

Department of History

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024

Department of History
Department Documents: Policies and Procedures
Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

in accordance with Academic Affairs inventory and analysis prepared

by the Office of the Vice Provost

As revised by the AUPAC, 24 January 2024

- I. Evaluation Policies and Procedures**
- II. Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures**
- III. Evaluative Bodies**
- IV. Modification Procedures**

I. Evaluation Policies and Procedures

Annual Evaluation

The AUH is responsible for Annual Evaluations for each member of the department in conformity with the requirements of the Faculty Handbook (Section III.E.4) for preliminary evaluations (written), evaluation conferences, and final evaluations (written). Faculty members will receive a rating of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of performance: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. The AUH will also evaluate the faculty member's overall performance as either acceptable or unacceptable.

An overall performance rating of acceptable requires that performance is satisfactory in at least two of the three areas of evaluation. An overall rating of unacceptable on two of the three most recent annual evaluations will result in the faculty member undergoing remediation in accordance with Faculty Handbook policies (Section III.E.8). Also in accordance with the Faculty Handbook (Section III.F.3), an unacceptable rating for a faculty member in their probationary period could result in non-renewal of their contract. For tenured faculty, an unacceptable rating could lead to post tenure review, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section III.E.4.k).

The Annual Evaluation will cover the period since the previous Annual Evaluation (generally the evaluation year will be 1 June to 30 May).

Timeline for the Annual Evaluation

Each Faculty Member will submit the Faculty Activity Report and Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan to the AUH on or before 1 June along with a copy of the current cv and any other materials the faculty member wishes to include. The AUH may request additional materials related to activities noted in the FAR/FAAP. In the FAAP, faculty propose their anticipated relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service (see Faculty Handbook III.E.4.a).

The AUH will email preliminary evaluations to each faculty member on or before 1 September.

Annual evaluation conferences will be scheduled by the AUH in consultation with the faculty member and held on or before 25 September.

Final written evaluations will be provided to the faculty member on or before 1 October.

Signed evaluations will be returned to the AUH by 25 October and provided to the Dean's Office by 28 October as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

Annual Evaluation Conferences

The evaluation conference must provide an opportunity for the faculty member and AUH to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and AUH. The conference may be cancelled by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the AUH, if both agree on the terms of the preliminary evaluation (Section III.E.4.d). Conferences will normally be held in person but may be held by videoconference by mutual consent. Either party may

request the presence of a third party. Designation of the third party will be reserved to Human Resources, the CAL Dean's Office, or the Faculty Ombudsman.

The AUH will use the following criteria to evaluate performance levels.

SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Lecturers are not evaluated on scholarship.

A rating of **excellent** is earned by one or more of the following:

- The publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph or the completion and public presentation of a public history project in digital or physical display formats that demonstrates a level of scholarly engagement and activity equivalent to the production of a monograph. Such production will earn a rating of excellent for three years.
- The publication of a peer-reviewed or refereed edited volume (as editor), book chapter, or article; the completion and public presentation of a public history project in digital or physical display formats that demonstrates a level of scholarly engagement and activity equivalent to the production of an article.
- The publication of a textbook that makes a meaningful contribution to the public's historical understanding or of a translation of a chapter, article, or book of comparable significance.
- The signing of a book contract with an academic press or a prestigious trade press with a significant humanities catalogue.
- The procurement of external funding—in particular, a prestigious fellowship or competitive research grant—for a proposed research project.
- Winning a prestigious award for a publication.
- Other scholarly achievements that the AUH deems excellent.

A rating of **satisfactory** is earned by one or more of the following:

- Progress on an ongoing research or public history project. This may include working on an article, book chapter, or public history project over the span of three consecutive years or a book project over the span of eight.
- Progress on authoring a textbook over the course of four years or translating a chapter, article, or book over the course of two (shorter works) or three (longer works) years.
- Receiving an internal grant in support of research activities.
- Presenting research at academic conferences or other public or policy forums or over electronic or broadcast media.
- Other scholarly achievements that the AUH deems satisfactory.

A rating of **satisfactory** may also be earned by a combination of several of the following:

- Off-campus consulting that draws on faculty research/scholarship and enhances the scholarly reputation of the university.
- Progress on editing reference works or document readers over the course of two years; the publication of edited reference works or document readers.

- Refereeing manuscripts for scholarly journals and publishers; reviewing applications for granting agencies; or serving as jurors for book prizes.
- The acceptance for publication in an academic journal, or the actual publication, of a scholarly book review or review essay.
- The publication of opinion pieces in newspapers or magazines that have a national audience and that draw upon the faculty's scholarly research (or research-based articles in the same).
- Other scholarly achievements that the AUH deems satisfactory.

The AUH may request evidence of progress on ongoing projects.

A rating of **unsatisfactory** is earned when a faculty member fails to demonstrate sufficient evidence of production as indicated in the categories above.

TEACHING

The AUH has strong grounds for awarding a rating of **excellent** based on one or more of the following:

- Development of a new course (new to the faculty member) or the development and institution of a Study Abroad Program.
- Teaching a new course.
- Substantially revamping an existing course so that much of the content is new.
- Earned teaching awards or grants from the college, university, or beyond.
- Successful implementation of new and innovative assignments or pedagogical methods in an existing course.
- Exceptional contributions to direction and/or reading of Honors or MA theses at JMU or to thesis or dissertation committees for other universities.
- Exceptional contributions in teaching independent studies courses.
- Exceptional contributions to advising.
- Evidence of substantial integration of teaching with ongoing research.
- Student evaluations that speak to exceptional success in fostering academic skills or engaging students in the course material.
- Exceptional contributions through continued excellence in teaching a body of classes over the course of the academic year.
- Other teaching achievements that the AUH deems excellent.

A rating of **satisfactory** is earned by:

- Competent, responsible, and timely performance of normal teaching duties in the classroom setting, including but not limited to:
 - Demonstrating mastery of course content.
 - Engaging students intellectually.
 - Ensuring the course coverage is focused on its stated content.
 - Aligning course instruction and assignments with department, program, and General Education objectives.
 - Holding classes at scheduled times and in scheduled modes of delivery.
 - Evaluating student work appropriately and in a timely fashion.
 - Providing clear and effective instructions.

- Contributing to the departmental teaching obligations including at the General Education, undergraduate, and graduate levels.
- Maintaining an open, accessible, inclusive, respectful, and professional classroom environment.

A rating of **unsatisfactory** is earned when a faculty member has failed to meet reasonable expectations regarding the performance of their teaching duties in areas indicated in the categories above.

Negative student evaluations may not form the sole evidentiary basis for a rating of unsatisfactory. Additional compelling evidence is required to demonstrate that a faculty member has failed to meet reasonable expectations.

SERVICE

The AUH has strong grounds for awarding a rating of “**excellent**” based on the following:

- One or more leadership positions in service to the department, college, university, or profession or in service to the wider community beyond JMU (with service related to the faculty’s role as a scholar or teacher). Examples include but are not limited to: chairing a committee that undertakes work crucial to the department (PAC, the Graduate Committee, the Curriculum Committee, a hiring committee), directing an APR, or chairing the governing committee of a professional organization.
- Participation in an array of meaningful service activities. For example, being a member of multiple committees tasked with time-consuming work with actionable results (speakers committees, hiring committees, or editorial boards).

A **satisfactory** is earned by involvement in service activities that enhance the department, college, university, profession, or wider community (with community work related to the faculty’s role as a scholar or teacher). Examples include but are not limited to serving on departmental committees essential to the routine operations of the department, special College or University task forces, or ad hoc committees.

An **unsatisfactory** is earned when a faculty member has failed to meet reasonable expectations for service performance. Failure to participate in service to the department, college, university, profession, or wider community (with community work related to the faculty’s role as a scholar or teacher), or failure to competently complete work as part of a service obligation, may result in this rating.

Evaluation Appeals Process

The Evaluation Appeals Process will follow procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section III E. 4), which provides that the faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make an appeal in writing. The AUPAC is the appeals body. If the faculty member is a member of the PAC, the member will be excused from all business related to the appeal. Upon receipt of the appeal, the PAC will consider the appeal together with any supporting documents that the faculty member submitted. The PAC may request additional materials as part of the review process. The PAC may also request a meeting with the AUH or the faculty member.

The AUPAC will provide a written recommendation to the AUH, with a copy to the faculty member and the dean, and the AUH will have 7 days to consider the recommendation and either confirm or modify the original evaluation. The AUH will notify the reviewing body, the faculty member, and the dean of their decision by 21 October.

Initial Evaluation

The Department of History will adhere to the guidelines for the initial evaluation of new faculty members as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (III.E.3). The AUH will conduct the Initial Evaluation of new faculty as outlined at the beginning of the second semester of employment.

The faculty member shall submit to the AUH a FAR/FAAP documenting activities in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, teaching, and service for the first semester of the probationary period and forecasted plans for the second semester. New faculty should also provide a cv and any other materials the faculty member wishes to submit such as course syllabi, innovative assignments, conference papers, or publications.

The faculty member will submit these documents to the AUH no later than the Friday before the start of classes for the second term. The AUH will schedule a conference with the faculty member no later than the Friday of the first week of the second semester and will provide the faculty member with a written evaluation stating whether the faculty member's performance has been acceptable no later than the end of the third week of the semester, in accordance with the policies outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

The initial evaluation conference must provide an opportunity for the faculty member and AUH to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and AUH. Conference policies will be guided by the policies and procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook (III.E.4.d). Conferences will normally be held in person but may take place via videoconference by mutual consent. Either party may request the presence of a third party. Designation of the third party will be reserved to Human Resources, the CAL Dean's Office, or the Faculty Ombudsman.

Per the Faculty Handbook (Section III.E.3.f), unacceptable performance as determined in the initial evaluation can lead to non-renewal of the faculty member's contract.

Merit Pay

If merit pay becomes available, the history department will evenly allocate 70% of the total amount of money designated for merit-based raises across the board to everyone in the department. If someone is rated as unacceptable for a particular year, they will not be calculated into merit for that year.

The additional 30% of money designated for merit-based raises will be allocated based on a formula that determines exceptional merit. Prorating follows a simple formula and its variables are easy to adjust.

The AUH will prorate this 30% based on annual evaluation ratings of "satisfactory" and "excellent" over a five-year period. Each rating of "excellent" will earn a faculty member 3 points. Each rating of "satisfactory" will earn a faculty member 2 points. Unsatisfactory will not result in any points.

The formula to decide the amount of this 30% portion is the following: divide a professor's total individual points accrued over five years based on annual evaluation ratings by the sum of points of all faculty members accrued from annual evaluations over the five-year period and then multiply that figure by 30% of the total amount of merit pay. Points should be considered for all three areas: teaching, service, and scholarship.

The AUH will amass the data and a department administrative assistant can do the calculations. The PAC will be part of this process to review the data as the elected body who represents the faculty.

Step One: Calculate points per faculty member per timeframe covered by merit raise based on 3 for excellent and 2 for satisfactory over three categories, over five years.

Step Two: Sum all the points scored for all existing faculty who are eligible for merit pay.

Step Three: Multiply the ratio for each professor by the group's total score.

Scenario:

Professor A accrues 25 points over five years from their annual evaluations.

Professor B has only been here for two years and accrues 10 points on annual evaluations.

A sample group of 20 faculty members accrued 500 points total.

30% of merit pay = \$100,000

Professor A

Divide 25 by 500 [total number of faculty points] multiply \$100,000 = \$5,000

Professor B

Divide 10 points by 500 and multiply by \$100,000 = \$2,000

II. Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures

In decisions regarding the procedures and policies for Promotion and Tenure, the Department of History acts in accordance with the Faculty Handbook Section III.E.6 **Promotion in Academic Rank** and Section III.E.7 **Tenure**. The AUH and the AUPAC, in the case of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or the AUH and the ad-hoc committee of full professors in the case of promotion to Professor, will independently evaluate applications for tenure and/or promotion and will make independent recommendations to the Dean. Consultation between the AUPAC and AUH may occur at any point in the process, provided that evaluations reflect independent, parallel determinations.

While the AUPAC and AUH will consider a faculty member's annual evaluations as part of their review process, application for tenure and/or promotion constitutes a distinct process with decisions rendered based on materials submitted by the candidate for tenure and/or promotion, and standards outlined below.

Timeline for Consideration for Promotion and Tenure or Promotion

Candidates for tenure and promotion are governed by deadlines established for the probationary period in the Faculty Handbook. Candidates are normally considered for tenure and promotion in the

sixth year of service, unless otherwise noted in the hiring contract or the candidate presents a compelling case for early promotion and tenure, as outlined in the College of Arts and Letters “Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion” policy (see Appendix A). Faculty members being considered for tenure should be notified by the AUH and the AUPAC not later than September 1 of eligibility and nomination for tenure and promotion. The electronic promotion file and supporting materials must be submitted to the AUH and the AUPAC by October 1.

The AUH must notify the AUPAC at the time of hiring if an incoming faculty member’s contract stipulates a shortened tenure and promotion probationary period.

According to the Faculty Handbook, Associate Professors normally should have completed five years in academic rank before being reviewed for promotion. The Faculty Handbook allows a faculty member who wishes to apply for promotion to Professor to do so without a nomination by providing written intent to apply by September 1 to the AUH and submitting a file to the AUH and AUPAC by October 1. Alternatively, faculty members may wish to consult first with the AUH and/or AUPAC Chair. The AUH and the ad-hoc committee of full professors including all voting faculty members at rank may confer and make recommendations to the faculty member prior to September 1 about their inquiry regarding promotion. If the AUPAC or AUH wish to then nominate a faculty member for promotion, they must do so and inform the faculty member by September 1. The faculty member may accept or decline the nomination without prejudice. If the faculty member accepts the nomination, they must submit a file to the AUH and AUPAC by October 1.

By November 15, the AUH and AUPAC or ad-hoc committee of full professors will submit their written recommendations to the Dean. The written assessment must include justification for the recommendations. Copies of the recommendations will be provided to the faculty member according to policies outlined by the College of Arts and Letters and the Faculty Handbook.

By December 15, the Dean will submit the recommendation to the Provost and provide a copy to the AUH, AUPAC, and faculty member.

By February 1, the Provost will recommend promotion in written communication to the University President or notify the faculty member in writing that promotion has been denied. These communications will be copied to the Dean, AUH, AUPAC, and faculty member.

If the President denies promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member will be informed of this decision by February 15 (Section III.E.6.b.(8) - promotion and Section III.E.7.f.(8) - tenure). If the President grants promotion and/or tenure, the President will make the recommendation to the Board of Visitors prior to the April meeting. The faculty member will receive official notification from the President at that time.

If promotion and/or tenure is denied by the Provost, the faculty member may appeal in accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section III.E.6.b.). There is no appeal if promotion is denied by the President (Section III.E.6.b.(8) of the Faculty Handbook) or if tenure is denied by the President or Board of Visitors (Section III.E.7.f.(8) of the Faculty Handbook).

Tenure and/or Promotion Materials/Dossiers

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must compile the following materials:

- 1) A promotion and/or tenure cover sheet specifying name, current rank and title(s), desired action (promotion to specific rank, promotion with tenure, tenure only, etc.), year of appointment to present rank, highest academic degree with institution and date awarded, rank and date of JMU initial appointment, other ranks held at JMU with term of appointment.
- 2) A table of contents.
- 3) A narrative statement of 3,000 to 5,000 words describing teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service accomplishments over the probationary period in the case of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or in the period since tenure in the case of promotion to Professor. The statement should explain as well, where appropriate, the ways in which activities in these three areas are connected and integrated in professional experience in the unit, in interdisciplinary programs across the college and university, and in professional circles beyond the university. The statement should articulate a plan for future professional development and activities in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.
- 4) A comprehensive, up-to date Curriculum Vitae, with activities in the probationary period (for promotion to Associate Professor) or activities since promotion (for promotion to Professor) clearly delineated.
- 5) Copies of all Faculty Activities Reports (FARs), Faculty Anticipated Activities Plans, AUH annual evaluations, and AUPAC evaluations since hiring (if applying for tenure and promotion) or since promotion (if applying for promotion to Professor).
- 6) A table listing by semester all courses taught and the enrollments of each as well as, if relevant, a list of thesis committees on which the candidate has served.
- 7) Copies of Blue teaching evaluations for all courses taught during probationary period or since promotion.
- 8) Teaching materials including syllabi for each course taught (if multiple classes were offered one syllabus suffices) and examples of tests, examinations, or assignments and any other documentation that supports the teaching portfolio.
- 9) A copy of each publication produced during the probationary period in the case of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or in the period since tenure in the case of promotion to Professor. In the case of a work that cannot be submitted electronically (such as a bound volume), the AUPAC should receive a physical copy to be shared with the AUH (and returned to the faculty member).
- 10) Electronic copies or links to other creative endeavors (exhibits, websites, etc.) linked to professional performance.
- 11) Any additional documentation the faculty member chooses to provide that supports the faculty member's candidacy.

The faculty member should consult with the AUH and the AUPAC Chair with questions relating to the submission of these or other materials to the file.

Tenure and Promotion Standards and Criteria

The following constitute the Department of History standards in the performance areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or promotion to Professor.

To achieve tenure and advance to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of History, candidates hired after adoption of these standards must minimally achieve a rating of excellent in the area of Teaching or of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications and a rating of at least satisfactory in the other two performance areas. Candidates hired prior to the adoption of these standards must minimally achieve a rating of excellent in any one of the performance areas and a rating of at least satisfactory in the other two. According to the Faculty Handbook, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is awarded to faculty members exhibiting substantial professional achievements.

To advance to the rank of Professor in the Department of History, candidates must, at a minimum, achieve a rating of excellent in two of the three areas of performance and a rating of at least satisfactory in the other performance area. Service may be one of the two performance areas of excellence to advance in rank to Professor. According to the Faculty Handbook, promotion to the rank of Professor is awarded to faculty members exhibiting outstanding professional accomplishment.

Regarding **Early Promotion and Tenure Requirements**, see Appendix A for the CAL policy “Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion”: <https://www.jmu.edu/cal/files/cal-compelling-case-policy.pdf>.

SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

All faculty members in the Department of History must engage actively in research and present a future research agenda that contributes to the advancement of the study and the teaching of history.

Research and scholarly work may be recognized in traditional scholarship or in public history research and projects including but not limited to products in print, digital, or physical display formats including museum exhibits and curatorial work, collections of oral histories, collections and transcriptions of historic documents, documentary films, scholarly reports on historic sites and structures. To count as a publication, a work must meet the American Historical Association’s definition of “in-press.”

For Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Faculty members must offer evidence of progress in their research through a body of published and peer-reviewed work while in the probationary period at James Madison University. The candidate must also present evidence of an ongoing program of future research and future production. Since candidates cannot always control the publication timeline, the publication expectation may be considered fulfilled if the candidate provides evidence, confirmed by the editor, that a completed manuscript has been accepted for publication and submitted in full to a press or journal.

Unless otherwise agreed in the hiring contract, prior publications must have appeared within three years before arrival at JMU to be considered for tenure review.

Evidence of a **satisfactory body of scholarship** includes at a minimum:

- Three peer-reviewed articles or book chapters such as those published in scholarly journals or in edited volumes, or three juried research projects or public history projects, or other scholarly work recognized as equivalent to three articles.

Evidence of an **excellent body of scholarship** includes:

- A peer-reviewed (refereed) historical monograph published with a recognized university or trade press or an integrated, juried research project or public history project equivalent to an historical monograph.

For a **rating of excellent in scholarship**, faculty should articulate and show evidence of their scholarly production beyond the requirements for satisfactory.

Examples of such scholarly production may include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- Publishes articles and books or produces projects beyond the requirement for satisfactory.
- Publishes a peer-reviewed or refereed edited volume (as editor).
- Receives a competitive external grant.
- Produces evidence attesting to research contributions and reputation in the field, such as:
 - Work published by a top-tier journal or press.
 - Positive reviews of the candidate's published work.
 - Significant and numerous citations of a candidate's published work by scholars in their published work.
 - Publishing research-based articles in reputable non-academic national and/or regional magazines and newspapers.
 - Making scholarly presentations of research at academic conferences, public or policy forums, or over electronic or broadcast media as well as on- and off-campus consulting, which promotes the scholarly reputation of the university and the Department of History.
 - Refereeing manuscripts for scholarly journals and publishers.
 - Reviewing applications for granting agencies.
 - Serving as jurors for book prizes, on the editorial board of academic journals, or on conference organizing committees.

For Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Faculty members must offer evidence of progress in their research through a body of published and peer-reviewed work. The candidate must also present evidence of an ongoing program of future research and future production.

Evidence of a **satisfactory body of scholarship** for promotion to the rank of Professor includes one of the following in the period since the last promotion:

- Three peer-reviewed articles or book chapters such as those published in scholarly journals or in edited volumes, or three juried research projects or public history projects, or other scholarly work recognized as equivalent to three articles.
- A peer-reviewed (refereed) historical monograph published with a recognized university or trade press or an integrated, juried research project or public history project equivalent to an historical monograph.

For a **rating of excellent in scholarship**, faculty should articulate and show evidence of their scholarly production beyond the requirements for satisfactory.

Examples of such scholarly production may include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- Publishes articles and books or produces projects beyond the requirement for satisfactory.
- Publishes a peer-reviewed or refereed edited volume (as editor).

- Receives a competitive external grant.
- Produces a significant body of commissioned, invited, or solicited scholarship or research work.
- Produces evidence attesting to research contributions and reputation in the field. This may include:
 - Work published by a top-tier journal or press.
 - Positive reviews of the candidate's published work.
 - Significant and numerous citations of a candidate's published work by scholars in their published work.
 - Publishing research-based articles in reputable non-academic national and/or regional magazines and newspapers.
 - Making scholarly presentations of research at academic conferences, public or policy forums, or over electronic or broadcast media as well as on- and off-campus consulting, which promotes the scholarly reputation of the university and the Department of History.
 - Refereeing manuscripts for scholarly journals and publishers.
 - Reviewing applications for granting agencies.
 - Serving as jurors for book prizes, on the editorial board of academic journals, or on conference organizing committees.

TEACHING

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For a rating of **satisfactory** in teaching, candidates for the rank of Associate Professor must achieve a ranking of satisfactory in teaching on annual evaluations in a minimum of three of the five annual evaluations, or 60%, in the probationary period.

In addition, to earn **satisfactory**, all faculty must:

- Teach the courses that they are assigned and those that they develop.
- Demonstrate careful class preparation and the careful evaluation and timely return of student work.
- Align course syllabi to department, program, and General Education standards.
- Demonstrate integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion in their teaching.
- Fulfill their assigned duties as academic advisors.
- Support the academic and professional advancement of students.

For a rating of **excellent** in the area of teaching, faculty should articulate and show evidence of meeting the expectations for satisfactory, as well as demonstrate exceptional achievement in additional ways which may include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Effectiveness in teaching or a pattern of significant improvement in teaching over the probationary period and commitment to student advising that indicates consistent responsible work to promote an instructional climate conducive to student learning.
- Intellectual growth as teachers through evidence of continuing training in pedagogy or innovation or evolution in teaching strategies.
- Developing and adapting courses to meet educational objectives appropriate to the level and scope of instruction.

- Teaching across the department curriculum in support of the BA and MA programs, general education and other programs defined within the areas of responsibility.
- Implementing a range of assessment and grading schemas and tools that recognize the scope of student learning.
- Promoting student learning beyond the traditional classroom. Encouraging student presentations at conferences and supporting experiential learning.
- Emphasizing and integrating the teaching of history skills, such as collecting and evaluating sources, developing, and substantiating arguments with appropriate evidence, writing clearly and effectively, and making oral or digital presentations.
- Emphasizing and integrating appropriate skills in interdisciplinary classes or those taught outside the department, with an emphasis for that program or field.
- Serving as a director or reader of student theses.
- Developing and instituting a Study Abroad Program.
- Mentoring students in professional development, providing support through recommendation and referee letters and reports, and offering evidence of having helped them to achieve career goals.
- Showing continued commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in their teaching.

Evidence in support of excellent teaching may include:

- Annual evaluations.
- Peer evaluations.
- Student evaluations.
- Examples of model course materials including syllabi, assignments, etc.
- Examples of letters of recommendation written in support of students.
- Examples of student work.
- Other materials the AUPAC and the AUH deem appropriate.

Promotion to Professor

For a rating of **satisfactory** in teaching, candidates for the rank of Professor must achieve a ranking of satisfactory in teaching in a minimum of four of the previous five annual evaluations (80%).

In addition, to earn **satisfactory**, all faculty must:

- Teach the courses that they are assigned and those that they develop.
- Demonstrate careful class preparation and the careful evaluation and timely return of student work.
- Align course syllabi to department, program, and General Education standards.
- Demonstrate integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion in their teaching.
- Fulfill their assigned duties as academic advisors.
- Support the academic and professional advancement of students.

For a rating of **excellent** in the area of teaching, faculty should articulate and show evidence of meeting the expectations for satisfactory, as well as demonstrate a significant evolution in teaching, course content, and/or course development since promotion to Associate and show exceptional achievement in additional ways which may include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- Effectiveness in teaching or a pattern of significant improvement in teaching since the probationary period and commitment to student advising that indicates consistent responsible work to promote an instructional climate conducive to student learning.
- Intellectual growth as teachers through evidence of continuing training in pedagogy or innovation or evolution in teaching strategies.
- Developing and adapting courses to meet educational objectives appropriate to the level and scope of instruction.
- Teaching across the department curriculum in support of the BA and MA programs, general education and other programs defined within the areas of responsibility.
- Implementing a range of assessment and grading schemas and tools that recognize the scope of student learning.
- Promoting student learning beyond the traditional classroom. Encouraging student presentations at conferences and supporting experiential learning.
- Emphasizing and integrating the teaching of history skills, such as collecting and evaluating sources, developing, and substantiating arguments with appropriate evidence, writing clearly and effectively, and making oral or digital presentations.
- Emphasizing and integrating appropriate skills in interdisciplinary classes or those taught outside the department, with an emphasis for that program or field.
- Serving as a director or reader of student theses.
- Developing and instituting a Study Abroad Program.
- Mentoring students in professional development, providing support through recommendation and referee letters and reports, and offering evidence of having helped them to achieve career goals.
- Showing continued commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in their teaching.

Evidence in support of excellent teaching may include:

- Annual evaluations.
- Peer evaluations.
- Student evaluations.
- Examples of model course materials including syllabi, assignments, etc.
- Examples of letters of recommendation written in support of students.
- Examples of student work.
- Other materials the AUPAC and the AUH deem appropriate.

SERVICE

All full-time, instructional members of the Department of History are expected to be involved in service activities that further the mission of the department, college, university, profession, or the community. Faculty must regularly attend department meetings, attend commencement or a similar annual event as required by the Faculty Handbook, participate in departmental discussions, and fulfill other duties outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

For Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

To merit a **satisfactory** rating in the area of service, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must meet the minimum expectations outlined above and contribute in a

demonstrable way to service work that is essential to the routine operations of the department, its mission, and its commitments to the College and the University. This service work includes, but is not limited to:

- Completing service work that is consistent with professional goals as a teacher and scholar.
- Serving on departmental standing committees, representing the department on College or University standing committees, or serving on special task forces, search committees, or ad hoc committees.

Candidates hired after the adoption of these standards should not strive to achieve an excellent rating in service to the neglect of excellence in teaching or scholarship. If a candidate exceeds satisfactory in service while also achieving excellence in both teaching and scholarship, the AUH may recognize this in annual reviews.

For Promotion to the Rank of Professor

To merit a **satisfactory** rating in the area of service, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must meet the minimum expectations outlined above and contribute in a demonstrable way to service work that is essential to the routine operations of the department, its mission, and its commitments to the College and the University. This service work includes, but is not limited to:

- Completing service work that is consistent with professional goals as a teacher and scholar over the previous five years (at rank, or as designated in the Faculty Handbook and CAL standards for Compelling Cases for early review).
- Serving on departmental standing committees, representing the department on College or University standing committees, or serving on special task forces, search committees, or ad hoc committees.
- Serving on multiple committees in the department, college or university.

For a rating of **excellent** in the area of service, faculty should articulate and show evidence of meeting the expectations for satisfactory, as well as demonstrate additional service beyond that required for satisfactory. Examples of such exceptional service might include, but are not limited to:

- Taking on multiple leadership roles or contributions that entail a commensurate level of complexity or time commitment to those roles.
- Chairing standing committees or taskforces, or taking the lead role in performing substantial tasks necessary for the operation of the department, college, university, or profession.
- Organizing conferences or major research forums.

Midpoint Review

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook (Section III.E.4.m) procedures and policies for Midpoint Review, the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Academic Unit Head (AUH) conduct parallel, independent midpoint reviews of tenure-track faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. The Department of History normally conducts the Midpoint Review in the spring semester of faculty member's third year of candidacy. The AUH and the PAC may consult during the review process, but each will submit its own review and feedback to the faculty member.

Review/Feedback Process

The AUH will meet with the faculty member prior to 1 October of the third year of service to provide preliminary information on the Midpoint Review process for the Spring.

The PAC will, no later than 1 November, provide to the candidate a document describing the review process with a list of required documents (or portfolio) for review.

No later than the first Friday of the second semester of the third year, the faculty member will submit the portfolio, in electronic form, to the PAC chair and AUH.

The AUH will provide a written copy of the Midpoint Evaluation to the faculty member no later than 25 March. The faculty member will have two weeks to review the evaluation and accept it as written or request a meeting with the AUH. By 15 April, a copy of the evaluation signed by both the AUH and the faculty member will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file.

No later than 25 March, the PAC will provide the preliminary evaluation/feedback to the faculty member. The faculty member shall have two weeks to review the evaluation and ask any questions or seek clarifications and to request an informal conversation with the PAC chair or direct a letter to the PAC. By 15 April, the PAC chair will provide an official evaluation to the faculty member and to the AUH to be placed in the faculty member's permanent file.

For the Midpoint Review, the candidate shall submit the following materials as a single PDF with a table of contents:

- 1) A narrative of not more than 2500 words describing teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service accomplishments during the probationary period and the ways in which activities in these three areas are connected. Include a plan for further professional development and activities in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service for the remainder of the probationary period and beyond.
- 2) An up-to-date Curriculum Vitae.
- 3) Copies of the Faculty Activities Reports (FARs) and Faculty Anticipated Activity Plans (FAAPs) submitted and the annual evaluations received during the probationary period to date. The faculty member should also create and include an unofficial preliminary FAR that covers both semesters of the third year.
- 4) Copies of Blue teaching evaluations for all courses taught during probationary period, organized chronologically.
- 5) Teaching materials including syllabi for each course taught (if multiple classes were offered one syllabus suffices) and examples of tests, examinations, or assignments and any other documentation that supports the teaching portfolio, organized chronologically.
- 6) A copy of each publication produced during the probationary period. In the case of a work that cannot be submitted electronically (such as a bound volume), the PAC should receive a physical copy to be shared with the AUH (and returned to the faculty member).
- 7) Electronic copies or links to other creative endeavors (exhibits, websites, etc.) linked to professional performance.

The faculty member should consult with the AUH and the AUPAC Chair with questions relating to the submission of these or other materials to the file.

Evaluation of Lecturers

Evaluation and promotion of lecturers will be guided by the processes and procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Sections IIIB.4 and III.E.6).

The Department of History has no faculty members currently at the rank of lecturer. At such time as the Department of History receives authorization for a faculty hire at the rank of lecturer, when the search committee is formed and announced, the AUPAC will convene to develop and recommend specific criteria for evaluation for the ranks of lecturer, senior lecturer, and principal lecturer.

Recommendations will be presented to the department by the due date for applications for the position and will be voted on by the department and forwarded on to the AUH, Dean, and Provost for approval prior to the on-campus interview for finalist candidates for the position. Criteria adopted at that time will be the basis for evaluation of subsequent hires.

III. Evaluative Bodies and Department Membership

The Department is both an academic community and an organized, decision-making body that takes responsibility for its own governance. The Department exercises self-government under the authority of the James Madison University Board of Visitors, as delegated by the University President, University Provost, and the College of Arts and Letters Dean, and as stipulated in the James Madison University Faculty Handbook.

Membership in the department carries with it responsibility for advancing the department's goals. These duties include teaching, scholarly research, and service and participation in the administrative duties and collegial processes that support them, both in the department and in the University at large. The department expects its members to share the burdens of departmental administration as equitably as possible and to contribute to the governance and workings of the Department of History.

Academic Unit Head (AUH)

The AUH carries out duties and responsibilities as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section III.C.3), Academic Affairs Policy #2, and in the Department of History By-laws (Article 2 Section B.1). With respect to annual evaluation processes and promotion and tenure, the AUH evaluates the performance of faculty and staff members annually and makes promotion and tenure recommendations to the Dean of the College.

Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC)

The Faculty Handbook requires each Academic Unit to have a Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) (Section III E.2). The committee advises the AUH and makes recommendations on personnel matters within the academic unit. The PAC is responsible to History department faculty and to the AUH for conducting its functions, and the dean provides oversight of the work of the PAC to determine if it has followed appropriate procedures. The PAC meets as needed to complete its review of applications for tenure and promotion, to conduct initial evaluations and midpoint reviews of tenure-track faculty, and to adjudicate appeals of Annual Evaluations.

The PAC consists of seven faculty members, six members and the PAC chair, all of whom are tenured members of the department. Members are elected by all voting members of the department, using the procedures specified in the following passage from the department by-laws.

At the beginning of each academic year, the department elects two new members of the PAC, each of whom will serve a three-year term. The election will be conducted as a ballot vote. The PAC chair will announce a call for nominations at the opening department meeting in August. Faculty should send all nominations, including self-nominations, to the AAUH, who will be charged with creating a ballot. The AAUH will announce to the faculty, usually through email, upon the receipt of each nomination. The time for nominations will close at 5:00 PM on the Monday before the September Department meeting. The AAUH will circulate an email on Tuesday morning confirming all the nominees and invite absentee ballots from those who cannot attend the September meeting. All absentee ballots are due to the AAUH by noon on the day of the September meeting. At the September meeting, the AAUH will distribute a ballot that lists all nominees and instructs members of the department to vote for two of the following candidates. The AAUH counts the ballots and has them verified by another member of the department in attendance who volunteers to verify the vote. The results are announced immediately in the meeting and recorded in the minutes.

The AUH and the AAUH may not serve. Elected PAC members serve three-year terms that are staggered so that a minimum of two faculty members rotate on and off each year. To be eligible to serve as PAC chair, the faculty member must have served in a tenured/tenure-track position at JMU for at least eight years. The chair is elected by the voting department faculty to serve a three-year term that may be renewed one time.

The Department conducts elections for open PAC seats in accordance with voting procedures and policies outlined in the Department By-Laws and as amended to accommodate an end of academic year vote for terms to commence at the start of the following academic year.

AUPAC Voting Processes for Promotion and Tenure

The PAC meets every year on or shortly after October 1, at which time it acknowledges the receipt of all dossiers in support of applications for tenure and promotion. Evaluation of applications for promotion to full professor is conducted by an *ad hoc* PAC committee of all full professors in the department, chaired by the PAC Chair.

All members of the PAC will review all dossiers in support of applications for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Each member will make a thorough reading of the application and supporting documents. The PAC will determine, based on the merits of each application, how many classroom observations it needs to conduct and by whom to complete its review of a candidate's teaching.

Once each member of the PAC has completed a review of the application and supporting materials and once the PAC has completed its classroom observations, the PAC convenes to deliberate on the merits of the application. The members of the PAC then vote, with a simple majority determining the applicant's rating (excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.

As stipulated in the Faculty Handbook (Sections III.E.6 and III.E.7.f.(3)), the PAC, the AUH, and the Dean are encouraged to consult one another but, in all cases the AUPAC and the AUH render independent judgments, present independent evaluations, and offer independent recommendations.

Once the PAC has decided on the rating in each category, it will report to the dean in writing by November 15.

Confidentiality

All members of the PAC must adhere to the following confidentiality policies.

In general, information and the content of discussions shared during committee meetings are confidential and should not be shared outside of the membership of the committee. Confidentiality is important in ensuring that committee members can be open and forthright in their opinions regarding the applicants. In addition, confidentiality is important to preserve the fairness of the review process and in meeting the requirements of policies described in the Faculty Handbook.

Under certain conditions, the committee will communicate about the process or its recommendation with others outside the committee. These situations are limited to:

- Once the review of candidates has been completed, the committee will send a letter about each applicant to the Dean with a summary of its recommendations.
- During the review process, any communications with faculty and the administration will be directed through the committee chair and with the consensus of the committee.
- During the process, any communications with the applicants, potential applicants, and their references will be coordinated by the committee. Any inquiries about the process, the status of its deliberations, or its decisions should be forwarded to the committee chair.

After the conclusion of a review process (including initial, midpoint, and tenure and promotion reviews), the PAC must retain all notes and files relating to the deliberations about the candidate for a period of at least five years, in compliance with Virginia's Records Retention and Disposition policy (see https://www.lva.virginia.gov/agencies/records/sched_state/GS-111.pdf)

IV. Modification Procedures

The Chair of the AUPAC is responsible for maintaining and updating the Department of History's governance documents and for assuring that they are available and accessible by all members of the Department.

Revisions to the Governing Documents

Any faculty member with voting privileges may propose a revision to the Department's governing documents by submitting a written proposal to the Chair of the AUPAC. The Chair of the AUPAC will bring the proposal to the AUPAC for consideration. If the AUPAC finds sufficient merit in the proposal, it will bring the matter to the Department for consideration. If the AUPAC recommends against bringing the proposal to the department, the faculty member will have the option to bring it directly to the AUH. The AUH will then bring the proposal to the department and seek a second member of the department to support the proposal. Should the proposal be seconded, it will proceed to consideration by the department, considered as a motion from the floor rather than at the recommendation of the AUPAC. Should the proposal fail to be supported by a second member of the faculty, it will not be considered.

Proposals under consideration will be voted on by the full voting faculty, according to voting procedures outlined in the department's by-laws. See Appendix B below.

If the department votes in favor of an amendment, an amended copy of the governing documents must then be approved by the AUH, dean, and Provost to be incorporated into the department documents as a permanent revision.

Contradictions or Inconsistencies in Governing Documents

In any cases of contradictions or inconsistencies of the department's documents, procedures and policies in the Faculty Handbook take precedence over departmental documents. Policies and procedures in Department Documents (outlined herein) take precedence over Department By-laws. Where there may be contradictions or inconsistencies in documents, the department will take action through the Governance committee outlined in the By-Laws to bring coherence and uniformity to procedures and policies.

Appendix A: College of Arts and Letters policy on “Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion”

<https://www.jmu.edu/cal/files/cal-compelling-case-policy.pdf>

To present a compelling case for early tenure and promotion to associate professor, a faculty member must have completed at least four years as an assistant professor at JMU and be evaluated by the AUH and AUPAC as “Excellent” in teaching and scholarship. The faculty member must also be esteemed in the discipline, as attested by at least three letters of recommendation from prominent people in the discipline.

To present a compelling case for early promotion to full professor, a faculty member must have completed at least four years as an associate professor at JMU and be evaluated as “Excellent” in teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty member must also be esteemed in the discipline, as attested by at least three letters of recommendation from prominent people in the discipline.

Faculty members who wish to apply for early promotion must consult with an associate dean about their candidacy by March 1 of the academic year preceding their application. The associate dean will advise the faculty member on the efficacy of that application by April 1.

The associate dean will choose the above mentioned “prominent people in the discipline” from lists submitted by the faculty members and her/his colleagues in the department/school; the associate dean will then solicit those recommendations.

Outside reviews will be held confidential and not be shared with the faculty member. The faculty member waives the right to see the recommendations by submitting an early application.

Appendix B: History Department Voting Procedures from the Bylaws of the History Department

Voting

A. Procedures and Definitions

Each member of the department is entitled to a single vote on any question before the department.

Questions about who can or cannot participate in a particular vote will be determined by the AUH, in consultation with the relevant faculty, and, if necessary, with appropriate authorities outside the department (for example, the CAL Dean, the University Provost, or the University Counsel). This is especially important for determining the voting status of persons who hold appointments in the department, who also hold administrative appointments, and for whom the Faculty Handbook does not provide adequate guidance.

An individual’s right to vote may not be transferred to another member (RR, 11th edition, section 45, p. 407).

The department does not compel members to vote. Any member may choose to refrain from voting. No member should vote on an issue in which she or he has a personal conflict of interest (see JMU Policy #1106). A member may, however, vote for her or himself for an office or other position for which she or he has been nominated.

Except where a rule provides otherwise, the basic requirement for an action to be approved is a majority vote. Majority vote means *more* than half of the votes cast, excluding blanks, illegal ballots and abstentions. (Thus, abstentions do not count, for purposes of the rule of voting.) For example: if 25 votes were cast, 5 of which were abstentions, a majority (*more* than 10) would be 11. Some votes, as specified in these bylaws, require a supermajority of 60%. A “60% majority vote” means *at least* 60% of the votes cast, excluding blanks, illegal ballots, and abstentions. For example, if 33 members voted, 3 of whom abstained, a 60% majority (*at least* 60%) would be 18.

A member has the right to change her or his vote up to the time that the results of the vote are announced; after that, she or he can make the change only by the unanimous consent of the assembly, requested and granted, without debate, immediately following the chair’s announcement of the result of the vote. (This can be useful, for example, if a member of the department wishes to change her or his vote, so that the department can record a unanimous election result).

The assembly itself is the judge of all questions arising that are incidental to the voting or the counting of the votes.

B. Procedure for conduct of voting

As much as is expedient, the department shall conduct business in regular face-to-face meetings. From time to time, however, it is more efficient for the department to conduct votes on various issues outside of department meetings. When the department conducts votes outside of a regular department meeting, the choices available to voters shall be uniform and consistent with those available in a regular face to face meeting.

Faculty on leave or otherwise absent when a vote is conducted will be included in votes as much as is feasible. In a normal department meeting, votes will usually be preceded by discussion, and the presumption is that the final vote shall reflect an informed judgment based in part on the prior deliberation. Since persons who are not present at the meeting cannot have their judgment shaped by the deliberation, absentee votes are impermissible for votes conducted in this fashion. When it is urgent to include absentee votes, the vote shall take place immediately, with no prior discussion.

Absentee ballots shall be submitted via email, from an email account that clearly belongs to the person voting. The email will be sent to the AAUH, who will open it in the presence of two witnesses assigned by the AUH. The AAUH and at least one witness will certify the ballot, which will then be added to and counted with the other non-absentee ballots.

Ballots from an election will be collected by a person designated by the AUH, and counted in the presence of at least one witness, also appointed by the AUH. The person designated by the AUH to

count the ballots will then report the results of the election to the department, following the form listed below.

C. Voice and Ballot Voting

The normal method of voting on a motion is by voice. The motion shall be read clearly to the persons present at the meeting, and then put to the vote. Voice voting is convenient and easy, but suffers from its public nature. For this reason, any department member, including the AUH, may request a secret ballot on any matter. All voting on personnel matters will take place by secret ballot.

In the event that a vote or election is conducted in a regular department meeting, the election will be valid only if a quorum of the department membership is present. Since a member must be present to count towards fulfilling the quorum, absentee votes *do not* count towards fulfilling the quorum when the vote is conducted in a regular meeting of the department. When we hold a vote in a meeting, the presumption is that people will listen to and consider any deliberation that preceded the vote. For this reason, we wish to encourage members to attend the meeting if at all possible, so that they can participate in the deliberation.

The AUH will determine in advance of a vote whether it is appropriate to accept absentee votes or not. In making this decision, the AUH will be guided by the need to balance maximum democratic participation with maximum potential for meaningful deliberation. In those situations where the AUH expects that deliberation conducted during the meeting will shape how people vote, it is appropriate only to accept ballots from persons present at the meeting. In those situations where deliberation has largely preceded the meeting, however, the AUH should strive to maximize democratic participation in the decision, and should solicit absentee ballots from persons on leave or who otherwise cannot attend the meeting at which the vote takes place. For a vote in which absentee votes are to be included, it is not appropriate to precede the vote with discussion. When we wish to include ballots from absentee voters, such voters cannot participate in the deliberation. Thus, votes for which it is important to include such ballots shall be conducted directly, without prior deliberation by the persons present at the meeting in which the vote is conducted.

Instructions for filling out the ballot shall be specified clearly on the ballot, since these instructions establish the criteria by which the person who certifies the election will determine if a ballot is valid or invalid. For example, the instructions might read: "Vote for two of the following candidates." Completed ballots that do not follow these instructions shall be rejected when the votes are tallied. In the above example, a ballot that contained votes for three candidates, or only one, would be invalid and should be rejected when the votes are tallied. Since the instructions on the ballot constitute the rule by which we determine if a ballot is valid, we will need to take care to write them precisely. For example, if we wish voters to be able to cast a vote for one *or* two of the candidates listed on the ballot, the instructions should read "vote for no more than two of the following candidates."

In the event that a vote or election is conducted outside a regular department meeting, the total number of votes cast must equal or exceed the number necessary to comprise a quorum for the election to be legitimate. In this circumstance, absentee votes *do* count for the purpose of determining the minimum number of votes that must be cast for the election to be valid. When we hold a vote outside of a meeting of the department, the presumption is that deliberation has already occurred. For this reason,

we wish to encourage members to participate in the vote, in order to make the election as democratic and inclusive as is possible.

So long as the election results can properly be reported and recorded (see below), and so long as improperly completed ballots can be identified and rejected, ballots may take any form, including paper and electronic ballots. Since the purpose of using secret ballots when electing department personnel is to preserve the anonymity of each voter, any form of balloting in personnel elections that does not preserve secrecy must be approved beforehand by a majority vote of the full department.

D. Recording and Reporting of Election Results

After a voice vote, any department member may put a motion to the department for the vote to be recorded. If this motion is successful, the chair will tally the votes by show of hands, and the results of the vote will be recorded in the minutes. If the votes are not tallied, the results of the election will be recorded as “carried by a majority of the department present and voting.” If the results are tallied, the results of the election will be recorded in the form specified below.

The results of ballots, including all personnel elections (e.g. for membership on the PAC), will be tallied by the chair or by one or more members of the department delegated by the chair. When the votes are tallied, at least one member of the department will witness the tally. Neither the person or persons delegated to tally the vote, nor the person or persons who serve as witness to the tally, shall be a candidate in the election being recorded.

Votes for the purpose of approving a new hire shall be conducted by paper ballot. The ballots shall be placed in a sealed envelope, signed and witnessed, and held in the custody of the AUH, or a designee of the AUH.

The chair, or the person or persons delegated to tally the vote, shall report the results to the department. This report should follow this form:

REPORT OF ELECTION

Number of Votes Cast: xx votes

Number of Voters necessary to comprise a quorum: xx votes

Candidate A received: xx votes

Candidate B received: xx votes

Candidate C received: xx votes

Etc.

Invalid votes (with reason why the vote was judged invalid): xx votes