

Department of Social Work
Promotion and Tenure Evaluation
Guidelines

Approved: 2009

**James Madison University
Department of Social Work**

**Promotion and Tenure
Criteria, Standards and Procedures**

(Created by the social work faculty at James Madison University, Spring semester, 1998; revised fall 2005 to be consistent with JMU Faculty Handbook, 2005; scholarly section revised August 2007; revision to be consistent with 2009 JMU Faculty Handbook and for clarity finalized June 2009)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure at James Madison University 3

***Department of Social Work:* Level of Performance in Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification, Professional Service and Administrative Assignments 12**

Teaching 14

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification 16

Professional Service 18

Administrative Assignments 23

General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure at James Madison University

(Taken from the JMU Faculty Handbook, 2009)

Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) (III.E.2.a.)

Each academic unit will have a personnel advisory committee (AUPAC). The committee advises the Academic Unit Head (AUH) and makes recommendations on personnel matters within the academic unit. The AUPAC is responsible to the academic unit faculty and to the AUH for conducting its functions, and the dean shall provide oversight of the work of the AUPAC to determine if it has followed appropriate procedures.

The full-time faculty of the academic unit except the AUH shall be responsible for determining the composition and electing the membership of the AUPAC. The rules for the election, procedures and operation of the AUPAC shall be approved by the academic unit faculty members, AUH, dean, appropriate vice provost, and Provost, and shall be available to all members of the academic unit. The rules should address the rights and obligations of a member of the AUPAC to participate in evaluations while the member is on leave or absent from the university, the recusal of a member from participation in evaluations of family members, and the conduct of the members in performing their duties. The AUPAC may consist of tenured or untenured faculty with the exception of the AUH and may contain faculty members from other academic units. If untenured faculty members are on the AUPAC, the academic unit will establish a subcommittee limited to tenured faculty to make recommendations on tenure.

The AUPAC may by majority vote of the committee as a whole remove a member of the committee for violation of AUPAC rules. Any such action is subject to review by the AUH and the dean.

All members of the AUPAC 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 AUPAC or for a misconduct charge under *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.A.25.

Criteria (III.E.2.b.)

The areas of performance that shall be considered in all performance evaluations are as follows:

- **teaching**
- **scholarly achievement and professional qualifications**
- **professional service**

Additionally, any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, should be addressed in the evaluation of these performance areas.

The ways by which these criteria are judged for consideration of promotion and awarding of tenure are as follows:

Teaching [III.E.2.b.(1)]

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 those academic units that do not use student evaluations in all classes taught by a faculty member, the policy determining which classes will be evaluated shall be stated in the academic unit's evaluation procedures. Any such policy shall apply equally to all similarly situated faculty members in the academic unit.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications [III.E.2.b.(2)]

Evaluation criteria in this area may differ according to discipline. 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.

Professional Service [III.E.2.b.(3)]

Evaluation of activity in this area 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.

Promotion in Academic Rank [III.E.6]

The promotion of an instructional faculty member shall be determined by merit regardless of the distribution of faculty by academic rank within the academic unit. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank at the university before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for promotion. A faculty member's pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application or nomination for promotion, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion. Administrative and Professional Faculty (A&P) faculty members may also apply for or be nominated for promotion in academic rank, and the following policies and procedures shall apply.

The Board of Visitors (BOV) is the only authority that can award promotions or make a commitment that promises promotion in academic rank. Regardless of the division in which a faculty member holds an appointment, the academic affairs division is the appropriate administrative division through which applications and nominations for promotion in academic rank will be processed

Standards [III.E.6.a.]

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. In the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank, the following standards apply:

Assistant Professor [III.E.6.a.(1)]

At least satisfactory ratings in all areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.

Associate Professor [III.E.6.a.(2)]

An excellent rating in one area and at least satisfactory ratings in the others are required for promotion to associate professor.

Professor [III.E.6.a.(3)]

Excellent ratings in two areas, and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area, are required for promotion to professor.

Procedures

The following policies and procedures apply to applications for promotion in academic rank:

- The faculty member may apply for promotion, or the AUPAC or AUH may nominate a faculty member for promotion. Written nomination must be made by Sept. 1. The faculty member shall be informed if the AUPAC or AUH has nominated the faculty member. The faculty member being considered for promotion shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH and AUPAC by Oct. 1.

If an AUH applies for promotion in faculty rank, or is nominated for promotion in faculty rank, the AUH shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in all areas to the dean and the AUPAC. The AUPAC will evaluate the AUH's performance and make its recommendation to the dean. If a dean applies for promotion in faculty rank, or is nominated for promotion in faculty rank, the dean shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in all areas to the appropriate vice provost or the provost, and the AUPAC of the appropriate academic unit. The AUPAC will evaluate the dean's performance and make its recommendation to the appropriate vice provost or the provost.
[III.E.6.b. (1)]

- A candidate for promotion may decline the nomination or withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any time prior to receiving official notification of the promotion decision.[III.E.6.b.(2)]
- Although consultation among the AUPAC, AUH and dean is encouraged, the AUH and the AUPAC shall make independent evaluations of the facts and make independent recommendations.[III.E.6.b.(3)]
- Recommendations on promotion in academic rank shall be justified using the academic unit criteria and based on the standards for promotion as set forth in *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.E.6.a. Specific academic unit criteria for promotion in academic rank shall be adopted by the AUPAC and approved by the academic unit's full-time faculty members, the AUH, dean, appropriate vice provost and Provost. New full-time faculty members who will be eligible for promotion in academic rank must be given information on the academic unit's promotion criteria during their first

semester at the university. Existing promotion criteria may be modified by the AUPAC with the approval of a majority of the full-time faculty members in the academic unit, the AUH, dean, appropriate vice provost and Provost. [III.E.6.b.(4)]

- The written recommendations of the AUPAC and AUH shall include a justification of their conclusions. The recommendations shall be submitted to the dean by Nov. 15, and a copy of both recommendations shall concurrently be provided to the faculty member. After the dean has received both the AUPAC and AUH recommendations, a copy of the AUPAC recommendation shall be provided to the AUH, and a copy of the AUH recommendation shall be provided to the AUPAC. [III.E.6.b.(5)]
- The dean may consult with his or her college personnel advisory body and shall make a recommendation after reviewing the recommendations of the AUH and the AUPAC (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section IV.A.3.). The written recommendation of the dean shall include a justification of his or her conclusions. The recommendations of the AUH, AUPAC and dean shall be submitted to the appropriate vice provost and the Provost by Dec. 15. The appropriate vice provost will make recommendations to the Provost by Dec. 18. After the recommendations have been received by the Provost, a copy of the dean's recommendation shall be provided to the AUH, the AUPAC and the faculty member. [III.E.6.b.(6)]
- The recommendations on promotion in academic rank from the AUH, AUPAC, dean and appropriate vice provost shall be reviewed by the Provost, who shall either deny the promotion or make a recommendation to grant the promotion. A decision by the Provost to deny a promotion in academic rank terminates the consideration process; denial does not require action by the BOV. In the absence of a timely written appeal, the decision by the Provost to deny promotion becomes final and effective on the date of the notification. Official written notification shall be sent to the faculty member by Feb. 1, with copies to the appropriate vice provost, dean, AUH and AUPAC concurrently. If the Provost recommends granting promotion in academic rank, the recommendation shall be sent to the president by Feb. 1, with copies to the appropriate vice provost, dean, AUH, AUPAC and faculty member concurrently. The notification of denial or recommendation to grant promotion in academic rank shall include a justification of the Provost's decision. [III.E.6.b.(7)]
- If the Provost recommends granting a promotion in academic rank, the president shall review the recommendation and either deny the promotion or make a recommendation to grant the promotion. A decision by the president to deny the promotion terminates the consideration process; denial does not require action by the BOV. Official written notification of denial shall be sent by the president to the faculty member by Feb. 15, with concurrent copies to the Provost, appropriate vice provost, dean, AUH and AUPAC. If the president recommends granting the promotion, the recommendation shall be sent to the BOV. The BOV shall act on the recommendation, and notification of its decision shall be sent to the faculty member by the Provost within 15 days after the BOV's meeting. Official notification granting promotion shall only be conveyed to a faculty member after the formal action of the BOV. Promotions become effective at the beginning of the following academic year. [III.E.6.b.(8)]

- All persons involved in the promotion process shall respect and maintain the confidentiality of all relevant documents and deliberations. [III.E.6.b. (12)]

Tenure [III.E.7]

Purpose [III.E.7.a]

Tenure is intended to protect academic freedom, provide a reasonable measure of employment and enable the university to retain a permanent instructional faculty of distinction. The BOV is the only authority that can award tenure or make a commitment which promises tenure. If an application for tenure also includes an application for promotion, the procedures and standards to be used are the tenure procedures and standards.

Probationary Period [III.E.7.b.]

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.

Suspensions [III.E.7.c]

The faculty member and the AUH may agree to suspend the running of the probationary period for a specific period of time under appropriate circumstances and with the approval of the dean and appropriate vice provost or Provost. Appropriate circumstances may include medical or family needs and other situations warranting a temporary suspension of the tenure clock.

Extensions [III.E.7.d.]

Faculty members on less than a seven-year probation may, by agreement with the AUH and with the approval of the dean, have the probationary period extended to a maximum of seven years.

Standards [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 mission of the academic unit, the college and the university. To be awarded tenure, the faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for promotion to associate professor and should enhance the academic environment of the academic unit and the university. Length of service is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for tenure. Tenure may be denied on any legitimate grounds including the lack of need for a faculty member in the particular academic unit or academic specialization, program reduction or elimination, financial exigency, or conduct. Problems with a faculty member's conduct may disqualify a candidate for tenure. Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service shall be used in evaluating the performance of a candidate for tenure. A faculty member's pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application for tenure, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on tenure.

Procedures [III.E.7.f.]

The following policies and procedures apply to applications for tenure:

- A faculty member in the penultimate year of the probationary period must apply for tenure and submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH and AUPAC by Oct. 1.

If an AUH applies for tenure, the AUH shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in all areas to the dean and the AUPAC. The AUPAC will evaluate the AUH's performance and make its recommendation to the dean. [III.E.7.f.(1)]

- In all cases, a candidate for tenure may withdraw without prejudice from consideration prior to receiving official notification of the tenure decision. Withdrawal from tenure consideration in the penultimate year of the probationary period will be considered resignation from the university effective at the end of the probationary period. [III.E.7.f.(2)]
- Although consultation among the AUPAC, AUH and dean is encouraged, the AUH and the AUPAC shall make independent evaluations of the facts and make independent recommendations. [III.E.7.f.(3)]
- Recommendations on tenure shall be justified using the academic unit criteria and based on the standards for promotion to associate professor as set forth in *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.E.6.a. Specific academic unit criteria for tenure shall be adopted by the AUPAC and approved by the academic unit's fulltime faculty members, the AUH, dean, appropriate vice provost and Provost. New full-time faculty members on tenure track must be provided information on the academic unit's tenure criteria during their first semester at the university. Existing tenure criteria may be modified by the AUPAC with agreement of a majority of the full-time faculty members in an academic unit, with approval of the AUH, dean, appropriate vice provost and Provost. [III.E.7.f.(4)]
- The written recommendations of the AUPAC and AUH shall include a justification of their conclusions. The recommendations shall be submitted to the dean by Nov. 15, and a copy of both recommendations shall be provided to the faculty member. After the dean has received both the AUPAC and AUH recommendations, a copy of the AUPAC recommendation shall be provided to the AUH, and a copy of the AUH recommendation shall be provided to the AUPAC. [III.E.7.f.(5)]
- The dean may consult with his or her college personnel body (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section IV. A. 3.) and shall make a recommendation after reviewing the recommendations of the AUH and the AUPAC. The written recommendation of the dean shall include justification of his or her conclusions. The recommendations of the AUH, AUPAC and dean shall be submitted to the appropriate vice provost and the Provost by Dec. 15. The appropriate vice provost will make recommendations to the Provost by Dec. 18. After the recommendations have been received by the Provost, a copy of the dean's recommendation shall be provided to the AUH, AUPAC and faculty member. [III.E.7.f.(6)]

- Recommendations on tenure from the AUH, AUPAC, dean and appropriate vice provost shall be reviewed by the Provost, who shall either deny tenure or make a recommendation to award tenure. A decision by the Provost to deny tenure terminates the consideration process; denial does not require action by the president or the BOV. In the absence of a timely written appeal, the decision by the Provost to deny tenure becomes final and effective on the date of the notification.

Official written notification of denial shall be sent to the faculty member by Feb. 1, with concurrent copies to the appropriate vice provost, dean, AUH and AUPAC. If the Provost recommends awarding tenure, the recommendation shall be sent to the president by Feb. 1, with concurrent copies to the appropriate vice provost, dean, AUH, AUPAC and faculty member. The Provost's notification of denial or recommendation to award tenure shall include a justification. [III.E.7.f. (7)]

- If the Provost recommends awarding tenure, the president shall review the recommendation and either deny tenure or make a recommendation to award tenure. A decision by the president to deny tenure terminates the consideration process; denial does not require action by the BOV. The decision of the president or the BOV to deny tenure is not appealable. Official written notification of denial shall be sent by the president to the faculty member by Feb. 15, with concurrent copies to the Provost, appropriate vice provost, dean, AUH and AUPAC. If the president recommends awarding tenure, the recommendation shall be sent to the BOV. The BOV shall act on the recommendation, and notification of its decision shall be sent to the faculty member within fifteen days after the BOV's meeting. Official notification awarding tenure may be conveyed to a faculty member only after the formal action of the BOV. The award of tenure becomes effective at the beginning of the following academic year. [III.E.7.f. (8)]
- All persons involved in the evaluation process shall respect and maintain the strict confidentiality of all relevant documents and deliberations.[III.E.7 f. (12)]

Post-Tenure Review [III.E.8]

The granting of tenure anticipates that a faculty member will retain his or her academic position, absent unusual circumstances. Post-tenure review should be used to encourage faculty development and productivity if a tenured faculty member fails to maintain a satisfactory level of performance.

Development Plan [III.E.8.a.]

If a tenured faculty member's overall annual performance is found to be unsatisfactory in the annual evaluation process (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.E.4.), a development plan shall be designed and executed as specified in *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.E.4.k.

Remediation Recommendation [III.E.8.b.]

If a tenured faculty member's overall annual performance has been found to be unsatisfactory in two of the three most recent annual evaluations, the AUH shall recommend that the faculty member undergo remediation. Notification shall be sent by the AUH to the faculty member by Nov. 1, with a copy sent to the AUPAC and the dean.

AUPAC’s Review of Remediation Recommendation [III.E.8.c.]

The AUPAC shall review the tenured faculty member’s annual evaluations and make an independent appraisal of whether the faculty member’s performance over the last three years has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall. The AUPAC shall submit its written evaluation to the dean by Nov. 30, with copies to the AUH and faculty member concurrently. The evaluation shall include a justification of the AUPAC’s conclusions, using the academic unit’s criteria. A conclusion that performance has been unsatisfactory must be supported by substantial evidence.

Dean’s Review of Remediation Recommendation [III.E.8.d.]

The dean shall review the tenured faculty member’s annual evaluations and the AUPAC’s evaluation of the faculty member’s overall performance. The dean shall provide a separate written evaluation. The evaluation shall conclude whether the faculty member’s overall performance has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory over the last three years. The evaluation shall include a justification of the dean’s conclusions using the academic unit’s criteria. A conclusion that performance has been unsatisfactory must be supported by substantial evidence.

Remediation [III.E.8.e.]

A plan of remediation will be required if the dean concludes that the overall performance of the tenured faculty member has been unsatisfactory. The dean shall send notification of whether or not remediation will be required to the faculty member by Dec. 15, with concurrent copies to the AUH and AUPAC.

Appeal of Remediation Decision [III.E.8.f.]

A tenured faculty member may appeal a decision to require remediation to the appropriate vice provost or the Provost. The appeal shall be in writing and must be submitted within seven days of receiving notification from the dean that a remediation plan is required. The appropriate vice provost or the Provost shall send to the faculty member a written response to the appeal by Feb. 1, with concurrent copies to the AUH, AUPAC and the dean, and shall include a justification of his or her conclusions. A conclusion that performance has been unsatisfactory must be supported by substantial evidence.

Remediation Plan [III.E.8.g.]

The AUH, in consultation with the AUPAC and the tenured faculty member, shall devise a remediation plan that respects academic freedom and professional self-direction. The plan shall include specification of activities to be performed, the desired objectives covering all aspects of the faculty member’s performance and the requirements for a plan report to be submitted by the faculty member at the conclusion of the remediation period. It should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration. Development of the plan shall proceed during consideration of any appeal of the need for a plan. See *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.E.8.f. A copy of the plan shall be sent to the faculty member by Feb. 1, with a concurrent copy to the dean.

Appeal of Plan Contents [III.E.8.h.]

A tenured faculty member may appeal the contents of the remediation plan to the appropriate vice provost or the Provost. The appeal shall be in writing and must be submitted within seven days of receiving the plan. The appropriate vice provost or Provost shall send to the faculty member a written response to the appeal by Mar. 1, with concurrent copies to the AUH and the dean.

Report of Faculty Member [III.E.8.i.]

The tenured faculty member will have the remainder of the academic year in which the plan was developed plus the next full academic year to accomplish the objectives of the plan. By Oct. 1 following the next full academic year, the faculty member shall submit the remediation plan report to the AUH and the AUPAC.

Academic Unit's Review of Plan Completion [III.E.8.j.]

The AUH and the AUPAC shall prepare separate written evaluations of the tenured faculty member's accomplishment of the objectives of the plan. The evaluations shall include a justification of their conclusions and shall be submitted to the dean by Nov. 15. After the evaluations have been received by the dean, copies shall be provided to the faculty member.

Dean's Review of Plan Completion [III.E.8.k.]

The dean shall review the evaluations of the AUH and AUPAC and prepare an independent evaluation. The dean's evaluation shall include a justification of its conclusions. The evaluations of the AUH, AUPAC and dean shall be submitted to the appropriate vice provost or the Provost by Dec. 15. After the evaluations have been received by the appropriate vice provost or the Provost, a copy of the dean's evaluation shall be provided to the AUH, AUPAC and faculty member.

Vice Provost's or Provost's Determination [III.E.8.l.]

The appropriate vice provost or the Provost shall review the evaluations of the AUH, AUPAC (AUPAC) and dean and shall determine whether the faculty member has satisfactorily accomplished the objectives of the remediation plan. If the appropriate vice provost and the Provost conclude that the faculty member has satisfactorily completed the objectives of the plan, the remediation phase of the post-tenure review process will be closed, although faculty development activities may continue as recommended by the AUH or dean. If the appropriate vice provost determines that the faculty member has not satisfactorily accomplished the objectives of the plan and that sanctions are appropriate, a recommendation on this issue shall be sent by the vice provost to the Provost. If the Provost determines that the faculty member has not satisfactorily accomplished the objectives of the plan and that sanctions are appropriate, the Provost shall confer with the AUPAC before deciding on the appropriate sanction.

Sanctions [III.E.8.m.]

Sanctions may include but are not limited to reduction in salary or dismissal.

Notice of Sanctions [III.E.8.n.]

Written notice of the Provost's determination and sanctions shall be sent to the faculty member by Feb. 1, with copies to the AUH, AUPAC, dean and appropriate vice provost. The notification shall include a rationale for the Provost's determination and any sanction. If the sanction is dismissal, it shall include the effective date of dismissal. In the absence of a timely written appeal by the faculty member, the decision of the Provost is final, and the sanction is effective on the date specified by the Provost.

Department of Social Work
**Level of Performance in Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification, Professional Service
and Administrative Assignments**

AUPAC Procedures

The full-time social work faculty with the exception of the AUH is responsible for determining the composition and for electing the membership of the AUPAC

The Social Work AUPAC is comprised of tenured and tenure-track faculty members with the exception of the AUH and may contain faculty members from other academic units. The additional person(s) may be requested by the tenured or tenure track faculty members under review or the AUH.

The final promotion, tenure or post-tenure review document created as a result of the deliberations of the AUPAC will be retained in the faculty members file indefinitely. Supporting documentation shall be retained by the AUPAC Chair for 15 days past the date for appeal as outlined in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*. If a faculty member appeals, the supporting documentation shall be retained by the AUPAC Chair until the appeal is resolved.

If tenure-track faculty members serve on the AUPAC, a subcommittee limited to tenured faculty to make recommendations on tenure will be established.

AUPAC members may not participate in evaluations of family members

AUPAC members have the right and obligation to participate in evaluations conducted while the member is on leave or absent from the university.

The AUPAC may by majority vote of the committee as a whole remove a member of the committee for violation of AUPAC rules. Any such action is subject to review by the AUH and the dean.

All members of the AUPAC 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 AUPAC or for a misconduct charge under *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.A.25.

Performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, professional service and administrative assignments shall be designated excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory based upon the following definitions:

Excellent: The candidate's performance on a given criterion (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, professional service and administrative assignments) has been clearly beyond the basic expectations and includes important contributions to the mission of the department, college and university. The candidate's record reflects a clear pattern of at least satisfactory performance within that criteria's indicators, that give evidence of performance approaching excellence on some of the indicators.

Satisfactory: The candidate's performance on a given criterion (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, professional service and administrative assignments) has clearly fulfilled contractual agreements with the department and has been consistent with and supportive of the mission of the department, college and university. The candidate's record on that criterion's indicators has been acceptable and consistent with expectations, with no significant shortcomings evident.

Unsatisfactory: The candidate's performance on a given criterion (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, professional service and administrative assignments) lacks sufficient evidence of positive performance and/or significant shortcomings are evident. The candidate has not fulfilled certain expectations of the department, college or university, has contributed little to or detracted from the mission of the academic unit or has shown incidents of unethical conduct or incompetence.

It has been decided by the tenure and promotion committee of the social work department that certain criteria must be met for a satisfactory rating and meeting additional criteria may lead to an excellent rating. Please refer to the beginning of each section (teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, professional service and administration) for the criteria ranking.

If consensus on a criterion's ratings cannot be reached by the AUPAC, a minority report can be made. The minority report can be submitted as an addendum to the AUPAC document.

Teaching

The scope and proportion of negotiated time for administrative assignments will be considered by the AUPAC in its evaluation of all sections of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures document. The impact of administrative assignments as reflected in a candidate's job description and proportional time negotiated is indicative of the proportion of time available for a candidate to participate in tenure and/or promotion activities. Therefore the AUPAC shall consider the impact of proportional administrative assignments during evaluations of each section of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures standards.

Teaching is a primary function of the university and includes a wide range of activities engaged in by faculty members. Assigned teaching may include social work courses or courses in a minor offered by the department. Teaching activities may occur in the absence of learning but teaching, by definition, occurs as learners acquire new knowledge, skills and/or attitudes. Outstanding teaching is the outcome of a variety of self-development, creative and scholarly activities.

Codes for Ranking:

1=Primary (must have) for satisfactory

2=Secondary (optional and will strengthen potential for an excellent rating)

Each AUPAC must determine an excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating for teaching. Determinants of the rating should be based on the following:

- If the candidate has evidence that goes beyond the minimal criteria needed for at least two of the primary criteria and has strong documentation representing at least two out of the five secondary criteria, this will be considered toward an **excellent** rating.
- If the candidate has evidence that meets the primary criteria then a **satisfactory** rating should be given
- If the candidate does not have evidence representing each primary criterion, then an **unsatisfactory** rating should be given.

Note: Additional evidence supplied by the candidate which helps to substantiate the quality of his/her teaching performance (e.g. documentation of outside classroom time spent with students on assignments, etc.) is encouraged.

| <i>Illustrations of Teaching</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Teaching</i> |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Teaching leading to academic degrees or completion of minors | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grid showing courses taught by semester, number of students in each course, and composite student evaluation score for each course • Anonymous student evaluations required by department • Self-evaluations including why I teach the way I do; teaching contributions to department; description of efforts to improve teaching; responsiveness to prior self-evaluations, department head evaluations, student evaluations, and grade distribution. • Taking at least three workshops, etc. designed to help improve teaching (or other evidence of faculty development) • Department head evaluations • May include departmentally approved peer evaluations based upon direct contact such as in class visitation or team-teaching |
| Using varied teaching methodologies | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation demonstrating use of varied teaching methodology and evaluating its effectiveness |
| <p>Preparing teaching materials such as syllabi, classroom materials and examinations and developing teaching methodologies which help transmit and reinforce information and/or develop skills. Special attention is given to the incorporation of multiple factors including age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, national origin, political ideology, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation. Class materials demonstrate an appreciation that, as a result of difference, a person's life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege and acclaim.</p> | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation which gives evidence of teaching efforts, such as syllabi, course materials and examinations • Documentation that course content is current and relevant |

| <i>Illustrations of Teaching</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Teaching</i> |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Teaching and guiding students related to field and internship responsibilities, if part of assignment. | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written evaluation from students, agency staff in field instruction setting, and/or the Director of Field Placement and Academic Unit Head (AUH) regarding a candidate's field/internship teaching and guiding students as a part of field/internship responsibilities • Documentation citing "above and beyond" field and internship support |
| Senior Outcome Assessment | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation of participation in the outcome assessment process • Participation in review and revision of the comprehensive exam • Participation in review and revision of the oral exam |
| Academic and professional advising | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self evaluations of advising, formal and informal, including philosophy of advising • Number of student recommendations per year in the following categories: letters, on-line references, and telephone references |
| Independent study advisor, thesis chair or serving as a committee member | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents such as contracts for independent study, thesis or proposal • Self-evaluation of participation in the process |
| Collaborative work relating to teaching and learning | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation of one's role in the collaboration • Documentation that illustrates role in collaborative work • Letters of support/peer evaluations |
| Active incorporation of one's personal research, scholarship or writing into one's teaching, or involvement of students in ones' research activities. | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of incorporation of one's work into teaching • Documentation of student involvement in one's research activities • Student conference presentations/publications on course related work, or other formal student presentations. |

| <i>Illustrations of Teaching</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Teaching</i> |
|---|--------------------|---|
| Development of new courses | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation which gives evidence of new course development, such as syllabi, course materials and examinations • Documentation that new course content is current and relevant |
| Special Recognitions | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special award/recognition for teaching excellence • Written opinions of former students (unsolicited, alumni surveys) |

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualification

The scope and proportion of negotiated time for administrative assignments will be considered by the AUPAC in its evaluation of all sections of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures document. The impact of administrative assignments as reflected in a candidate's job description and proportional time negotiated is indicative of the proportion of time available for a candidate to participate in tenure and/or promotion activities. Therefore the AUPAC shall consider the impact of proportional administrative assignments during evaluations of each section of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures standards.

Scholarship refers to careful, systematic and diligent inquiry for the purpose of creating, developing or refining knowledge (i.e. propositions or principles). Scholarship occurs in many forms. It is a primary function of the university and an ethical obligation of social workers, whether they be in direct or indirect practice. Scholarship is essential for the survival of the profession and the Department of Social Work and it enhances the reputation of each. Its benefits accrue to the scholar, students, academic and professional colleagues, and the larger society. Scholarship, as used here, is an open process which results in products others can read, view, critique and use. It is assumed that all faculty members will participate in scholarly activities, and especially formal research, although the types of quality of each activity will vary. Outstanding scholarship is the outcome of a variety of self-development, creative and other academic activities.

Codes for Ranking:

Each PAC must determine an excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating for scholarly achievement and professional qualification. Determinants of the rating should be based on the following:

- If the candidate has any activity beyond satisfactory as described below, it will be considered toward an **excellent** rating.

- The candidate must meet minimal standards in three of the indicators in Group A and B and have three publications in peer-reviewed journals under scholarly achievement to receive a **satisfactory** performance or to have negotiated, in advance, with the dean, department head, and PAC acceptable alternatives. Minimal standards for the Group A indicators under professional qualification must also be met for satisfactory performance.
- If the candidate does not meet the criteria for a satisfactory rating, then an **unsatisfactory** should be given.

A. Scholarly Achievement:

The following are indicators for scholarly achievement and can be used with any of the illustrations below. Group A are generally considered to have greater importance and impact than activities under Group B and will therefore usually be given greater weight in deciding on the level of one's performance.

Group A (the indicators in Group A are rank ordered)

- Publications in refereed journals
- Papers delivered at local, state, regional and national colloquia, symposia, academic meetings and/or professional groups (includes such activities as paper presentations, workshops, round table discussions, poster sessions, and panels which are supported by papers completed prior to delivery)
- External grants
- Publications in non-refereed journals
- Books
- Monographs
- Chapters in books or in monographs
- Editing volumes published by recognized presses (contributing written portions to the volume in the way of introductions, articles, etc.)

Group B

- Contributions to scholarly work, e.g. case studies, that are incorporated into published works
- Round table discussions, poster sessions and panels delivered at colloquia, symposia, academic meetings and/or professional groups at local, regional, state, and national levels.
- Invitation to be a keynote speaker
- Papers submitted but not accepted
- Research in progress or completed but not published
- Media presentations and brief descriptions of their purpose and utility
- Reviewer, textbook
- Internal grants

B. Professional Qualification

Group A

- Professional Development as indicated by active participation in professional meetings, workshops, courses, etc.
- Professional affiliations in relevant professional organizations

Group B

- Professional practice as indicated by acquiring and maintaining appropriate professional licensure/credentials
- Professional recognition at the University level as indicated by award of educational leave.

Professional Service

The scope and proportion of negotiated time for administrative assignments will be considered by the AUPAC in its evaluation of all sections of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures document. The impact of administrative assignments as reflected in a candidate's job description and proportional time negotiated is indicative of the proportion of time available for a candidate to participate in tenure and/or promotion activities. Therefore the AUPAC shall consider the impact of proportional administrative assignments during evaluations of each section of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures standards.

Service is an activity of faculty members differentiated from teaching and scholarship which contributes to the mission of the department and profession as indicated by the NASW Code of Ethics. Social workers are encouraged to volunteer some portion of their professional skills with no expectation of significant financial return (NASW Code of Ethics). The primary purpose of service is to contribute professional expertise and time to activities within and across various communities, without expectation of significant remuneration. Service activities must be focused within the Department of Social Work, the college and/or University, the larger professional community, the local community and/or the communities with which the candidate identifies. Membership in various committees, boards, groups or organizations coupled with documentation of contributions may constitute some portion of service, but membership/affiliation alone does not constitute service.

The JMU Social Work Department functions primarily as a committee of the whole with an expectation that all faculty members participate in the following committees: Curriculum, Assessment, Student Advisory (minus the AUH), Admissions, and AUPAC as constituted each academic year of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Other Ad Hoc committees that represent work of the committee of the whole include Text Book Selection, Awards Selection, and Gatekeeping. Additional task committees may be determined within the department (Social Work Faculty Handbook). Even though faculty participate as a committee of the whole, it shall not diminish the unique contributions of individual candidates.

Codes for Ranking:

Each PAC member must determine an excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating for professional service. Determinants of the rating should be based on the following:

- If the candidate has evidence that goes beyond the primary criteria and has documentation representing at least 2 out of the five secondary criteria, this will be considered toward an **excellent** rating.
- If the candidate has evidence that meets the primary criteria then a **satisfactory** rating should be given.
- If the candidate does not have evidence representing each of the primary criteria, then an **unsatisfactory** rating should be given.

| <i>Illustrations of Professional Service</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Professional Service</i> |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Contributing to departmental functions through service on the committee of the whole, other designated (assigned) departmental committees or departmental activities that support its mandate | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation citing examples of contributions • Documentation of active committee participation and or assignments • Documentation of developing or coordinating special events or activities for the department - work done to enhance the work of the department (flyers, programs, itineraries, etc. of special events or activities developed or coordinated for the department. |
| Contributing to college and or university functions through service on committees or other designated (assigned) committees or activities | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation citing examples of contributions and participation • Documentation from active committee participation and/or assignments at the college or university level; • Documentation from chairpersons of committees, groups, boards, and/or commissions within which one served or colleagues also serving on such entities • Documentation of work done to enhance the college or university - work done to enhance the work of the college or university (flyers, programs, itineraries, etc. of special events or activities developed or coordinated for the college or university. |

| <i>Illustrations of Professional Service</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Professional Service</i> |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Contributing to work that supports or enhances the profession (i.e. VSWECE, NASW, BPD, CSWE) | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation identifying and defining selected community[ies], citing examples of contributions and participation • Documentation from chairpersons of committees, groups, boards, and/or commissions within which one served chairpersons and/or colleagues serving on committees, groups, boards, and/or commissions within which one has served, or from those affected by the committee's work • Examples of work done as part of these entities • Documentation of membership on agency governing/advisory board or committee |
| Contributing to the local community and/or the community with which the candidate identifies | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation identifying and defining selected community[ies], citing examples of contributions and participation • Documentation from chairpersons and/or peers of committees, groups, boards, agencies/organizations within which one served, and/or from those affected by the committee's work • Examples of work done as part of these entities • Documentation of membership on agency governing/advisory board or committee |
| Contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees, as an advisor to student organizations and/or participation in activities that support (engage) students | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation citing examples of participation and contributions (flyers, programs, itineraries, etc. of special events or activities developed or coordinated on behalf of student welfare/development) • Documentation/program from activity • Documentation from university units, sponsoring/advising student organizations |

| <i>Illustrations of Professional Service</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Professional Service</i> |
|--|--------------------|---|
| Assisting other professionals to maintain current, professional practice; serving as a leader/organizer/facilitator of workshops, panels, colloquia, or other meetings | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation of such activities • Documentation of involvement in developing, conducting or evaluating in-service or training activities for community professionals • Documentation of involvement in writing, submitting and/or obtaining grants |
| Serving as an officer (e.g. chairperson, treasurer, secretary) of an academic and/or professional committee or group; and/or providing service above general expectations of committee membership | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation citing examples of “above-and-beyond” service • Documentation of work done • Letters of support or certificates from University Administrators and/or other professionals and/or peers serving on departmental, college, university, professional, or community committees • Documentation reflecting responsibility taken for program development, policy/procedures development, accreditation |
| Participation in or development of position papers, task force reports or doing studies for academic, community and/or professional groups to assist in policy development within that context (if this written work is openly available to the professional and academic community and qualifies as scholarship, it may be listed there rather than under service). | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation of participation • Documentation of work done within other academic and/or professional group • Development of community or professional resources |
| Consulting or advisory activities | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation of consulting or advisory activities • Documentation of formal advising or consultation with community groups or in a professional capacity; may include activities for which compensation occurred. • Correspondence and/or contracts identifying the nature of the consultancy activities, and the relationship between the candidate and the party[ies] receiving consultation |

Administrative Assignments

The scope and proportion of negotiated time for administrative assignments will be considered by the AUPAC in its evaluation of all sections of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures document. The impact of administrative assignments as reflected in a candidate's job description and proportional time negotiated is indicative of the proportion of time available for a candidate to participate in tenure and/or promotion activities. Therefore the AUPAC shall consider the impact of proportional administrative assignments during evaluations of each section of the Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures standards. Administrative positions in the Department of Social Work include the Academic Unit Head, Director of Field Placement, and Director of the Aging, Family and Intergenerational Studies Program. Other administrative assignments may be designated as a specific proportion of a faculty member's total work load as negotiated with the AUH.

Faculty members with assigned administrative responsibilities are not exempted from evaluation in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service as identified by this document (Promotion and Tenure Criteria, Standards and Procedures).

Administrative assignments are recognized as a proportion of the assigned faculty member's overall work load and will impact the amount of work load devoted to other areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service) for tenure and promotion. Candidates with administrative responsibility will provide a job description for evaluative purposes. Indicators associated with illustrations should be representative of the job description. Each faculty member with administrative assignments shall inform and provide documentation to the AUPAC of such proportional determinations for tenure and/or promotion.

The following criteria are to be used to evaluate persons who have a specific administrative assignment. Administrative tasks not negotiated as a specific proportion of a faculty members total work load is to be identified as service.

Code for Ranking:

Each PAC must determine an excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating for administrative assignments. Determinants of the rating should be based on the following:

- If the candidate has evidence that goes beyond the minimal criteria needed for a designation of satisfactory (all four primary illustrations), and at least one secondary illustration then an **excellent** rating should be given.
- If a candidate has evidence that meets all 4 primary illustrations below, then a **satisfactory** rating should be given.
- If the candidate does not have evidence representing all 4 primary illustrations below, then an **unsatisfactory** rating should be given.

| <i>Illustrations of Administrative Assignments</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Administrative Assignments</i> |
|---|--------------------|---|
| Conceptualization of and adherence to administrative role in unit/program | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of philosophy or approach towards administrative role • Self-evaluation of designated administrative role |
| Provision of leadership in designated assignments relative to the department/program mission, goals, objectives, curriculum, and academic/departmental policy | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of how administrative role activities support the mission and goals of the department • Changes, revisions, and/or modifications in components of the unit/program based on assessment results and research • Review of curriculum and decisions to retain, change or modify components of the unit/program based on assessment results |
| Implementation of administrative role implementation including operational management and practices | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines specific goals and strategies for unit/program, and evidence of goal attainment • Management of resources (financial, people, materials) necessary to meet unit/program goals, as well as advocacy for development of additional resources as needed to meet goals or planned activities • Maintenance of unit/program documents such as manuals, agency agreements, or student/learning contracts • Provides basic organizational management tools such as agendas for meetings, minutes from meetings, schedules of activities/events, or documentation of key decisions |

| <i>Illustrations of Professional Service</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Indicators of Professional Service</i> |
|--|--------------------|---|
| Implementation of administrative role and implementation regarding the process of management | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides leadership in the unit/program such as working with other faculty members, administrators and/or community members to achieve designated goals • Implementation and evaluation of key decisions • Meeting facilitation • Demonstrates ability to resolve conflicts • Evaluation regarding his/her ability to work with others, individually and collectively, to define problems, develop goals, identify strategies, implement strategies and evaluate results (letters from administrative personnel/faculty/professionals in the community) • Demonstrate an ability to work with students |
| Advancement of departmental profile at local, state, regional/national levels | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attends conferences, workshops/seminars/courses related to administrative tasks • Planning, implementing and evaluating workshops or continuing education opportunities • Position papers, task force reports, or studies developed in one's administrative capacity that further the mission of the department, college and/or university • Leadership in development of opportunities at the local, state, regional/national levels (participation in workshops, conference sessions, readings, discussion groups, etc. relevant to administrative role) |
| Development of unit/program | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of innovations introduced into unit/program, administrative role or responsibility |

- Additional illustrations/indicators supplied by the candidate which help to substantiate the quality of performance in assigned administrative responsibilities.