School of Strategic Leadership Studies

Criteria Guidelines for

Annual Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Original Date of Document: March/April, 2012

Revised: April 2014, October 2015

The formatting and content of this document are borrowed from JMU ISAT document dated 2011 and modified with other sections from the College of Business, Graduate Psychology, and College of Education.

Part I. Background and Overview

Overview

The School of Strategic Leadership Studies values teaching, scholarship and service activities that support the goals and objectives of the School, College and University. Faculty members in the School of Strategic Leadership Studies reflect the diversity in the field of leadership studies and the concentrations offered within the school. This diversity will manifest itself in faculty members teaching, scholarship and service.

Following are the criteria that the School Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) and School Director will use to evaluate the performance of faculty members in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional service for the purpose of annual evaluations, and for promotion and tenure decisions. Knowing that there are unique features to the activities, assignments, and appointments of each faculty member, both the PAC and the School Director will use professional judgment in evaluating the merits of each application.

A faculty anticipated activities plan (FAAP) is made between the faculty member and the School Director at the beginning of each academic year. The proposed FAAP is included at the end of the Faculty Annual Review (FAR) document and finalized at the FAR conference.

The FAAP identifies anticipated activities in teaching, scholarship and service and indicates any reassigned time. Unusual weightings of teaching, scholarship and service must be approved by the School Director and will be noted in the FAAP.

Faculty are expected to have substantive activity (i.e., meets the criteria for Satisfactory performance evaluation) in teaching, scholarly activity, and service as specified in FAR documents. Faculty members assume responsibility for providing the necessary documentation (including a narrative description of their individual unique professional activities). This information should be submitted in the Faculty Annual Review (FAR) for annual evaluations, or with the professional dossier for promotion/tenure. Performance in each of the three areas will be evaluated as "Excellent," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory." Professional development activities may be suggested during discussion of the FAR, and these activities may be expected to be incorporated in developing the subsequent FAAP.

A. Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty members in the School of Strategic Leadership Studies (SSLS) should meet the general responsibilities of a full-time JMU faculty member as defined in the Faculty Handbook. See *Faculty Handbook,* **Section III.E.4**.

In addition, faculty must consider the unique mission of the School of Strategic Leadership Studies:

> The **School of Strategic Leadership Studies** is a doctoral program of James Madison University that develops educational, organizational, and nonprofit leaders through rigorous theoretical study, coupled with practical application through experiential learning. Leadership Studies faculty conduct original research and professional activities that promote and model innovative, evidence-based decision-making in a global context.

B. Criteria

The JMU Faculty Handbook criteria for re-appointment, promotion, and the award of tenure include: (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and (c) professional service. These criteria will also be used as the basis for the annual evaluations of SLSS faculty.

C. Flexibility of Guidelines

The evaluation standards described here should not be interpreted as inflexible and absolute. The reward system within the SSLS program should be sufficiently flexible that all members of the faculty can concentrate on their strongest areas within teaching, scholarship, and service.

D. Pre-Tenure Review

The SSLS requires tenure-track faculty members with a standard (seven-year maximum) probationary period to undergo a pre-tenure review in the second semester of his or her first year and third year at the university. Faculty members will prepare documentation for the pre-tenure review in the same manner as if they were preparing for the standard tenure review.

The pre-tenure review is intended to provide faculty members with guidance, and an indication of insufficiency or areas that need improvement does not automatically preclude a faculty member's continued employment status during the time remaining in the probationary period prior to the tenure review. Neither does an indication of appropriate progression or positive feedback guarantee the eventual awarding of tenure.

E. Ongoing Performance Faculty Evaluation: Annual Evaluation

Faculty will complete portions of their Annual Faculty Report (AFR) and Faculty Anticipated Activities Plan (FAAP) on college supported electronic databases. Within these reports contain each faculty members' percentage time spent in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service. These percentages may change from year to year but will reflect the SSLS general guidance for faculty activities.

Performance evaluation process and merit pay calculations are outlined in Appendix B. From these documents, each faculty member in conjunction with the school director will follow the procedures for annual faculty evaluations outlined in Appendix C.

F. 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 the SSLS, but with greater emphasis placed on recent accomplishments by the faculty member. Tenure-track faculty will normally have a seven-year probationary period. However, some faculty may have a shorter probationary period, which would have been determined at the time of initial hire. The standards for early tenure are the same as for the standard probationary period.

G. Promise of Continued Performance

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

H. Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Recommendations for promotion are made separately from recommendations for tenure and reappointment. Several factors may affect the awarding of tenure or promotion, e.g., Section B, above; however, the *minimum* required standards shall be those specified in the Faculty Handbook for promotion and tenure and are as follows:

III.E.6.a. Standards
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:

III.E.6.a.(1) Assistant Professor. *At least satisfactory ratings in all areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.*

III.E.6.a.(2) Associate Professor. *An excellent rating in one area and at least satisfactory ratings in the others are required for promotion to associate professor.*

III.E.6.a.(3) *Professor Excellent ratings in two areas and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to professor.*

I. Standards for Reappointment of Non-tenure-track Faculty

The minimum qualification for a faculty member to receive a non-tenure-track reappointment is *Satisfactory* ratings in all three review criteria, although factors similar to consideration for tenure (such as promise of continued long-term performance) will also be evaluated in determining qualification for reappointment. Other factors such as program need and program financial exigencies must also be considered in determining reappointment of faculty.

J. Formation of PAC and the Process of Submitting Materials for Consideration of Promotions or Tenure.

III.E.2. Evaluation Bodies and Criteria (JMU Faculty Handbook July 2014)

AUPAC
Each academic unit shall have a personnel advisory committee (AUPAC). The committee advises the 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 membership of the AUPAC. The rules for determining the membership of the AUPAC shall be approved by the academic unit faculty members, AUH, dean and provost, and they 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 and untenured faculty members other than the AUH, and may contain faculty members from other academic units. If untenured faculty members are on the AUPAC, the academic unit shall establish a subcommittee limited to tenured faculty members to make recommendations on tenure. Each academic unit is permitted (but not required) to allow all tenured faculty to serve on the AUPAC with regard to tenure and promotion applications.

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.

- See more at: http://www.jmu.edu/facultysenate/facultyhandbook/iii-policies-procedures/e-evaluation.shtml#IIIE2

1. Process of Evaluation:

The Faculty Handbook (FH) in sub-section III.E.2.b.(1): Teaching states: Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: *self-evaluation, evaluations by peers and/or academic unit heads, and student evaluations*.

1.1 Self-evaluation of Teaching
Each faculty member will prepare a self-evaluation of their teaching that includes (but is not limited to) the following information:

- Number of course preps, level and type of courses taught (e.g., undergraduate/graduate, required/elective, etc.), class size, and any other descriptive that may have affected teaching success.
- Approximate grade distribution (or GPA) for each course (section) taught (this is also entered on Digital Measures).
- Teaching honors and awards.
- Participation in teaching workshops, seminars, or other professional development focused on teaching.
- Innovation in teaching methods and materials.
- Notable successes or problems in the classroom.
- Interpretation/explanation of the most recent student evaluations, and modifications made to address problems or concerns of prior evaluations. The self-assessment should also include unique challenges, special circumstances, and supplemental activities faced or undertaken by the faculty member. Failure to complete a comprehensive self-evaluation will negatively affect the overall performance evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to develop innovative teaching evaluation methods (e.g., a mid-semester student feedback survey) that can be used to supplement the traditional student evaluations. Any measure that a faculty member develops and systematically applies to their teaching performance will be considered in evaluating their teaching.

1.2. Student Evaluation (Some of this may be changed by adoption of university-wide common teaching evaluation form)

Student evaluations will be administered for all courses taught. The following information pertaining to student evaluations shall contribute to the performance appraisal outcome:

- Program wide summary statistics of student evaluation information for all SSLS program faculty members.

- Scores of individual survey items (or small clusters of items) that have been identified as particularly relevant to the successful teaching of specific courses. For example, special consideration may be given to items that measure "degree of challenge" and/or "amount of effort required" in addition to the traditional focus on "overall teaching effectiveness".
- Written comments of students.

Quantitative performance from student evaluations that is below sectional averages is not, in isolation, indicative of "unsatisfactory" performance. Qualitative comments should be used to provide context for understanding quantitative scores.

1.3 Outside Evaluations

If unsatisfactory student evaluations or discrepancies between self-evaluations, peers or other SSLS faculty may observe classes or interview students regarding faculty member areas of strengths or need for improvement. Alternatively, the Center for Faculty Innovation at JMU can also help with a course evaluation including videotaping interactions, or conducting student interviews.

2. **Outcome of Evaluation**

To receive a *Satisfactory* rating for Teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate many of the activities listed below through her or his self-ratings and or student evaluations:

a) Commitment to assigned classes, e.g. thoroughness of class preparation, careful and objective grading, and timely return of tests and papers.

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 SSLS practice.

c) Clear and effective communication.

d) Mastery of the subject matter.

e) Acceptable student evaluations of classes over the period of review.

f) Commitment to effective student advising when assigned duties as an adviser.

g) Positive attitude toward students, as shown by availability outside of class, assistance with student professional development, and job placement.

h) Personal leadership demonstrated through self-initiative and follow-through with instructional tasks.

i) Participation as a valued team member in team teaching, curriculum development, or instructional improvement activities.

j) Because the SSLS program directly interacts with the larger community, teaching requirements include courses that directly engage the community whether in nonprofit & community leadership, postsecondary analysis & leadership, or other leadership concentration/s

To receive an *Excellent* rating, the individual must show satisfactory performance in teaching as described above. In addition, the individual must demonstrate several of the achievements listed below:

a) Strongly positive student response to teaching, e.g. student-sponsored teaching awards, consistently above average student evaluations, or unusually positive alumni comments.

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.

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.

d) Presentations and publications on innovations in course content and teaching methodology.

e) 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.

f) Leadership in teamwork, e.g. generating a spirit of teaming, building team consensus or capabilities, initiating teams that effectively address SSLS curriculum needs.

g) Instructional leadership, e.g., the ability to initiate and execute constructive change in an SSLS, JMU, or external curriculum.

h) Demonstrated instructional accomplishments that the PAC deems exceptional.

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies in either quality or quantity of effort shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory.*

Part III. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications Standards

1. Background on Scholarly Achievement

The SSLS faculty represent a broad range of research areas: Assessment, Strategic Management, Psychology, Testing, Organizational Theory, Organizational Behavior, Nonprofit Studies, Public Policy, Education, and Leadership Studies within the contexts of many types of organizations, including but not limited to nonprofits, postsecondary education and organizations generally. Therefore, a wide range of topics do and will continue to reflect scholarly achievement within the SSLS. In addition, publishing or presenting with doctoral students is strongly encouraged.

Scholarly activities fall into two categories, Professional Publications and Additional Scholarly Activities, and while one can overlap with another, both are taken into consideration in evaluating the scholarly contribution of the faculty member.

2. **Professional Publications**: Professional publications include: referred journals and book chapters. Newsletter publications, book reviews, or non-refereed journal publications do not count toward the count of professional publications. Within the School of Strategic Leadership Studies authored books or edited books can be considered scholarly activities, but may not necessarily count toward the number of publications required for promotion to either Associate or Full professor. When evaluating publications, journal ranking and audience will be taken into account with higher quality journals (based on impact factor and agreed upon reputation) being given more weight. In addition, empirically-based studies, citation counts, research difficulty, and the requirement of multiple studies per article will be taken into account when determining adequacy of numbers.

The **minimum** publication requirements for tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are as follows:

SATISFACTORY Scholarship: A minimum of four professional publications plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

EXCELLENT Scholarship: A minimum of six professional publications plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

The **minimum** requirements for promotion from Associate to Full Professor are as follows:

SATISFACTORY Scholarship: A minimum of seven (i.e., three beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor) professional publications plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort. A national or international reputation is expected to be recognized through this scholarship.

EXCELLENT Scholarship: A minimum of eleven (i.e., five beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor with an exceptional rating in scholarly achievement) professional publications plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort.

3. **Additional Scholarly Activities:** These include activities other than publications and include but are not limited to professional presentations, engaging in unpublished research, reviewing for journals and conferences, etc.

The activities listed below are examples of evidence that may be used to support a rating of *SATISFACTORY* in scholarly activities. An individual is expected to show many of these activities:

a) Membership and participation in professional meetings, field conferences, and other scholarly gatherings.
b) Presenting papers at **regional** meetings.
c) Development of instructional or education materials.
d) Demonstration of professional development through such activities as:
   - Ongoing personal professional development (continuing education, 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.
e) Engaging in unpublished ongoing research.
f) Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.
g) Service as editor of a state or regional organization publication or referee of papers for such an organization/publication.

To receive an *EXCELLENT* rating, the individual must contribute to the advancement of knowledge. An *EXCELLENT* rating requires evidence from professional's external to JMU that the individual is recognized for scholarly contributions or professional expertise (e.g., national or international positive reputation). The individual must demonstrate several of the achievements listed below:

a) Demonstrated contribution to knowledge through a focused, goal directed program of research or other scholarly activity.
b) Receipt of professional achievement awards, or other evidence that demonstrates external recognition of individual professional achievement.
c) Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of national or international conference.
d) Publication of book reviews, discussions, and technical reports in one's professional area.
e) Service as editor of a national or international journal or referee of papers for such a journal. Also publications should include knowledge generation and leading to knowledge use in practice and policy.

f) Recipient of government, foundation, or agency grants, awards, or contracts. Active research involving students and demonstrable through presentation or publication in a professional forum.

g) Serving as editor of a scholarly volume in one's field.

h) Presentation of papers at **national or international** professional meetings.

i) Initiating a successful grant proposal for external funding and/or directing the resulting project.

j) Authoring textbooks or teaching materials.

k) Other scholarly achievement, recognition, or professional development which the PAC deems exceptional.

l) Service as editor of a national or international organization publication or referee of papers for such an organization/publication.

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies in either quality or quantity of effort shall be rated as *UNSATISFACTORY*.

Part IV. Professional Service Standards

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

To receive a SATISTFACTORY rating for Professional Service, the individual must participate in many of the activities listed below at an acceptable level, and must provide an adequate level of service to the SSLS. To receive an EXCELLENT rating, the individual must be at least SATISTFACTORY in performing the activities below, must demonstrate leadership in service, and must demonstrate many of the achievements listed below at an extraordinary level. A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies in either quality or quantity of effort shall be rated as UNSATISFACTORY. A rating of either SATISFACTORY or EXCELLENT is necessary for tenure and promotion to either Associate or Full Professor.

1. Service that advances the mission of James Madison University, the College of Business, The Graduate School and the School of Strategic Leadership Studies.
   a. Serving and participating as a member on Departmental (SSLS), College (this is not limited to the College of Business) and University committees.
   b. Participating in public relations events and student recruiting.
   c. Participating in grant proposals and other opportunities for external funding for teaching, graduate assistants, student assistance, student work opportunities and equipment support.
   d. Serving as a satisfactory student concentration advisor.
   f. A major service or office at the Department, College or University level.
   h. Other professional service which the PAC deems to be a leadership contribution.

2. Service that advances one's professional scholarly community.
   a. Serving as a referee or reviewer of scholarly articles, textbooks, or conferences.
   b. Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.
   c. Serving as an officer of a national or international professional organization.
   d. Serving as an editorial member of a professional journal.
   e. Conducting workshops, symposia, and training sessions in one's professional area.
   f. Other professional service to the faculty member's professional scholarly community, which the PAC deems to be a leadership contribution.

3. Service that benefits society in areas related to one's professional expertise.
   a. A contribution which applies the resources of the University to solving a problem of local, regional, state, national, or international concern.
   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.
   c. A major service or office at the local, state or national level related to one's professional competence.
   d. Other professional service directed at the betterment of society in the area of one's professional competence, which the PAC deems to be a significant contribution.

Part V. Amendment Process

Recommendations regarding changes to these Guidelines may be submitted to the Program Director by a two-thirds vote of the SSLS faculty.

Appendix A

Excerpt from James Madison University Faculty Handbook on Criteria for Teaching, Scholarly Achievement, and Professional Service

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

Performance Evaluations and Merit Pay

A. Performance Ratings

The School will employ a nine-point scale using three levels of performance evaluation ratings for each of evaluation category of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent, with ratings of $0 - 2$ for unsatisfactory, $3 - 5$ for satisfactory, and $6 - 8$ for excellent. Faculty members will also receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory or excellent, which will be based on relative weights assigned to each area of performance. Faculty with a score of zero in any single functional area (teaching, scholarly activity, or service) will receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory for that evaluation period. A zero will be given when faculty have not made a good faith effort to fulfill their responsibilities in a functional area.

The James Madison University Faculty Handbook states that promotion to Associate Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least one of the three functional areas (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement, and service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional areas and as at least satisfactory in the third area.

B. Merit Pay Calculations

Merit pay will be allocated as follows:

1) Faculty members receive an overall annual performance rating: scores in teaching, research, and service are multiplied by their respective weights and are then summed. The summed score is divided by three yielding an annual performance rating.

2) The performance index (rating/mean) is multiplied by the merit allocation % (e.g.. .04)

3) The product of step 4 is multiplied by the faculty member's current salary to determine merit pay.

4) In the event that there are years in which no merit raises are offered, the yearly average performance rating since the last merit raise is calculated for each faculty member. The index is then used as in steps 2 and 3 above to determine merit pay. The index of faculty who have not served during the entire time in which there has been no merit pay will be calculated based on their scores during the years when they have received annual evaluations.

Appendix C

SSLS Annual Faculty Report and Review Timeline

November: SSLS faculty reviews performance evaluation process, forms, criteria and stand-ards to suggest any updates. These may reflect Performance Planning Database information or other changes in strategic plan.

March: SSLS program director makes current year form, criteria and standards available to faculty.

End of May: Electronic copy of completed Annual Faculty Report (AFR) form, <u>including next year goals</u>, due to AUH (generate a Digital Measures Report).

May-June: Faculty complete Digital Measures entries for the year, including their Faculty Activity Plan (FAP) and complete their Annual Faculty Report (AFR) and for-ward to Program Director.

June-July: AUH meets with individual faculty to confer on APR's and summarize content of written informal review that is shared with faculty.

 September: AUH meets individually with each faculty member to discuss performance evalu-ation, review, revise and affirm goals in their Faculty Activity Plan (FAP) for the coming year and agree on percentage of effort distributions across Teaching, Scholarship and Service.

September: Letters are distributed by Oct. 1.

October: Faculty are asked to review, sign and return a copy of the letter by October 25.

Merit: Merit distribution occurs when funds are available. If merit is awarded, SATISFACTORY performance serves as the base for calculation of initial awards for faculty achieving SATISFACTORY performance. Those achieving EXCELLENT ratings in any one of the reviewed performance categories receive an amount above the base for the number of EXCELLENT ratings up to three. Those with three EXCELLENT ratings receive the largest portion of additional funds beyond the equally distributed satisfactory base.

Scale: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Excellent