

School of Integrated Sciences  
Promotion and Tenure Evaluation  
Guidelines

Approved: 2018

# FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

SCHOOL OF INTEGRATED SCIENCES  
JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

This document details the principles, procedures, criteria, and standards for evaluating faculty in the School of Integrated Sciences as required by the JMU Faculty Handbook. It addresses annual evaluations, renewal of rolling-term contracts, tenure, promotion, and the appeal of annual evaluations conducted by the Academic Unit Head.

---

EFFECTIVE: [27 JULY 2018]

---

# CONTENTS

## **Section I. Evaluation Principles and Process .....1**

---

- I.A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....1**
  - I.A.1. Annual Evaluations .....1
  - I.A.2. Consultation with PAC.....1
  - I.A.3. Supporting Materials .....1
  - I.A.4. Level of Performance .....2
- I.B. PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE .....2**
  - I.B.1. Rules Governing the Elected PAC .....2
  - I.B.2. Use Of Faculty Personnel Records .....3
- I.C. EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACT FACULTY.....4**
  - I.C.1. Procedures for Annual Reviews and Reappointment.....4
  - I.C.2. Procedures for Promotion.....5
  - I.C.3. Procedures for Early Promotion .....5
- I.D. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY .....6**
  - I.D.1. Procedures for Annual Review .....6
  - I.D.2. Procedures for Promotion .....6
  - I.D.3. Procedures for Tenure .....6
  - I.D.4. Interim Evaluation Procedures .....6
  - I.D.5. Procedures for Early Promotion and Tenure .....6
- I.E. DEADLINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS .....7**
- I.F. TRANSPARENCY OF THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS .....7**

## **Section II. Evaluation Criteria and Standards .....9**

---

- II.A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....9**
  - II.A.1. Faculty Responsibilities .....9
  - II.A.2. Criteria.....9
  - II.A.3. Flexibility of Guidelines..... 10
  - II.A.4. Time Span of Criteria ..... 10
  - II.A.5. Promise of Continued Performance ..... 10
  - II.A.6. Standards for Promotion and Tenure..... 10
  - II.A.7. Standards for Reappointment ..... 10

<b>II.B. TEACHING STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
II.B.1. Satisfactory Rating .....	11
II.B.2. Excellent Rating.....	11
II.B.3. Unsatisfactory Rating.....	12
<b>II.C. SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>13</b>
II.C.1. Satisfactory Rating .....	13
II.C.2. Excellent Rating.....	14
II.C.3. Unsatisfactory Rating.....	14
<b>II.D. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
II.D.1. Service that Advances the Missions of the University, the College, and the School .....	15
II.D.2. Service that Advances One’s Professional Scholarly Community .....	16
II.D.3. Service that Benefits Society in Areas Related to One’s Professional Expertise.....	16
 <b>Section III. Appeal of Annual Evaluations.....</b>	 <b>17</b>
<hr/>	
<b>III.A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
III.A.1. Role of the PAC .....	17
III.A.2. Role of the Written Annual Evaluation and the AUH .....	17
<b>III.B. APPEAL PROCESS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>III.C. PAC REVIEW OF EVALUATION APPEALS.....</b>	<b>19</b>
III.C.1. Substantive Evaluation Issues .....	19
III.c.2. Non-Substantive Evaluation Issues .....	19
 <b>Section IV. Amendment Process .....</b>	 <b>20</b>
<hr/>	
<b>IV.A. CHANGES TO GUIDELINES.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>IV.B. RECORD OF GUIDELINE CHANGES .....</b>	<b>20</b>

SECTION I.  
EVALUATION  
PRINCIPLES  
AND  
PROCESS

## I.A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

### I.A.1. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Every School of Integrated Sciences (SIS) faculty member shall undergo a yearly evaluation. A SIS faculty member is one who has professional responsibilities assigned from or directed toward the academic programs within SIS. The Dean has the responsibility for evaluating the Academic Unit Head (AUH) and will determine the method to be employed in that evaluation process.

### I.A.2. CONSULTATION WITH PAC

Consultation among the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC), AUH, and the dean is encouraged prior to any decision affecting reappointment, promotion, or tenure. The AUH is not obligated to concur with the PAC's advice and recommendations.

### I.A.3. SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Each SIS faculty member is responsible for submitting complete and timely review materials. These materials should thoroughly document performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service.

The Annual SIS Faculty Activity Report (FAR) will serve as the primary source of information for the annual evaluation, including a one-year reappointment decision. However, faculty members may submit additional materials for this evaluation at their own discretion.

The format for the portfolio/materials in support of reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions is left up to the individual faculty member. Faculty should organize their materials and provide sufficient documentation to facilitate a thorough evaluation of their teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. Effective Fall 2019, faculty must provide a digital portfolio for ease of use and review by the PAC and AUH.

It is the responsibility of the candidates—not the AUH or PAC—to make the case for reappointment, promotion, or tenure through an effective portfolio of materials. Candidates should prepare their materials in a manner that enables the determination of a satisfactory, excellent, or unsatisfactory rating as indicated by the evaluation criteria [see Section II]. Faculty applying for promotion and tenure are encouraged to seek out a SIS mentor for preparation of their portfolio, and SIS faculty are encouraged to help if so requested or to volunteer

such mentorship. The PAC will provide model portfolios for promotion and tenure to SIS faculty via appropriate administrative channels such as Sharepoint, and will update model portfolios periodically.

#### I.A.4. LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE

It is the responsibility of the AUH and the PAC to rate a faculty member's performance as *Excellent*, *Satisfactory*, or *Unsatisfactory*. The PAC and the AUH should exercise their subjective judgments as to whether *Excellent*, *Satisfactory*, or *Unsatisfactory* performance has been achieved in each of the three criteria. Because annual evaluations are made for a single year's performance and reviews for tenure, promotion, and reappointment consider the faculty member's cumulative record over a multiyear period, there may be some differences in what constitutes *Satisfactory* and *Excellent* ratings for these two types of reviews.

## I.B. PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

---

An elected PAC shall make recommendations on personnel matters to the AUH and Dean. Normally this will entail recommendations regarding promotion and tenure of SIS faculty. Recommendations for reappointment will be provided in special cases when the PAC is requested to provide a recommendation by the AUH or faculty member per the JMU Faculty Handbook. The PAC also serves as an appeal body for annual evaluations (See Section III).

In the case of promotion and tenure, the PAC will provide an information copy of its recommendations to the AUH *after* the Dean has received both the PAC's and AUH's recommendation. In all cases, however, consultation among the PAC, AUH, and the Dean is encouraged before any decision affecting reappointment or promotion. All full-time SIS faculty except the AUH are eligible for the elected PAC.

### I.B.1. RULES GOVERNING THE ELECTED PAC

[I.B.1a] The Elected PAC will normally be composed of seven members, each serving a staggered three-year term. Three-year membership is intended to provide consistent application of criteria by the PAC and feedback from the PAC to SIS faculty.

[I.B.1b] Under some circumstances, elected PAC representatives should be temporarily excused or recused from service. When a PAC member is a candidate for promotion or tenure or has university-approved leave during a given academic year, the PAC member shall be excused from PAC deliberations for that academic year. A substitute faculty member will be selected to replace the excused PAC representative for the entire academic year as described in I.B.1g. PAC representatives may not participate in evaluations of their family members, and must be recused from any evaluation of a family member. A PAC representative recused from a family member's evaluation shall otherwise continue to fully participate on the PAC.

[I.B.1c] SIS faculty will normally elect members on a 3-year cycle; two members will be elected in each of the first two years and three members in the third year (a 2-2-3 cycle). An elected PAC member's term will not be extended due to being recused as a candidate for promotion or tenure or for university-approved leave.

[I.B.1d] New service on the elected PAC begins at the start of the academic year. Elections shall be held in the previous spring semester. All full-time SIS faculty members who are eligible for PAC service are automatically nominated for service and an election is held by closed ballot. Each full-time faculty member will vote for two or three candidates, depending on how many members are rotating off of the PAC. The top two or three vote getters (depending on how many members are rotating off) are added to the PAC for a three-year term. SIS faculty should strive for a diverse/representative membership of the PAC.

[I.B.1e] A subcommittee of the tenured faculty on the PAC will make the recommendation on the award of tenure. In the event that the tenured PAC consists of fewer than five members, tenured alternates will be selected as described in [I.B.1g]. Tenured alternates will serve for only one year and only on the tenure subcommittee, and may only make tenure recommendations. The entire PAC will be allowed to participate in the discussions and deliberations on tenure.

[I.B.1f] After completing service on the PAC, faculty shall not be required to serve again for twice the length of time actually served on the PAC. For example, faculty who serve for three full years on the PAC shall not be required to serve for the next six years, and faculty who serve for one year as an alternate shall not be required to serve for two years. An AUH who resigns from her or his AUH duties but maintains a SIS faculty appointment shall not be required to serve on the PAC for the next two years.

[I.B.1g] When academic-year vacancies occur on the PAC due to a PAC member's excused participation (See I.B.1b), the PAC shall randomly select from the remaining group of eligible faculty until all alternate positions have been filled, with the proviso that during years in which at least one tenure case will be reviewed, the resulting number of tenured faculty on the PAC be at least five for that year. If needed, additional alternates will be selected to serve only on the tenure subcommittee. This will be by randomly drawing only from eligible tenured faculty for those slots that must be filled by tenured faculty.

[I.B.1h] All members of the PAC must respect and maintain strict confidentiality of deliberations on all matters under their consideration. Failure to maintain confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the PAC or for a misconduct charge under the JMU Faculty Handbook Section III.A.25. Violations of confidentiality include those related to PAC deliberations as well as disclosure of information from faculty or PAC documents. Appropriate measures for a PAC member who violates the requirement of PAC confidentiality will be determined by the AUH in consultation with the PAC.

## I.B.2. USE OF FACULTY PERSONNEL RECORDS

In support of its role in evaluations, the JMU Faculty Handbook states that the PAC has the right<sup>1</sup> to review all relevant, non-private material in the faculty member's personnel file in the academic unit's office or dean's office. The PAC can therefore routinely request copies of teaching evaluations for all candidates for tenure and promotion. The PAC can also request other materials from a faculty member's personnel file at its discretion, but is not obligated to do so. If materials other than teaching evaluations are requested by the PAC, the AUH will identify the

---

<sup>1</sup> Per the JMU General Counsel, an academic unit cannot prohibit its PAC from accessing these personnel records in its guidelines.

non-private documents relevant for consideration and involve the faculty candidate in the process as prescribed in the JMU Faculty Handbook.

## I.C. EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACT FACULTY

---

Contract renewal and reappointment of contract faculty will be based on annual evaluations. The Annual SIS FAR will be used as the primary source of information for the annual evaluations. The annual summary will include material for the academic year previous to the year in which the evaluation is being conducted.

As a minimum, a faculty member must maintain, on the basis of the annual evaluations, a *Satisfactory* rating in each of the three criteria (see Section II) to be eligible for contract renewal. However, additional considerations similar to those for tenure will also be considered in determining qualification for reappointment such as promise of continued long-term performance, program need, and program financial exigencies. The contract will be renewed on a rolling-term basis that extends the current term by one year for a satisfactory reappointment evaluation (except for the first satisfactory reappointment evaluation, which leads to a two-year extension).

### I.C.1. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REAPPOINTMENT

A more detailed explanation of the reappointment process and the Renewable Term Appointment (RTA) is contained in the Faculty Handbook. RTA Faculty are advised to be familiar with the provisions in the current version of the handbook.

[I.C.1a] The first reappointment review will take place in the spring semester of the second year of the initial contract. Subsequent reviews will take place annually. A *Satisfactory* rating from the first reappointment review will qualify a faculty member for a contract extension, and the University may offer to extend the contract for an additional two years assuming the University's continued need for the faculty member's services. All such offers will be reviewed and approved through the Dean's office. The effect of any contract extension would be that the academic year following the extension offer would be the first year of a new three-year term.

[I.C.1b] An RTA faculty member may be terminated prior to the end of the initial three-year appointment period for inadequate performance. Requirements for notification of termination vary based on the number of years served in the contract, and are detailed in the Faculty Handbook for further reference.

[I.C.1c] After the first reappointment, evaluations will be conducted annually per the requirements of the JMU Faculty Handbook, and the following will apply:

- A faculty member whose annual evaluation results in a *Satisfactory* rating will be qualified for a contract extension, and the University may offer to extend the contract for an additional year assuming the University's continued need for the faculty member's services.



- A faculty member whose annual evaluation results in an *Unsatisfactory* rating in one or more criteria shall not receive a revolving term extension. Effectively, the unexpired portion of the contract is unchanged. The faculty member will be cautioned that a consecutive unsatisfactory evaluation in the current year will result in his or her dismissal at the end of that (the second successive unsatisfactory) year.
- If a year of *Satisfactory* annual evaluation consecutively follows a year of unsatisfactory rating, the faculty member will again be eligible for a revolving term contract extension.
- If a year of *Unsatisfactory* annual evaluation consecutively follows a year of unsatisfactory rating, the faculty member will be terminated at the end of the second year of unsatisfactory performance.
- Results of the annual review by the AUH may be appealed. [See Section III]

## I.C.2. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

The JMU Faculty Handbook governs both the procedures and standards for promotion. Faculty are advised to be familiar with the provisions regarding promotion in the current version of the handbook. The minimum essential criteria for promotion are as follows:

- *Satisfactory* ratings in all of the criteria shall be necessary for promotion to assistant professor.
- An *Excellent* rating in one of the criteria and *Satisfactory* ratings in the others shall be necessary for promotion to associate professor.
- *Excellent* ratings in two of the criteria, one of which must be teaching,<sup>2</sup> and a *Satisfactory* rating in the other shall be necessary for promotion to professor.

The SIS standards contained in Section II of this document will be the basis of the ratings for the teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service criteria.

## I.C.3. PROCEDURES FOR EARLY PROMOTION

Contract faculty members who intend to submit a package for promotion before they have completed their time in rank (as described in the Faculty Handbook or their contract) are advised to be familiar with the provisions regarding early promotion in the current version of the Faculty Handbook. When they notify the AUH of their intent to submit their package, the AUH shall inform them that they are submitting early and that additional criteria will apply.

A faculty member who wishes to apply for early promotion, as defined by the Faculty Handbook, must submit an application and supporting materials to the AUH and PAC. The AUH and PAC will review the materials, will consult with each other, and will consider whether the faculty member's application presents a compelling case. The AUH and the PAC will separately determine if the early application presents a compelling case for promotion. If either the AUH or the PAC determines that the application does not present a compelling case, the applicant will be strongly urged to withdraw the early application before recommendations are sent forward to the dean.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Faculty Handbook does not say which criteria (teaching, scholarship, service) must receive an excellent rating. However, academic units are allowed to specify which evaluation criteria must receive an excellent rating for promotion to full professor.

## I.D. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

---

Recommendations for promotion may be separated from recommendations for tenure.

### I.D.1. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW

Procedures for annual review of tenure-track faculty are detailed in the JMU Faculty Handbook. Results of the annual review by the AUH may be appealed. [See Section III]

### I.D.2. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

The promotion procedure for tenured and tenure-track faculty is the same as that for contract faculty (see I.C.2).

### I.D.3. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE

The JMU Faculty Handbook governs both the procedures and standards for tenure. Tenure-track faculty are advised to be familiar with the extensive provisions regarding tenure in the current version of the handbook. An *Excellent* rating in one of the criteria and *Satisfactory* ratings in the others shall be the minimum necessary requirement to be awarded tenure (see I.E. and II.A.6). The SIS standards contained in Section II of this document will be the basis of the ratings for the teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service criteria.

### I.D.4. INTERIM EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The PAC and AUH must independently review the accomplishments of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the faculty member's probationary period, typically the third year of candidacy. All tenure-track faculty will submit a summary of their activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH and PAC by January 15 of their midpoint year. This summary should include a two- to three-page narrative highlighting the faculty member's reflections on her/his career to date and anticipated career trajectory.

In addition, the faculty member should provide a brief description of the evidence and accomplishments in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service as they correspond to the Criteria Guidelines for the department. At the faculty member's discretion, she or he may opt to include a limited amount of evidence in support of this case, particularly when the faculty member has some concerns about whether the evidence would be fully considered. The PAC may request additional information as it deems appropriate. No later than March 15, the PAC will provide the faculty member with a written and oral evaluation of their progress towards the promotion and tenure standards. This feedback will include suggestions for improvement.

### I.D.5. PROCEDURES FOR EARLY PROMOTION AND TENURE

Tenure-track faculty members who intend to submit a package for promotion and tenure before they have completed their time in rank (as described in the Faculty Handbook or their contract) are advised to be familiar with the provisions regarding early promotion and tenure

in the current version of the handbook. When they notify the AUH of their intent to submit their package, the AUH shall inform them that they are submitting early and that additional criteria will apply.

A faculty member who wishes to apply for early tenure and/or promotion, as defined by the Faculty Handbook, must submit an application and supporting materials to the AUH and PAC. The AUH and PAC will review the materials, will consult with each other, and will consider whether the faculty member's application presents a compelling case. The AUH and the PAC will separately determine if the early application presents a compelling case for tenure and/or promotion. If either the AUH or the PAC determines that the application does not present a compelling case, the applicant will be strongly urged to withdraw the early application before recommendations are sent forward to the dean.

## I.E. DEADLINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

---

The AUH will notify by 1 March the PAC and each faculty member who will be reviewed for Tenure in the following academic year as well as each faculty member who must undergo their midpoint tenure-track probationary review.

Faculty members must notify the AUH of their intention to submit a package for Promotion and Tenure by 1 April (or the following Monday if 1 April falls on the weekend).

Faculty members must submit packages for Promotion and Tenure to the SIS Administrative Assistant by 15 September (or the following Monday if 15 September falls on the weekend). Faculty applying for promotion or tenure should note that the SIS 15 September deadline supersedes the 1 October deadline in the JMU Faculty Handbook (academic units are allowed to set a deadline earlier than October 1, just not later).

All letters to the PAC regarding Promotion and Tenure must be received by the SIS Administrative Assistant by 15 October (or the following Monday if 15 October falls on the weekend).

## I.F. TRANSPARENCY OF THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

---

Faculty may reasonably expect that the promotion and tenure process is transparent and that the PAC is consistent in its practices from year-to-year regardless of changes in PAC membership. Over the years, the PAC has evolved "cultures of practice" that are codified here. These practices relate to general awareness about who is undergoing review for promotion and tenure, the ability of faculty to engage in that process if not on the PAC, and how the PAC uses or obtains information after the deadline for submission of a candidate's application materials. The following guidelines apply to the PAC's review of applications for promotion and tenure:

- [I.F.1] The PAC shall provide to SIS faculty by email the names of people applying for promotion and/or tenure by September 17<sup>th</sup> each year. In the same email message, the PAC shall invite SIS faculty to comment in writing on individual applications for promotion and tenure. Such comments are due no later than October 15<sup>th</sup> each year (or on the following Monday if the 15<sup>th</sup> is on a weekend) and should be submitted to both the PAC and the AUH. Such faculty comments are not confidential, and will be promptly provided to the candidate; the candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to any negative comments.
- [I.F.2] The materials that candidates prepare in support of their applications for promotion and tenure are not confidential and may be reviewed by any member of the SIS faculty through October 15<sup>th</sup> each year (or through the following Monday if the 15<sup>th</sup> is on a weekend). Candidate-compiled dossiers that are print/hard copy may only be reviewed in the SIS administrative assistant's office. These materials may not be taken from the SIS administrative assistant's office by anyone other than the AUH, a PAC member, or the CISE Dean. Candidate-compiled dossiers that are digital will be provided on the SIS Sharepoint platform through October 15<sup>th</sup> each year (or through the following Monday if the 15<sup>th</sup> is on a weekend).
- [I.F.3] The PAC may ask a candidate to provide clarification or supporting documentation to an application for promotion and tenure after the application deadline. However, such PAC requests should be for the purpose of basic clarification or to correct minor oversights in the preparation of a packet. The PAC may not ask for clarification or supporting documentation that gives a candidate the opportunity to substantially add to, elaborate, provide detailed evidence, or embellish an application for promotion and tenure; this is potentially unfair to other candidates. In addition, it is the responsibility of the candidate to prepare a complete and compelling dossier for promotion and tenure.
- [I.F.4] The PAC shall consider relevant information to a candidate's application for promotion and tenure that becomes newly available after the application deadline, but not after October 15<sup>th</sup> each year (or on the following Monday if the 15<sup>th</sup> is on a weekend). Examples include achievement awards or honors, acceptances of papers currently under review for publication, or grant awards for grant proposals currently under review. The PAC should only consider relevant information for candidate activities that are already completed or in process; for example, submitting papers for review or grant proposals after the deadline should not be considered as part of the candidate's application.

## SECTION II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

### II.A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

#### II.A.1. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

SIS faculty members should be dedicated, accomplished, and viable professionals and educators. SIS faculty members should meet the general responsibilities of a full-time JMU faculty member as defined in the JMU Faculty Handbook. Along with these professional responsibilities, SIS faculty will enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of academic freedom.

#### II.A.2. CRITERIA

SIS will use the JMU Faculty Handbook criteria for annual evaluation, reappointment, promotion, and the awarding of tenure. These criteria are (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional qualifications (hereafter referred to as scholarship), and (c) professional service.

SIS recognizes that the quality of faculty performance goes beyond those three categories and also depends upon professionalism and self-motivation. Therefore, in addition to the evaluation criteria described in sections II.B, II.C, and II.D, faculty members are expected to demonstrate a high level of professional conduct as described in the three points delineated below. These factors should be clearly evidenced like other aspects of a candidate's portfolio. Consideration of these factors shall be included in the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and professional service. Thus, a candidate's ratings in these categories may be positively or negatively affected by their professionalism as described in the following three areas:

*1. Personal leadership.*—A faculty member should regularly display personal initiative and follow through, the ability to discern high-priority areas of need and suggest effective solutions, and the willingness to accept responsibility for completing assigned or self-initiated tasks.

*2. Professional commitment.*—A faculty member should generally exhibit a positive attitude and enthusiasm for SIS and its needs as well as the college and the larger JMU community. This commitment should not stem from the pursuit of personal incentives or reward, but should reflect a genuine spirit of dedication to the profession and to SIS and its programs.

*3. Professional collegiality.* —Faculty members should be willing to participate and cooperate with other faculty members to help foster and nurture a spirit of teaming and mutual support, and to foster harmony among faculty, staff, and students. Such faculty members contribute to a positive work environment in the School and University.

### II.A.3. FLEXIBILITY OF GUIDELINES

The evaluation standards described in this document should not be interpreted as inflexible and absolute. The reward system within SIS should be sufficiently flexible that all members of the faculty can concentrate on their strongest areas within teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty are encouraged to identify activities that contribute to two or more of these areas.

### II.A.4. TIME SPAN OF CRITERIA

For both promotion and tenure, the standards applied shall consider all accomplishments of the faculty member's entire career that are relevant to the member's role in SIS, but with greater emphasis placed on recent accomplishments by the faculty member.

### II.A.5. PROMISE OF CONTINUED PERFORMANCE

Evidence of promise for continued dedication to (1) teaching, (2) scholarship, and (3) professional service are essential before an SIS faculty member can be recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

### II.A.6. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Recommendations for promotion are made separately from recommendations for tenure and reappointment. The *minimum* required standards shall be as follows:

*Satisfactory* ratings in all of the criteria shall be necessary for promotion to assistant professor.

An *Excellent* rating in one of the criteria and *Satisfactory* ratings in the others shall be necessary for promotion to associate professor.

*Excellent* ratings in two of the criteria, one of which must be teaching, and a *Satisfactory* rating in the other shall be necessary for promotion to professor.

An *Excellent* rating in one of the criteria and *Satisfactory* ratings in the others shall be necessary for a tenure recommendation.

In addition, for all cases of promotion and tenure, the factors described in Sections II.A.1 through II.A.5 above, shall also be considered.

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 and must be evaluated by the AUH and the PAC.

### II.A.7. STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT

The minimum qualification for a faculty member to receive a non-tenure-track reappointment is *Satisfactory* ratings in all three review criteria. In addition, for all cases of non-tenure track reappointment, the factors described in Sections II.A.1 through II.A.5 above shall also be considered. Other factors such as program need and program financial exigencies will also be considered in determining reappointment of faculty.

## II.B. TEACHING STANDARDS

---

The JMU Faculty Handbook states that consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation, evaluations by peers and/or AUHs, and student evaluations. Consideration should be given to a faculty member's commitment to student advising and innovations in teaching as evidenced by development of new course work and teaching methodology.

In addition to student evaluations, the SIS evaluation standards for teaching clearly include many other activities and resources that are important for assessing teaching effectiveness and that may be included in a candidate's portfolio for promotion and tenure. Nonetheless, candidates should expect that the PAC will independently obtain all copies of their teaching evaluations for the years relevant to their evaluation. The PAC expects faculty to candidly address in their portfolio any issues of concern that emerge in student evaluations.

### II.B.1. SATISFACTORY RATING

A *Satisfactory* rating requires evidence that the faculty member is dedicated to their teaching responsibilities and performs reliably across their assigned courses. Attainment of this rating can be demonstrated by activities and achievements such as the following:

- [II.B1.a] Commitment to assigned classes, e.g. thoroughness of class preparation, careful and objective grading, and timely return of tests and papers.
- [II.B1.b] Course organization, e.g. clearly defined course objectives; course content, syllabi, handouts, readings and/or textbook consistent with the course description; and course level and rigor consistent with student abilities and SIS practice.
- [II.B1.c] Clear and effective communication with appropriate use of teaching resources.
- [II.B1.d] Mastery of the subject matter.
- [II.B1.e] Acceptable student evaluations of classes over the period of review.
- [II.B1.f] Commitment to effective student advising when assigned duties as an adviser.
- [II.B1.g] Positive attitude toward students, as shown by availability outside of class, assistance with student professional development, and jobs/ graduate school placement.
- [II.B1.h] Personal leadership demonstrated through self-initiative and follow-through with instructional tasks.
- [II.B1.i] Participation as a valued team member in team teaching, curriculum development, or instructional improvement activities.

### II.B.2. EXCELLENT RATING

To receive an *Excellent* rating, a faculty member should demonstrate vitality and innovation in their teaching, commitment that goes beyond the classroom, and a notably high level of student

engagement. The individual should show a dedication to teaching beyond meeting the satisfactory requirements. Attainment of this rating can be demonstrated by activities and achievements such as the following:

- [II.B2.a] Strongly positive student response to teaching, e.g. student-sponsored teaching awards, consistently above average student evaluations, or unusually positive alumni comments.
- [II.B2.b] Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching, e.g. JMU or externally sponsored teaching awards or exceptionally positive reports of peer observation of teaching.
- [II.B2.c] Evidence of instructional vitality, e.g. developing new courses, methods and materials; innovations in course content or methodology; and use of a variety of teaching methods.
- [II.B2.d] Leadership in non-traditional learning experiences and activities, e.g. honors research, independent study, class projects, and field teaching.
- [II.B2.e] Quality teaching in a variety of learning contexts, e.g., special lectures, seminars, special studies, and discussion groups.
- [II.B2.f] Breadth in teaching expertise, e.g. the ability to teach a variety of subject areas, at the upper and lower levels, or courses for non-majors.
- [II.B2.g] Publication of book chapters, textbooks, or teaching materials.
- [II.B2.h] Presentations and publications on innovations in course content and teaching methodology.
- [II.B2.i] Professional development through such efforts as
  - Participation in workshops, conferences or similar activities devoted primarily to improving teaching methods and course content.
  - Participating in regional and national pedagogical organizations.
- [II.B2.j] Leadership in teamwork, e.g. generating a spirit of teaming, building team consensus or capabilities, and initiating teams that effectively address SIS curriculum needs.
- [II.B2.k] Instructional leadership, e.g., the ability to initiate and execute constructive change in a SIS, JMU, or external curriculum.
- [II.B2.l] Demonstrated instructional accomplishments that the PAC deems exceptional.

### II.B.3. UNSATISFACTORY RATING

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory*.



## II.C. SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION STANDARDS

---

The Faculty Handbook states that the evaluation criteria for scholarly achievement and professional qualifications may differ according to discipline. However, the criteria should include, but need not be limited to, publication of scholarly works, presentations at professional conferences, achievement through performance in the arts, engaging in recognized research, obtaining research grants, continuing professional development through formal course work, publication of educational materials and consulting activities.

### II.C.1. SATISFACTORY RATING

A *Satisfactory* rating in scholarship requires evidence that the faculty member is continuing to learn and stay abreast of developments within his/her field. The activities listed below are examples of evidence that may be used to support a rating of *Satisfactory*. Attainment of this rating can be demonstrated by activities and achievements such as the following:

- [II.C1.a] Membership in relevant professional and scholarly societies and organizations.
- [II.C1.b] Participation in professional meetings, field conferences, and other scholarly gatherings.
- [II.C1.c] Research involving students in independent studies or within the Honors Program.
- [II.C1.d] Supervising student independent study and honors projects.
- [II.C1.e] Presenting papers at regional meetings.
- [II.C1.f] Publishing in non-refereed journals.
- [II.C1.g] Development of instructional or education materials.
- [II.C1.h] Demonstration of professional development through such activities as
  - Ongoing personal professional development (e.g., NSF short courses and attending national meetings, etc.) or an organized program of self-study in a new area of research.
  - Securing additional education at professional short courses and conferences.
- [II.C1.i] Engaging in unpublished ongoing research.
- [II.C1.j] Presentation of faculty seminars and colloquia.
- [II.C1.k] Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.
- [II.C1.l] Authoring or co-authoring grant proposals to sponsored external funding programs.
- [II.C1.m] Receiving competitively awarded internal JMU grants.

## II.C.2. EXCELLENT RATING

To receive an Excellent rating in scholarship, the individual must contribute to the advancement of knowledge. An Excellent rating requires evidence from professionals external to JMU that the individual is recognized for scholarly contributions or professional expertise. Attainment of this rating can be demonstrated by activities and achievements such as the following:

- [II.C2.a] Demonstrated contribution to knowledge through a focused, goal directed program of research or other scholarly activity.
- [II.C2.b] Receipt of professional achievement awards, or other evidence that demonstrates external recognition of individual professional achievement.
- [II.C2.c] Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of a national or international conference.
- [II.C2.d] Publication of book reviews, discussions, and technical reports in one's professional area.
- [II.C2.e] Publication of books or monographs in one's professional area.
- [II.C2.f] Service as editor of a national or international journal or referee of papers for such a journal.
- [II.C2.g] Active research involving students demonstrable through presentation or publication in a professional forum.
- [II.C2.h] Publication of ongoing research and other scholarly activity in refereed national or international professional journals or serving as editor of a scholarly volume in one's field.
- [II.C2.i] Presentation of papers at national or international professional meetings.
- [II.C2.j] Receiving external research grants, awards, or contracts; initiating a successful grant proposal for external funding and/or directing the resulting project.
- [II.C2.k] Authoring textbooks or published teaching materials.
- [II.C2.l] Professional consulting that reflects recognition of the individual's expertise.
- [II.C2.m] Other scholarly achievement, recognition, or professional qualification that the PAC deems exceptional.

## II.C.3. UNSATISFACTORY RATING

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory*.

## II.D. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE STANDARDS

---

The Faculty Handbook states that evaluation of professional service shall include committee service and leadership at James Madison University or in professional or educational organizations, or service otherwise enhancing the profession, academic unit, college or university.

Professional Service includes activities that advance the mission of the University, the College, or SIS; activities that advance one's professional scholarly community; and activities that benefit society in areas related to one's professional expertise.

A *Satisfactory* rating can be attained through an adequate level of participation in activities such as those listed below. This must include an adequate level of service to SIS. To receive an *Excellent* rating, the individual must be at least Satisfactory in performing the activities below, and must demonstrate a higher level of leadership, initiative, effectiveness, and consistency in service. A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory*.

### II.D.1. SERVICE THAT ADVANCES THE MISSIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY, THE COLLEGE, AND THE SCHOOL

- [II.D1.a] Serving and participating as a valued team member on SIS and SIS program committees, task forces, etc.
- [II.D1.b] Serving and participating as a valued team member on college and university committees, task forces, etc.
- [II.D1.c] Participating in public relations events and student recruiting.
- [II.D1.d] Participating in grant proposals for external funding for teaching and equipment support.
- [II.D1.e] Serving as a faculty advisor to student organizations.
- [II.D1.f] Serving as a satisfactory student curriculum advisor when assigned duties as an advisor.
- [II.D1.g] Initiating and carrying out a program that leads to a significant increase in SIS or JMU resources, or in SIS's or JMU's ability to perform its mission.
- [II.D1.h] A major service or office at the School, College or University level.
- [II.D1.i] Service leadership, e.g., the ability to initiate and execute constructive change in SIS.
- [II.D1.j] Other professional service that the PAC deems to be a leadership contribution or exceptional.

## II.D.2. SERVICE THAT ADVANCES ONE'S PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY

- [II.D2.a] Serving as a referee or reviewer of scholarly articles or textbooks.
- [II.D2.b] Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.
- [II.D2.c] Serving as an officer of a professional organization.
- [II.D2.d] Serving as an editorial member of a professional journal.
- [II.D2.e] A major effort conducting workshops, symposia, and training sessions in one's professional area.
- [II.D2.f] Other professional service to the faculty member's professional scholarly community that the PAC deems to be a leadership contribution or exceptional.

## II.D.3. SERVICE THAT BENEFITS SOCIETY IN AREAS RELATED TO ONE'S PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE

- [II.D3.a] A contribution that applies the resources of the University to solving a problem of local, regional, state, national, or international concern.
- [II.D3.b] A major effort to solve a problem at the local, state, national, or international level providing a significant benefit to society and in an area directly related to one's professional expertise.
- [II.D3.c] A major service or office at the local, state or national level related to one's professional competence.
- [II.D3.d] Other professional service directed at the betterment of society that the PAC deems to be a significant contribution.

## SECTION III. APPEAL OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

### III.A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

#### III.A.1. ROLE OF THE PAC

The JMU Faculty Handbook indicates that the PAC functions as an appeal body for annual evaluations. The Handbook states that in considering an appeal, the crucial questions are whether (1) all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH in accordance with established criteria and standards, and (2) whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated faculty using the same standard of judgment.

#### III.A.2. ROLE OF THE WRITTEN ANNUAL EVALUATION AND THE AUH

The primary purpose of the written annual evaluation is to document the AUH's evaluation ratings (satisfactory, excellent, unsatisfactory) for faculty performance regarding teaching, scholarship, and service as well as to document overall faculty performance as acceptable/unacceptable. In doing so, the AUH cites examples from the faculty member's annual faculty activity report and plan (FAR/FAP) as evidence for the rating.

The AUH's written annual evaluation is not a catalog of work tasks reported on the FAR, because the FAR itself is part of the faculty member's personnel record. By nature the AUH summary cannot be exhaustive, and an AUH will selectively highlight faculty achievements to support a rating.

The AUH may choose to emphasize certain criteria from the formal *SIS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines* or develop a standard of judgment based on these established criteria. That is the prerogative of the AUH provided he or she is consistent.

Many faculty activities and achievements cross over teaching, scholarship, and service. An AUH may consequently sort some faculty activities into categories differently than the faculty member may have done for the purpose of the annual evaluation.

A change in AUH will result in changes in the annual review and written evaluation, some subtle and some obvious. Changes in tone, interpretation, judgment, criteria emphasis, and writing skill are to be expected. In addition, the AUH could change focus and strategy over time.

The FAR template/form for reporting annual activities and achievements is complementary to and grounded in the SIS performance criteria, and is meant to structure information for the AUH. Academic Unit Heads may change the FAR reporting form to best meet their evaluation needs, and an annual evaluation may be grounded in SIS performance standards that are not separately itemized by the FAR template.

The AUH's written annual review can legitimately involve statements of faculty performance over time. The annual reviews are records of faculty performance and professionalism that cumulate for decisions regarding tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and reappointment. They can reasonably contain AUH references to prior performance, particularly in terms of sustained achievement, improvement from past practice, correction of areas of concern, or ongoing issues and weaknesses.

## III.B. APPEAL PROCESS

---

The JMU Faculty Handbook governs appeals of the AUH's annual evaluation and more detail is provided there for further reference.

The AUH must provide faculty with their official written annual evaluation by 1 October each year. Any failure to meet this deadline will extend the appeal process by the number of days the written evaluation is late. Faculty have a maximum of seven calendar days following receipt of their official written evaluation to make an appeal in writing. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available. The appeal process in SIS must be completed by 21 October.

The written recommendation of the PAC regarding the appeal will be given to the AUH by 19 October, with a copy to the faculty member and the dean. The PAC may recommend that the AUH's evaluation be upheld or modified (and how) and must provide an explanation of its reasoning. The AUH may or may not modify the evaluation according to the PAC's recommendation, but must notify the PAC, the faculty member, and the dean of his or her decision to do so (or not) by 21 October. The appeal process in SIS must be completed by 21 October.

Faculty who wish to appeal their annual evaluation should do the following:

- Notify the AUH and PAC Chair as soon as possible by email of their intent to appeal.
- Submit their written appeal concurrently by email to the PAC Chair and the AUH within seven calendar days of receiving their official written evaluation.
- Include the following in the appeal:
  - A copy of the preliminary or official written evaluation.
  - A copy of the FAR and any supporting material provided to the AUH as part of the annual review.
  - A list of the evaluation issues that are being appealed, with an explanation of (a) why, and (b) what remedy is requested.

The AUH will provide a brief written response to the PAC regarding the aspects of the evaluation under appeal no later than October 15.

## III.C. PAC REVIEW OF EVALUATION APPEALS

---

### III.C.1. SUBSTANTIVE EVALUATION ISSUES

The PAC may recommend to *uphold* or *modify* an AUH's evaluation regarding substantive issues. Examples of substantive points of concern are as follows:

- [III.C.1a] An *unsatisfactory* rating in teaching, scholarship, or service.
- [III.C.1b] A *satisfactory* rating in teaching, scholarship, or service that the faculty member believes should be an *excellent* rating.
- [III.C.1c] An *unacceptable* annual performance determination.
- [III.C.1d] Language or tone in the AUH's written evaluation that a faculty member believes (1) substantively misrepresents her or his performance or professional conduct, and/or (2) reflects the AUH's underlying judgment regarding an evaluation rating that is being appealed.
- [III.C.1e] Omission of key faculty activities and achievements in the written evaluation *if* their omission appears to have affected an evaluation rating that is being appealed.
- [III.C.1f] The criteria (teaching, scholarship, service) to which the AUH has assigned a "crossover" activity or achievement *if* a change in category might improve an evaluation rating that is being appealed.

### III.C.2. NON-SUBSTANTIVE EVALUATION ISSUES

SIS strongly discourages appeals that reflect "wordsmithing" of the AUH written evaluation. Minor edits, changes, and corrections to the evaluation are already accommodated within the annual review process. The PAC will *uphold* the AUH evaluation on points of concern it considers to be non-substantive. The following are examples of such points of concern:

- [III.C.2a] The tone, word choice, organization, grammar, and/or structure of the AUH written evaluation if they have no obvious bearing on the actual evaluation ratings or do not substantively misrepresent faculty performance or professional conduct.
- [III.C.2b] Requests to include key faculty activities or achievements omitted in the written evaluation if the omissions have no obvious bearing on the actual evaluation ratings.
- [III.C.2c] Requests to change the category in which an activity or achievement is considered by the AUH if it has no consequence for the evaluation ratings.
- [III.C.2d] An AUH change from past process—from one AUH to another or for an individual AUH—if the process complies with the Faculty Handbook.

## IV.A. CHANGES TO GUIDELINES

---

Recommendations regarding changes to the *SIS Evaluation Guidelines* may be submitted to the AUH by a two-thirds vote of the SIS faculty.

## SECTION IV. AMENDMENT PROCESS

## IV.B. RECORD OF GUIDELINE CHANGES

---

The SIS Guidelines are edited and amended from time-to-time for clarity, to maintain consistency with policies in the JMU Faculty Handbook, and to reflect substantive changes to the School guidelines desired by the faculty.

Beginning with the amendments dated 27 July 2018, the record of formally adopted (or rejected) amendments to the SIS Guidelines will be *briefly summarized* herein.

### **CHANGES ADOPTED 27 JULY 2018**

The Guidelines were edited thoroughly and a number of substantive additions were made. All proposed changes were accepted by the faculty; none were rejected. The two separate implementation and criteria guidelines were consolidated into a single document; minor edits were made for clarity, internal consistency, and accuracy of descriptions; a section was added to record guideline changes over time.

The Guidelines were harmonized with the Faculty Handbook by adding content related to recusal of PAC members when family members come up for promotion and tenure, violations of PAC confidentiality, use of faculty personnel records, and appeals of the AUH annual review.

New language was added about the transparency of the promotion and tenure process as well as codifying cultures of practice that have evolved over time. In addition, new language was added that placed greater emphasis on the preparation of materials for promotion and tenure by applicants as well as the need for mentoring and model portfolios. Beginning in Fall 2019, applicants must submit digital portfolios.