

Department of Health Sciences
Promotion and Tenure Evaluation
Guidelines

Approved: 2018

Department of Health Sciences

POLICY 08: ACADEMIC UNIT TENURE / PROMOTION CRITERIA

Tenure: Approved by faculty vote of 9 yes: 0 no: 0 abstain on 5-10-18

Promotion: Approved by faculty vote of 9 yes: 0 no: 0 abstain on 5-10-18

Approved by CHBS Dean and Provost 9-30-18

Policy 08 applies to any faculty member whose timeline allows for tenure and / or promotion application after January 1, 2020. Faculty members whose timeline allows for tenure and / or promotion application between the approval of Policy 08 by the Provost and December 31, 2019 may select to be evaluated using either this policy or Policy 09: Academic Unit Tenure/Promotion Criteria of the 2017-18 Faculty / Staff Policies and Procedures Manual. The selection must be included in the letter of intent submitted by the faculty member and is irrevocable.

Tenure standards (overview) [JMU Faculty Handbook Policy III.E.7.e](#).

The award of tenure is based on the qualifications, performance and conduct of individual faculty members and the long-term needs, objectives and missions of the academic unit, college and university. To be awarded tenure, the faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for promotion to associate professor and should enhance the academic environment of the academic unit and the university.

Promotion standards (overview)

Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service are the bases for evaluating the performance of candidates for promotion in academic rank. In each of these areas, the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate for promotion in academic rank.

Procedures and Timelines

Tenure and/or Promotion:

All criteria and expectations are based on a traditional tenure/promotion time period where application occurs in the fall semester of the faculty member's 6th year in rank. Applications outside of this timeframe may result from the submission for early decision due to compelling reasons, a contractual agreement at the time of hiring, or any adjustment approved by the AUH and the Dean.

RTA Lines:

"RTAs are not candidates for tenure and cannot be awarded tenure. RTAs in a rank other than lecturer are eligible for promotion and have the same performance expectations as tenure track and tenured faculty members in the same rank" ([JMU Faculty Handbook Policy III.D.4](#)). RTAs are not required to apply for promotion.

All Faculty Lines:

In cases where a faculty member has been in the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor for more than five years prior to tenure and/or promotion, materials from the most recent five-year period will be used to make recommendations unless negotiated with the AUH.

Early Decisions:

At the time of hiring, if a faculty member has negotiated a shortened timeline for tenure and/or promotion, materials evaluated will only include work affiliated with JMU.

Procedures and Criteria for Approval to Pursue an Early Decision after Hire:

“When an instructional faculty member is hired on tenure track, the agreed probationary period preceding consideration for tenure shall be stated in the initial employment contract. The maximum probationary period is seven years. Applications made prior to the penultimate year of the probationary period may be considered but will receive favorable review only upon presentation of compelling evidence of accomplishment by the faculty member.” III.E.7.b. Probationary Period

The faculty member requesting an early decision must present in writing evidence that is indicative of ratings EXCEEDING the criteria for excellence in all areas of evaluation. The request for consideration for an early review must be submitted to the AUH and the AUPAC at least six months prior to September 1st. All materials for review must be submitted by October 1st.

Eligible faculty members may request an early tenure and/or promotion review up to one and a half years prior to their prescribed timeframe for tenure/promotion. Early decision approval by the AUH, the AUPAC and the Dean is highly unusual. The AUH, AUPAC, and the Dean must approve the request to submit materials for an early decision.

Work Load Weightings

	Teaching	Scholarly Achievements & Professional Qualifications	Service
Instructor	90% (5/5)	5%	5%
Assistant/Associate	75% (4/4)	10%	15%

1. In cases involving 12-month appointments, weightings that vary from 75/10/15, or for faculty with dual or alternate appointments, the AUH or supervising administrators must prepare a document detailing adjustments and expectations. This document will be shared with the AUPAC at the time the faculty member applies for tenure and/or promotion. The AUPAC will use this document in deliberations concerning tenure and/or promotion.

2. Reduced teaching loads may be approved for funded grant release time.
3. Faculty members may have non-traditional course loads approved by the AUH.
4. An increased expectation in scholarship will accompany reduced loads.
5. Course release time must be approved by the AUH. Reduced teaching loads may be approved as a result of administrative re-assignment, service assignment, and teaching large sections as approved by the AUH.

Tenure & Promotion Overall Expectations

1. When making tenure and/or promotion decisions, the AUH and the AUPAC will use the tenure/promotion criteria found in this document to determine a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent in the individual areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.
2. Faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor must earn a rating of excellent in the area carrying the highest weighting and a minimum rating of satisfactory in all other areas of consideration.
3. Faculty members applying for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor must earn a rating of excellent in the area carrying the highest weighting, an additional rating of excellent in one of the two remaining areas, and at least a satisfactory rating in the remaining area.
 - “In addition to the requirements for associate professor, appointment at the rank of professor is contingent upon recognition of outstanding professional accomplishment.” [JMU Faculty Handbook Policy III.B.4. Academic Faculty Ranks](#)
 - Outstanding professional accomplishment is met through this requirement.
4. “The award of tenure is based on the qualifications, performance and conduct of individual faculty members and the long-term needs, objectives and missions of the academic unit, college and university. To be awarded tenure, the faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for promotion to associate professor and should enhance the academic environment of the academic unit and the university” ([JMU Faculty Handbook Policy III.E.7.e](#)).
5. The annual evaluations are short-term assessments. The annual evaluations are not designed to be used in a summative manner.
6. Faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion must submit a dossier following the CHBS Professional Dossier Outline to the AUH and AUPAC by October 1st the year in which application is made.

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. [JMU Faculty Handbook Policy III.E.7.e](#).

8.1 Teaching

The AUPAC and the AUH will assess how well a faculty member has met annual evaluation criteria throughout the evaluation period. If teaching carries the highest weighting, the faculty member must present evidence that indicates excellence in teaching throughout the evaluation period. If teaching does not carry the highest weighting, the faculty member must present evidence that indicates satisfactory or excellence in teaching throughout the evaluation period.

1. Peer observations must be conducted by AUPAC and AUH using the teaching observation instrument developed by AUPAC. Candidates will be contacted to schedule observations during the Fall semester in which the dossier is submitted. If teaching carries the highest weighting, observations may be considered in the overall rating of teaching. Candidates may request feedback regarding the observation.
2. Faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion must submit student evaluation results from 50% of sections taught during the academic year (fall/spring/option of substituting summer courses) within the evaluation period.

The following criteria are to be submitted as evidence of quality in teaching within the CHBS Dossier Outline.

8.1.1 Excellent

(Complete items 1 and 2)

1. Meet criteria for satisfactory in teaching.
2. Provide five examples within the evaluation period that demonstrate assessment of learning outcomes as indicated below. These five examples can come from any option (2a, b, c, or d) and any combination of classes.
 - a. Demonstrate connection between assessment measures (e.g. assignments, activities, exam questions, projects, etc.) and course learning objectives.
 - b. Test question analysis (i.e. difficulty, rubrics, matrices, use scantron for comprehensive final exam, one class, one semester, item analysis, test-reliability, multiple drafts on writing assignments, etc.).
 - c. Pre-test/post-test results indicating learning objectives were met in the course.
 - d. One or more engagement-related practices. [The Association of American Colleges and Universities](#) list of “high impact” practices provides some working examples. Some of those include:

Capstone Project	Global Learning/Study Abroad
Co-Curricular Project	Internship
Common Intellectual Experience	Learning Communities
Collaborative Assignments/Projects	Service-Learning
Diversity	Undergraduate Research
Formal Leadership Experience	Writing-Intensive Courses

- e. Completion of two of the following items can substitute for one of the examples in a, b, c or d (items may be used more than once, however this option can only be used once in the review period).
 - i. Advising major/minors (more than 30 advisees including results of advising evaluation)
 - ii. First year advising including results of advising evaluation
 - iii. Thesis chair/honors advisor for completed project
 - iv. Directed research chair for completed project
 - v. Independent study or senior project chair for completed project
 - vi. Readers/committee member on thesis/independent study for completed project
 - vii. Conduct CFI TAP and demonstrate how suggestions for improvement have used.
- f. Other as approved by AUH in consultation with AUPAC.

8.1.2 Satisfactory

(Complete items 1 and 2):

1. Demonstrate fulfillment of assigned teaching responsibilities using narrative statements, course evaluations, and examples as appropriate. (Complete 1a and 1b.)
 - a. Syllabi, instructional materials, teaching methodologies, assignments and assessments are current and well organized to help transmit and reinforce information and/or develop skills.
 - b. Maintaining accessibility to students.
2. Demonstrate satisfactory teaching evaluations. (Complete 2a or 2b.)
 - a. Obtain a minimum **3.5/5.0** overall mean score from all submitted student evaluations. For each selected course, faculty members may use the mean value associated with statement number 5, or use the overall mean of the mean values associated with statements 1-5. (See Policy 02: Student Evaluations)
 - b. If overall mean scores from all submitted student evaluations fall between **2.99 – 3.499**, one of the following must have been completed and evidence must be provided regarding how information was used to improve teaching:
 - i. Workshops/trainings (online or in-person)
 - ii. Conferences
 - iii. TAP
 - iv. Mentoring
 - v. Other as approved by AUH in consultation with AUPAC.

8.1.3 Unsatisfactory

An unsatisfactory rating will result from a failure to meet either satisfactory or excellent criteria. Overall mean scores from all submitted student evaluations fall below **2.99**.

8.2 Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

The AUPAC and the AUH will assess how well a faculty member has met annual evaluation criteria throughout the evaluation period. If scholarly achievement and professional qualifications carries the highest weighting, the faculty member must present evidence that indicates excellence in scholarship throughout the evaluation period. If scholarship does not carry the highest weighting, the faculty member must present evidence that indicates satisfactory or excellence in scholarship throughout the evaluation period.

1. An assessment of the quality and quantity of the scholarly achievement and/or professional qualifications will be conducted. The faculty member is responsible for presenting evidence supporting the quality of all scholarship, including the depth and breadth of each piece of scholarship activity. Scholarship can be displayed in the form of juried presentations, publications, book chapters, books and grants.

Examples of the assessment of quality may include:

- a. the academic reputation of the journal in which a publication appears
 - b. the academic reputation of the conference where a presentation was made
 - c. the faculty member's authorship position
 - d. external reviews relating to books and book chapters
 - e. the professional impact of grants
2. It is expected that consistency of scholarly productivity throughout the evaluation period be evident.
 3. In all cases, both 1) quality and 2) quantity of scholarly products will be used to determine the overall evaluation rating for scholarship.

The following criteria are to be submitted as evidence of quality in scholarship within the CHBS Dossier Outline.

8.2.1 Excellent

(Complete items 1-3):

1. Meet one of the following criteria (a-c):
 - a. Three publications as first author in international and/or national peer reviewed journals.
 - b. Four total publications in international and/or national peer reviewed journals with first authorship on two, first or second authorship on one other, and "any authorship" on the fourth.
 - c. Five total publications in international and/or national peer reviewed journals with first authorship on two and "any authorship" on remaining.

Possible substitutions (Only one substitution is allowed in the evaluation period).

- i. A book/book chapter or edited book with same authorship requirements as above.
 - ii. Peer reviewed publication in a regional and/or state journal (no editorials, book reviews or activities) with same authorship requirements above.
 - iii. Internal or external research grants totaling \$10,000 or more with same authorship requirements above.
 - iv. Four peer-reviewed presentations at national or international conferences can substitute for one “any author” publication under options 1b or 1c.
2. Level of participation in and quality of scholarly products will be considered in evaluating scholarship activities. For each publication, provide an explanation of the following:
- a. The faculty member’s role on the research project (e.g. describe role in conception or design of the work, or the acquisition, or interpretation of data for work, drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content).
 - b. The quality and potential outcomes of the product (e.g. scope, reach and acceptance of the journal or professional organization, impact factors, citations or use of your publication, impact of grant activities, etc.).
3. For tenure decisions, faculty members must demonstrate significant progress on a research project that originated during the pre-tenure period at JMU.

8.2.2 Satisfactory

(Complete items 1-3):

1. Provide evidence for three international and/or national peer reviewed publications that include:
 - a. At least first author on one manuscript.
 - b. First or second author on another manuscript (with significant role in research and authorship).
 - c. Any authorship on third manuscript.

Possible substitutions (Only one substitution is allowed in the evaluation period).

- i. A book/book chapter or edited book with same authorship requirements as above.
- ii. Peer reviewed publication in a regional and/or state journal (no editorials, book reviews or activities) with same authorship requirements as above.
- iii. Internal or external research grants totaling \$10,000 or more with same authorship requirements as above.
- iv. Four peer-reviewed presentations at national or international conferences can substitute for 1c.

2. Level of participation in and quality of scholarly products will be considered in evaluating scholarship activities. For each scholarly product, explain:
 - a. The faculty member's role on the research project (e.g. describe role in conception or design of the work, or the acquisition, or interpretation of data for work, drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content).
 - b. The quality and potential outcomes of the product (e.g. scope, reach and acceptance rate of the journal or professional organization, impact factors, citations or use of your publication, impact of grant activities, etc.).
3. For tenure decisions, faculty members must demonstrate significant progress on a research project that originated during the pre-tenure period at JMU.

8.2.3 Unsatisfactory

An unsatisfactory rating will result from a failure to meet either satisfactory or excellent criteria.

NOTE: Other scholarly products may be considered as negotiated with the AUH in consultation with the AUPAC.

8.3 Professional Service

The AUPAC and the AUH will assess how well a faculty member has met annual evaluation criteria throughout the evaluation period. If service carries the highest weighting, the faculty member must present evidence that indicates excellence in service throughout the evaluation period. If service does not carry the highest weighting, the faculty member must present evidence that indicates satisfactory or excellence in service throughout the evaluation period.

1. A brief summary of each service activity, outcomes of the activity, and the faculty member's specific role and extent of contributions in the service activity must be presented. Every service activity used as evidence in tenure and/or promotion must be summarized by the faculty member.
2. The faculty member should present multiple sources of evidence to demonstrate a consistent pattern of service contributions.

Evidence of effective service may be demonstrated through one or more of the following:

- a. Committee minutes.
- b. Reports.
- c. Letters from committee chairs and/or colleagues.
- d. Written endorsements from the committee chair of the brief summary of the service activity.
- e. Other documented evidence of community, educational or professional service.

3. An assessment of the evidence and summary presented by the faculty member will be conducted by AUPAC and the AUH to evaluate the quality, quantity and scope of the service.
4. A faculty member can complete the same, or similar, service activities for five years or complete different service activities over the five years.
5. In all cases, both 1) quality and 2) quantity of service activities will be used to determine the overall evaluation rating for service.
6. Evidence of at least one leadership role in service must be presented.
7. All activities must be completed prior to the submission of materials in order to be used in this category.

8.3.1 Excellent

1. A faculty member must have played an active role in at least fifteen professional service activities. Service activities may include:
 - a. Reviewing journal articles, conference abstracts, or other professional publications.
 - b. Invited internal or external presentations or trainings related to faculty member's area of expertise.
 - c. The following activities are illustrative of contributions that exceed teaching expectations and therefore are considered service to the department. Faculty who volunteer for these activities perform vital service to the department to keep students on track to graduate.
 - i. Responsible for three different course preparations per academic year (excluding first year).
 - ii. Prepare and deliver a new course preparation.
 - iii. Teach an overload within the department.
 - d. Significant participation on any JMU committee (Departmental, College or University) or task-force.
 - i. Departmental service (Examples: Faculty Senate, AUPAC, Member of search committee, Assessment Liaison, C & I, Assessment Fellow, CFI Fellow, Madison Collaborative Fellow, Honors Liaison, Departmental Mentor)
 - ii. College service (Examples: Diversity Council, College C & I, Faculty Development Committee, college newsletter contribution)
 - iii. University service (Examples: Officer in Faculty Senate, Assessment APT Graders, Honor Advisory Council, CIT Mentor)
 - e. Serve as the alternative break faculty advisor.
 - f. Serve as faculty advisor for an international experience.
 - g. Serve as faculty advisor for student organization.
 - h. Serve as a chair of a major internal or external profession-related committee, upon AUH approval.
 - i. Serve as an elected or appointed officer or Board member in a major profession-related organization.
 - j. Serve, in an active role, on a profession-related committee outside of JMU.
 - k. Professional community service (Examples: Health Advisory Board, Healthy Community Council, community organization board member, professional linkage back to qualifications).
 - l. Other as approved by AUH in consultation with AUPAC.

8.3.2 Satisfactory

1. A faculty member must have an active role in at least ten professional service activities. Service activities may include:
 - a. Reviewing journal articles, conference abstracts, or other professional publications.
 - b. Service presentations related to faculty member's area of expertise.
 - c. The following activities are illustrative of contributions that exceed teaching expectations and therefore are considered service to the department. Faculty who volunteer for these activities perform vital service to the department to keep students on track to graduate.
 - i. Responsible for three different course preparations per academic year (excluding first year).
 - ii. Prepare and deliver a new course preparation.
 - iii. Teach an overload within the department.
 - d. Significant participation on any JMU committee (Departmental, College or University) or task-force.
 - i. Departmental service (Examples: Faculty Senate, AUPAC, Chair of search committees, Member of search committee, Assessment Liaison, C & I, Assessment Fellow, CFI Fellow, Madison Collaborative Fellow, Honors Liaison, Departmental Mentor)
 - ii. College service (Examples: Diversity Council, College C & I, Faculty Development Committee, college newsletter contribution)
 - iii. University service (Examples: Officer in Faculty Senate, Assessment APT Graders, Honor Advisory Council, CIT Mentor)
 - e. Serve as the alternative break faculty advisor.
 - f. Serve as faculty advisor for an international experience.
 - g. Serve as faculty advisor for student organization.
 - h. Serve as a chair of a major profession-related committee.
 - i. Serve as an elected or appointed officer or Board member in a major profession-related organization.
 - j. Serve, in an active role, on a profession-related committee outside of JMU.
 - k. Professional community service (Examples: Health Advisory Board, Healthy Community Council, community organization board member, professional linkage back to qualifications).
 - l. Other as approved by AUH in consultation with AUPAC.

8.3.3 Unsatisfactory

An unsatisfactory rating will result from a failure to meet either satisfactory or excellent criteria.

8.4 Conduct

Any conduct issues occurring during the evaluation period will be considered by the AUPAC and the AUH when determining the overall recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

8.5 Long Term Needs, Objectives and Mission of the Department, College and University

In the case of a tenure decision, an assessment will be conducted by AUPAC and the AUH to determine how well a faculty member is meeting the long term needs, objectives and missions of the academic unit, the college and the university

8.6 Enhancement of the Academic Unit

In the case of tenure decisions, assessment will be conducted by AUPAC and the AUH to determine the faculty member's contributions to the enhancement of the academic unit.