthropology. Early in the second semester the Head asks the anthropology AUPAC Chair for input based on the program's assessment of Prof. Doe's performance to date. The AUPAC chair will likely ask Prof. Doe to provide a very brief statement of her teaching and scholarship and, in consultation with other program faculty, will evaluate her on the basis of this statement, course evaluations, classroom observation, syllabi, and other relevant material. This evaluation will be passed onto the Academic Unit Head (AUH) who will meet with Prof. Doe and provide her with a written evaluation that is either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." An unsatisfactory evaluation will result in the nonrenewal of Prof. Doe's appointment.

Bob Jones is a new faculty member in sociology on a one-year full-time appointment. He will also undergo an initial evaluation following the same procedures outlined above for Jane Doe.

Consult: Section III.E.3 of the Faculty Handbook.

Attachment 2 – Annual Evaluation

Section III.E.4 of the Faculty Handbook outlines the policies and procedures governing Annual Evaluations. Every full time faculty member, whether tenure track or non-tenure track, undergoes an annual evaluation and is responsible for understanding university and departmental guidelines pertaining to the annual evaluation.

Comments:

Although the annual evaluation is the responsibility of the Department Head who provides each faculty member with a written annual evaluation and evaluation conference, the annual evaluations in our department are conducted by a committee that includes the Head, the Program Coordinators, and two additional tenure-track (but not necessarily tenured) faculty from both Sociology and Anthropology. Service on this committee is rotated among tenure track faculty who serve for a two-year term.

Faculty members submit their annual evaluations by completing the *Annual Report of the Faculty*, a form that has been devised by departmental faculty. The form is divided into the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service each of which is subdivided into categories of “Excellent +,” “excellent,” “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory.” The Annual Report Form clearly specifies those activities that fall into each of these three categories enabling the faculty member to get a clear sense of her/his performance rating.

In addition, faculty members submit a **Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan** in which they outline anticipated teaching, scholarly, and service plans for the next academic year. The annual evaluation is submitted to the evaluation committee between May 1 and May 15.

The Annual Evaluation is used primarily to determine annual salary increments and adjustments, if any. A faculty member’s pattern of prior annual evaluations is considered during a candidate’s application for promotion. Candidates should keep in mind, however, that promotion and tenure standards are different from those employed in the annual evaluation, and the annual evaluation committee is different from, and has a different evaluative mission than, the AUPAC that considers promotion and tenure requests.

- Consult:** 1. Section III.E.4 Annual Evaluation guidelines from the Faculty Handbook
2. Sociology and Anthropology “Annual Report of the Faculty” form

Attachment 3 – Pre-tenure Review Guidelines

Although the Faculty Handbook does not prescribe pre-tenure reviews for tenure-track faculty, the department **requires** tenure line faculty on a standard six-year tenure stream to undergo a pre-tenure review in either the second semester of her/his third year or first semester of her/his fourth year at James Madison University. The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to provide the faculty member with an evaluation of her/his progress towards tenure and/or promotion **from members of the PAC, most of who will be involved in the tenure and promotion decision.** The exact timing of the review shall be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the program PAC Chair. Faculty on less than a six-year tenure stream (determined by contract on initial hiring) may or may not undergo a pre-tenure review pending consultation with the program PAC. The pre-tenure review will be conducted by the program PAC and may include, based on consultation with the faculty member, one or more faculty from outside the faculty member’s program.

Comments:

The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to provide a tenure line faculty member with important feedback from tenured program faculty regarding her/his progress towards tenure and to give the faculty member experience in crafting a promotion and tenure document. To that end, the faculty member will submit a pre-tenure review packet that follows the **Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (see Attachment 4)**. This packet will be thoroughly reviewed by the program PAC who will prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's progress to date and identify areas that the faculty member needs to address when submitting her/his tenure and promotion application.

Examples:

1. Jim Smith is a tenure-track sociologist in his third year of full-time teaching at JMU. His first year, however, was on a non-tenure track appointment that was later converted to a tenure line appointment for which he was subsequently hired. His employment contract states that he will be eligible for tenure after completing his sixth year of tenure-track employment. He has consulted with the Sociology PAC Chair and they have decided that Prof. Smith will undergo a pre-tenure review in the second semester of his fourth year of teaching (which is his third year for tenure purposes).

2. Mary Adams is in her first year as a senior assistant professor, tenure track, in anthropology. She brings four years of teaching and research experience from a previous position and has negotiated a tenure decision to be made after her third year at JMU. She will thus submit a tenure and promotion application to the Anthropology PAC in the fall semester of her third year. She will have an initial evaluation in the second semester of her first year at JMU and annual evaluations, but will not undergo a pre-tenure review.

Consult: Attachment 4, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Attachment 4 – Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Section **III.E.6** of the Faculty Handbook describes the standards and procedures for promotion to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Section **III.E.7** outlines the standards and procedures for tenure. Every faculty member must know these standards and procedures since they govern the evaluation process for tenure and promotion. Promotion and tenure standards differ slightly and, therefore, involve two separate decisions although recommendations for both are made at the same time (see “Comments” section below).

As a general rule assistant professors will apply for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure provided they have been in the rank of assistant professor for the customary 5-year period at the time of application for tenure/promotion. As a general rule, a candidate who is recommended for tenure will also be recommended for promotion. Associate Professors will be considered for promotion to Full Professor provided they have been in the rank of Associate Professor for the customary 5-year period at the time of application for promotion. Exceptions to these rules may occur depending on individual

circumstances. What follows are specific departmental guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship and service and advice for preparing the tenure and/or promotion packet.

Departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

As prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, the program PAC evaluates each candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Three general questions are stressed: (1) Has the candidate demonstrated the ability to stimulate students intellectually, to contribute to scholarship, and to provide leadership through professional service? (2) Will the candidate continue to be productive in these areas? (3) In what ways has the candidate contributed to program, departmental, college, and university goals?

Because of the diversity of programs within the department and because candidates, even within programs, vary greatly in the manner in which they inspire students, produce scholarly work, and serve the professional community, it is impossible to provide a specific formula that will cover all tenure cases. The Guidelines below, in conjunction with those provided by the College of Arts and Letters, are intended to give the candidate a sense of the questions asked by the PAC when evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure. These guidelines are also designed to assist the candidate in the writing of the promotion and tenure packet submitted to the PAC. **It is imperative, however, that a candidate for promotion and tenure consult the program PAC chair for specific guidance on how to prepare a tenure/promotion packet.** The P & T guidelines are “nested” within the general instructions for preparing the promotion/tenure packet.

The Promotion/Tenure Packet

A promotion/tenure packet consists of two parts: (1) a narrative statement where the candidate addresses the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service and to which a current CV is attached; (2) a packet of supporting materials referenced in the narrative including course syllabi, a sample of exams and student handouts/exercises, publications, grant proposals, work in progress, supporting letters from colleagues and students (if any), relevant documents pertaining to service, and other materials the candidate considers important to the evaluation of her/his case.

1. The Narrative Statement – this statement summarizes the candidate’s activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service. **Four copies of the narrative statement should be submitted to the department office by the specified date (usually October 1).**

A. Teaching: Evaluation of teaching centers on several questions. (1) Do the candidate’s courses contain a high level of scholarly content and reflect current approaches in the discipline? (2) Does the candidate effectively convey course content and stimulate students to understand, appreciate, and produce scholarly work? (3) Is the candidate thoughtful and reflexive about her/his class preparation and performance? (4) Do the candidate’s courses contribute to the curricula of the program, the department and the university? These issues should be addressed in the narrative, which should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

1. A statement of the candidate's pedagogical philosophy and the teaching styles (lectures, discussion, use of media, etc.) used to convey course content.
2. A description of the courses taught at JMU, the development of new courses, and how these contribute to the program and college curricula. Indicate the main features or aspects of each course you have taught/developed in terms of structure, content, and importance to the program.
3. A **summary** of student evaluations and other written evaluations of teaching, if any (the student evaluations themselves need not be included as these are available in the main office for review by the PAC).
4. A description of teaching related professional development opportunities (e.g., attendance at NEH Summer Seminars or Institutes; attendance/participation in teaching-related conferences) and how these have enhanced her/his teaching.
5. A description of any teaching-related grants one has written and/or received.
6. A summary of honors theses supervised or read; independent studies, internships and/or other ways that have served particular students (e.g., writing letters of recommendation that further a student's career, informal mentoring for specific projects), and an assessment of her/his departmental advising activities.
7. A statement where the candidate critically reflects on her/his teaching and provides a self-evaluation regarding its quality.
8. A statement regarding future teaching contributions and plans.

B. Scholarship: Assessment in this area is concerned with both the quality and quantity of scholarship and centered on the following questions: (1) Is the candidate's work of high enough quality that it reflects an understanding of the best work available in the discipline? (2) Does the work make a contribution to the scholarly tradition in which it is situated? (3) Is the work of sufficient quantity? (4) Has the candidate sought to make her/his work available by disseminating it to appropriate audiences? (5) In what ways has the candidate's scholarly work been recognized by the wider scholarly community to which the candidate is contributing? (6) Has the candidate shown promise of being consistently productive? Addressing these questions in the narrative involves:

1. A statement indicating the candidate's subdisciplinary specialties and her/his theoretical position within these specialties. For example, if the candidate is theoretically located in political ecology, or social organization, or race/gender/class, or human biology, or techno-environmental issues, etc. clearly state the theoretical and methodological approaches taken to pursue these research areas. The goal here is to explicitly locate and define scholarly interests and approaches.

2. A summary of research activities, publications, and presentations. The candidate must show the extent to which her/his scholarly production has contributed to the scholarly tradition in which s/he works. Each scholarly product (publication, meeting presentation, work in progress, etc.) should be briefly summarized to give PAC members a good sense of the candidate's research and theoretical interests and contributions. **If the publications include joint authorship, the candidate must clearly state the nature and extent of her/his role in the publication.**
3. A summary of grant-seeking and/or contract activities that inform the candidate's scholarly work.
4. A statement indicating the candidate's past and current research and publications, future research and publication plans, including the progress made to date.
5. A brief statement evaluating the quality and quantity of the candidate's scholarly work.

*The question of "sufficient quantity" is often the most troubling one confronting faculty members. As a general rule, candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should regard **three published** scholarly products such as books, edited books, book chapters, peer-reviewed articles, and major review articles/essays (brief book reviews are not counted among the three) as meeting the "satisfactory" standard for tenure and promotion, provided at least **one** of these is a significant publication in a recognized peer-reviewed journal. A scholarly book published by a recognized press **may** be sufficient to meet the "satisfactory" standard irrespective of other publications. By "published" we mean work that is already published, has been accepted for publication, or is far enough along in the review process (as indicated by editor/reviewer comments) that there is a reasonable expectation of publication. Receipt of a book contract based on a prospectus, while an indication of future publication plans, will not be regarded as a "publication." Written portions of a book manuscript are, however, to be included in a packet for review by the PAC. Issues and advice regarding scholarly output is given to each candidate in the pre-tenure review and is given to guide the candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion. Candidates for promotion to full professor can refer to the tenure and promotion guidelines regarding scholarship provided by the College of Arts and Letters.

C. Professional Service: Evaluation in this area concerns the extent to which service activities reflect the candidate's scholarly, teaching and professional interests and the role these have played in furthering personal, program, departmental, college and university goals. This section of the narrative should address:

1. The candidate's involvement in JMU-related service activities at the program, departmental, college and university levels. The candidate should assess her/his specific roles in these activities as opposed to giving a mere listing of committee memberships.

2. The candidate's involvement in community service organizations that reflect her/his professional interests (e.g., lectures given to a local community organization that is based on the candidate's scholarly expertise; involving students in community projects; serving as a board member or consultant to an organization).
3. If the candidate holds an office in a state/regional/national professional organization the candidate should address the nature of this office and how it impacts the profession. This would also include membership on an agency governing board or journal editorial board.
4. The candidate's activities as a manuscript reviewer for presses and journals and/or as a proposal reviewer for granting agencies. The candidate should list specific manuscripts and grants s/he has reviewed.
5. A description of any other service activities not addressed above that the candidate thinks is important to an evaluation of her/his service to the university and the scholarly community.
6. A brief assessment of the candidate's overall service activities and anticipated future service roles.

2. The Supporting Materials Portfolio – this packet should be divided into three sections for teaching, scholarship, and professional service respectively. Each section should contain written materials that support and/or are referenced in your narrative statement and CV. **Only one copy of the packet need be submitted.** The packet should, at a minimum, contain the following materials:

A. Teaching – Course syllabi; a representative **sample** of exams and student assignments/handouts; unsolicited testimonials, if any, from students regarding teaching performance or other impacts the candidate has made on students; peer reviews of teaching, if any; any other written materials that help the PAC evaluate your teaching.

B. Scholarship – All published work; all written work currently being evaluated for publication (including appropriate documentation of submission/receipt and its current review status); papers presented at professional meetings; documentation of awards, if any, received for published work; professional panels one has chaired and/or served as discussant; grant proposals written (including those that have not been funded as these may reflect sound scholarship and scholarly development); manuscripts in progress that are sufficiently far along to be evaluated; any other written scholarly work that enables the PAC to evaluate scholarship.

C. Professional Service – Outline or description of public lectures given; letters or other supporting documents indicating performance in service roles; any written documentation that highlights service activities.

Candidates are encouraged to review successful tenure/promotion packets (as provided by individual faculty members) for further help in crafting their narratives.

Candidates need not include the raw teaching evaluations or annual evaluations as these are available in the department office for review by the PAC. However, these materials should be submitted to the Dean with the candidate's packet.

Comments:

Promotion and tenure candidates will be evaluated as either “excellent,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory” in each of the three areas of evaluation. Tenure recommendations require a minimum of “satisfactory” ratings in each area. Promotion to Associate Professor requires one “excellent” rating while promotion to Professor requires two “excellent” ratings. An “unsatisfactory” rating in any area will result in a recommendation against tenure or promotion. Although the department has tried to be as specific as possible in helping candidates prepare for tenure and promotion, the department has resisted explicit measures for achieving “excellent” and “satisfactory” ratings. This would necessarily involve a numbering system that is both cumbersome and insensitive to faculty diversity and quality. Junior faculty should readily communicate with tenured colleagues regarding their progress in the areas of evaluation.

It is important that candidates strike a balance among the three areas of evaluation. Candidates should avoid emphasizing any one area to such an extent that it hinders accomplishment in the others. For example, junior faculty often over-emphasize service activities. While junior faculty are expected to serve on various committees at the departmental and college levels, it is unwise to be overextended in this area. Tenure decisions emphasize the candidate's teaching and scholarly accomplishments over service-related activities. Exceptions would be service activities related to the establishment of new curricula or the continuation of an ongoing program(teaching); or service activities related to increasing scholarly output among faculty. Annual evaluations and the pre-tenure review are intended to provide guidance on the “balance” issue.

Attachment 5 – PAC Election Guidelines and Duties of the PAC Chairs

AUPAC Membership and Election Guidelines

All full-time, tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the AUPAC in line with the following guidelines.

1. The tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department will elect the PAC during the first faculty meeting of the Fall semester. During the first meeting of the PAC, chair(s) will be elected for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion.
2. The PAC will be composed of eight tenured departmental faculty members, four from the sociology program and four from the anthropology program. Of these members, five will constitute a “voting” PAC for each candidate (see 3).

3. Each candidate applying for tenure and promotion will have a five-member “voting PAC.” Four will be members of the same program (sociology or anthropology) as the candidate.

Example: An anthropologist seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor has a “voting PAC” consisting of four anthropologists and one sociologist from the department. Therefore, the eight member PAC votes to exclude three sociologists from the candidates “voting PAC.”

4. A candidate can also request that a member of the JMU faculty outside the department with expertise in their field of study or knowledge of their teaching contributions serve as a voting member of the PAC. In this case, the candidate will provide the PAC a list of names of people from outside academic units from which the PAC will select one to join the committee. The PAC will then vote to replace an existing committee member with the faculty member from outside the department.

5. Non-JMU faculty may not serve on the PAC, but a candidate can ask the “voting PAC” to solicit outside letters evaluating the qualifications of a candidate from non-JMU faculty who have professional knowledge of the candidate’s specialties.

- A. The candidate can provide the “voting PAC” with a list of outside faculty who can act as reviewers. The names should be drawn from comparable institutions and should not be former advisors, post-doc supervisors, or close personal friends.
- B. The list of names should be three times greater than the number of outside letters the candidate is asking the “voting PAC” to review. Example, if the candidate requests two outside reviewers then six names will be forwarded to the committee.
- C. External letters are confidential and are not provided to the candidate. The final list of outside reviewers who provide letters on behalf of the candidate is also confidential.
- D. The candidate will provide a list of reviewers to the “voting PAC” within a week after the “voting PAC” is constituted. The Chair of the voting PAC will solicit the outside letters within a week after the candidate provides this list. .
- E. Outside letters will be used to assist the committee in arriving at a decision but the letters cannot, in and of themselves, form the primary basis for a tenure decision.

6. Faculty members may not serve on a PAC for recommendations/decisions where there is any professional or personal conflict of interest with a candidate (e.g., a spouse, domestic partnership etc.).

7. PAC recommendations/decisions are required for the following: pre-tenure review, promotion and tenure evaluations.

- A. Pre-tenure review evaluations will result in a letter from the PAC that will be given to the candidate and placed in the candidate’s personnel file. The letter will

summarize the PAC's evaluation and outline recommendations to the candidate to aid in progress toward tenure and promotion.

- B. Promotion recommendations: Associate Professors and Professors only participate in and vote on promotions. Favorable recommendations require a simple majority of the PAC.
- C. Tenure decisions: Tenured faculty from the Department is eligible to vote on tenure decisions.

Duties of the Program PAC Chairs

1. PAC Chairs are responsible for meeting with all new full-time faculty in their program and program faculty who are candidates for pre-tenure review, promotion and/or tenure. This meeting will familiarize faculty with the guidelines and procedures for the various evaluations contained in this document as well as relevant sections of the faculty handbook. Faculty members are responsible for understanding these guidelines and procedures.
2. PAC chairs will schedule PAC meetings in consultation with PAC members.
3. PAC chairs will be the contact persons for candidates undergoing evaluations, although a candidate is encouraged to consult with other PAC members regarding her/his candidacy.