

Department of Kinesiology

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024



**Department of
Kinesiology**

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Updated: October 7, 2024

1 MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES	3
1.1 MISSION	3
1.2 DIVERSITY & INCLUSION.....	3
2 ANNUAL PLAN	4
2.1 TIMELINE.....	4
2.2 REQUIREMENTS.....	4
3 INITIAL EVALUATION	5
3.1 FIRST-YEAR EXPECTATIONS.....	5
3.2 DOCUMENTATION.....	5
3.3 DRAFT WRITTEN EVALUATION.....	5
3.4 CONFERENCE	5
3.5 FINAL WRITTEN EVALUATION.....	5
3.6 DEADLINE.....	6
3.7 DEAN’S REVIEW	6
3.8 NON-RENEWAL.....	6
4 ANNUAL EVALUATION	7
4.1 ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION GUIDELINES	7
4.2 EVALUATION PROCEDURES	7
4.3 MERIT RATING	8
5 TENURE TRACK (TT) PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND PROMOTION.....	11
5.1 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES	11
5.2 PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES.....	18
5.3 CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION/TENURE	22
6 RENEWABLE TERM APPOINTMENT (RTA).....	24
6.1 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES.....	24
6.2 RTA PROMOTION GUIDELINES.....	31
7 DEPARTMENT STANDING COMMITTEES.....	34
7.1 PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AUPAC).....	34
8 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY.....	37
8.1 OFFICE HOURS	37
8.2 CONTRACTED TIME, VACATION, ETC.....	37
8.3 SUMMER SCHOOL.....	37
9 EMERGENCY PROCEDURES	39
9.1 SIGNAGE	39
9.2 HPL SAFETY TRAINING.....	39
9.3 ACCIDENT REPORT	39
10 TRAVEL.....	40
10.1 TRAVEL PRE-APPROVAL	40
10.2 TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT.....	40
11 PURCHASING EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES	41
11.1 PROGRAM ALLOTMENTS	41
11.2 PURCHASING OF EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES	41
12 PROCEDURE FOR AMENDMENTS	42

APPENDICES43

APPENDIX A: FACULTY ANNUAL PLAN (FAP)..... 44

APPENDIX B: FIRST YEAR EXPECTATIONS..... 45

APPENDIX C: ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS..... 46

APPENDIX D: CHBS PROFESSIONAL DOSSIER OUTLINE 48

APPENDIX E: EVALUATION RUBRIC TEMPLATE 50

APPENDIX F: SAMPLE FACULTY ABSENCE FORM 55

APPENDIX G: SAMPLE INCIDENT REPORT FORM 56

APPENDIX H: SAMPLE EVA ORDER FORM FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASES..... 57

1 MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES

1.1 Mission

The Department of Kinesiology is dedicated to the development of future leaders in professions that maximize the potential of individuals and society through physical activity. Programs include exercise science and teacher education in physical education and health.

The department is committed to providing:

- *Outstanding undergraduate programs based on the criteria of relevant professional associations which will enable graduates' success in their professional endeavors.*
- *Programs that build upon the strong liberal studies background provided through General Education.*
- *Opportunities that challenge students to think critically*
- *Use of technological advances.*
- *An appreciation of the global community.*
- *Quality graduate programs that complement the undergraduate programs and provide qualified students with an opportunity for advanced study in the disciplines of kinesiology.*
- *Contributions to the university's general education curriculum through programs designed to promote lifelong fitness and wellness.*
- *Service to JMU, the professions and local community through our unique knowledge and expertise.*
- *Research and development projects that push back the boundaries of knowledge and promote effective practice in the kinesiology disciplines.*

1.2 Diversity & Inclusion

Our aim is to develop professionals committed to engaging with diverse communities in ways that help all individuals reach their full potential. We are dedicated to appreciating differences in perspective, identity, and experience through cultivating class environments, curriculum, and pre-professional opportunities that align with the spirit of inclusion.

2 ANNUAL PLAN

All full-time faculty submit the Faculty Annual Plan (FAP) to the department head at the beginning of the academic year. Further information about the FAP is included in Appendix A.

2.1 Timeline

The FAP is finalized and approved by the department head at a meeting in August or September of the Fall semester.

2.2 Requirements

A minimum of 10% assigned to every category of the plan (teaching, scholarship/professional qualifications, service).

3 INITIAL EVALUATION

The Faculty Handbook indicates in section III.E.3. that the AUH will provide a new faculty member with information concerning the academic unit evaluation procedures and criteria in the faculty member's first semester. The initial evaluation will be completed in the faculty member's second full semester of full-time employment at JMU. The following policies and procedures apply to the initial evaluation:

3.1 First-Year Expectations

A new faculty member will meet monthly with the AUH to assist with their transition to the university and to answer any questions that may arise. A tentative outline of the information that will be covered during the monthly meetings with the AUH is available in Appendix B.

3.2 Documentation

During the evaluation process, the AUH may request that the faculty member supply information for review and evaluation purposes. Materials include Peer observation, AUH observation, copy of the syllabus for each class. Student evaluations from each class are sent to the AUH directly and may be reviewed for discussion, feedback, and goal setting.

3.3 Draft written evaluation

At least one week prior to the conference scheduled for the beginning of the second semester, the AUH will provide a draft of the written evaluation to be discussed at the conference to allow the faculty member adequate time to review it prior to the conference. The evaluation will clearly indicate whether the AUH deems the performance of the faculty member as acceptable or unacceptable.

3.4 Conference

At the start of a new faculty member's second full semester, the AUH must schedule an evaluation conference with the faculty member. The conference provides an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's first-semester performance and professional needs as perceived by both the faculty member and AUH. A meeting between the AUH and faculty must be scheduled for within the first two weeks of the second semester. During this time, the AUH and faculty member may agree to modifications to the written evaluation.

3.5 Final Written Evaluation

The AUH shall provide the faculty member with a final written initial evaluation within 14 days of the evaluation conference. The evaluation shall state whether the faculty member's overall performance has been acceptable or unacceptable.

3.6 Deadline

The initial evaluation process shall be completed by the end of the third week of the second full semester.

3.7 Dean's Review

A copy of the evaluation, signed by the faculty member and the AUH, shall be sent to the dean by the AUH. If the faculty member refuses to sign the evaluation, this refusal shall be noted on the evaluation when the AUH sends it forward to the dean.

3.8 Non-Renewal

Unacceptable performance as determined in the initial evaluation will normally result in nonrenewal of an appointment of an untenured first-year faculty member (tenure-track and RTA faculty). AUPAC review of the faculty member's performance is required as specified in the Faculty Handbook, Section III.F.3, if the AUH finds that the faculty member's performance is unacceptable. The AUPAC review must be completed and sent to the dean within seven days of receiving a recommendation for nonrenewal of a first-year faculty member from the AUH. See Faculty Handbook, Section III.F.3.c.

4 ANNUAL EVALUATION

All full-time faculty are expected to submit their annual dossier to the Kinesiology Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) within one week of the last day of final exams in the spring semester.

4.1 Electronic Submission Guidelines

The materials for annual, tenure and promotion evaluation must be submitted on-line in Canvas.

- Step 1: Create your Canvas site ([Appendix C](#) contains the guidelines for creating a Canvas site). Each year you will be updating this site with your current materials. It is recommended that you create a separate 'Module' each year.
- Step 2: Upload your materials to your Canvas site in the appropriate areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications and Service. Specific information about the materials that need to be submitted can be found in [Appendix C](#) and [Appendix D](#).
- Step 3: When complete, add the AUH and the current members of AUPAC (and remove any former members) as "Students" to your Canvas page. If you are submitting materials for Tenure and/or Promotion, you will also need to add the Dean as a "Student".
- Step 4: Notify the current AUPAC members and the AUH that your materials are ready for review.

4.2 Evaluation Procedures

The AUPAC meets before June 5th and evaluates each faculty member according to established performance criteria. The PAC committee evaluates each faculty member in the focus areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service using the following procedures:

- Each AUPAC member generates a score using the departmental guidelines in an independent manner
- Performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service are evaluated using the following numerical ratings:
 - 4- Exceptional
 - 3- Exceeds expectations
 - 2- Meets expectations
 - 1- Needs improvement
 - 0- Unsatisfactory

** note: evaluation ratings for Tenure and Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory*
- Each AUPAC member submits a list of scores to the AUPAC chair using the excel sheet provided by the AUPAC chair

- For any faculty member's focus area with rating discrepancies of <0.5pts across raters composite scores are generated by averaging AUPAC member scores
- AUPAC meets to discuss and finalize scoring for any faculty member's focus area with rating discrepancies of 0.5pts or greater
 - AUPAC members recuse themselves from rating and discussions of discrepancies among their own performance ratings and those of significant others (e.g., family members).
- AUPAC chair submits all composite scores and comments to the AUH. These scores are utilized by the AUH to inform the final faculty rating.

Once AUPAC submits the evaluation scores with relevant comments, the AUH will create a preliminary report that includes ratings for teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service for each faculty member. The reports will be shared with each respective faculty member and discussed at a face-to-face evaluation conference. Should a faculty member disagree or see a discrepancy in their given scores, a discussion with the AUH should occur. After the scores are agreed upon and signed by both the faculty member and the AUH, the official evaluation is forwarded to the Dean. If final scores are not agreed upon, the faculty member has a maximum of 7 days after receipt of the official evaluation to initiate a formal appeal to an ad hoc committee comprised of the three most recent faculty members to rotate off of the AUPAC.

4.2.a Dates and Deadlines

- Within two weeks from the last day of final exams in the spring semester, faculty provide current PAC members and AUH with link to annual evaluation materials on Canvas.
- June 1: PAC evaluations due to PAC Chair
- June 8: PAC Chair send evaluations and award nominations to AUH
- July 31: A copy of the preliminary annual evaluation is sent to faculty from AUH
- September 1: Eligible faculty members must notify AUH of intent to apply for tenure and/or promotion
- August to October 1: AUH schedules individual evaluation conferences with faculty members to discuss and finalize annual evaluations and review Faculty Annual Plan documents.
- October 1: Dossiers for qualified faculty members to apply for tenure and/or promotion due to PAC and AUH
- October 21: Appeals of annual faculty evaluations by the ad hoc appeals committee are completed
- November 15: Recommendations from AUH and PAC for faculty promotion and tenure due to college dean.

4.3 Merit Rating

The annual evaluation is used to make recommendations to the Dean for merit pay increases. Each faculty member is evaluated annually for overall performance | and in each of the three standard categories: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.

4.3.a Evaluation Procedures

Overall performance is evaluated in each category using the following numerical ratings:

- 4- Exceptional
- 3- Exceeds expectations
- 2- Meets expectations
- 1- Needs improvement
- 0- Unsatisfactory

** note: evaluation ratings for Tenure and Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory*

Each year, a relative weight is assigned to each of the three categories by mutual agreement of the AUH and the respective faculty members. A faculty member's total rating for purposes of merit pay for a year is computed by multiplying each of the three performance category values by their respective weights, then summing the three products.

4.3.b Merit Pay Algorithm

Using the total ratings, the amount of merit pay awarded would proceed as follows:

1. An overall departmental raise percentage (ODRP) would be calculated by taking the funds available for merit and dividing by total faculty salaries (new faculty not included).
2. 75% of the ODRP would be the standard percent increase given to every faculty member with an overall performance rating of 2 (meets expectations) or higher.
3. This standard percent increase would be applied to each eligible faculty member's salary to determine their base merit increase (BMI).
4. The additional merit percentage (AMP) available would be 25% of the ODRP.
5. An average merit rating (AMR) for each faculty member would be determined by averaging the overall performance ratings over the past 5 years (or the maximum number of years available if their time at JMU < 5 years). AMR would be divided by the average AMR for all faculty to determine the merit percentage (MP).
6. Additional merit increase (AMI) would be calculated as: $AMI = MP * \text{current salary} * AMP$.
7. Total raise for each faculty member would be $BMI + AMI$

5 TENURE TRACK (TT) PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND TENURE / PROMOTION

Faculty members at JMU are assessed on their performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. While performance in these areas is assessed independently, these central functions are inextricably linked. A professor's workload typically consists of a reasonable mixture of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. While teaching is our most important function, we believe that a continuing program of relevant scholarship enhances teaching and teaching motivates scholarly inquiry. Involvement in service similarly motivates teaching and scholarly inquiry. So, again, these three pillars of the professorate are inextricably linked and are interdependent.

5.1 Annual Performance Review Guidelines

The following outlines Department of Kinesiology policy and procedure information as it relates to the annual review process.

5.1.a Teaching Evaluation Criteria for Annual Reviews

The Department of Kinesiology regards teaching as the most important aspect of our professional responsibilities. Teaching involves instructional planning and assessment, including in-class and out-of-class activities (e.g., office meetings devoted to course tutoring).

(Minimum weight of 40%)

5.1.a.i Criteria for Teaching

1. Engage in instructional planning that provides students with clearly aligned course objectives, content, and evaluation metrics.
2. Maintain up-to-date professional knowledge.
3. Utilize a variety of instructional approaches and educational experiences to enhance learning.
4. Engage in culturally responsive teaching and equitable practices.
5. Create a positive learning environment.
6. Provide regular, meaningful feedback to students throughout the semester.
7. Communicate regularly and respectfully with students.

5.1.a.ii Sources of Evidence for Teaching

Faculty will submit evidence that documents accomplishment for each item they have selected on the Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#) (see Appendix E). These sources of evidence may include but are not required or limited to:

1. Course syllabi*
2. Evidence of engagement in activities related to culturally responsive teaching and equitable practices*

3. Peer classroom observations
4. Examples of student work
5. Course materials (e.g., PowerPoint presentation, assignments & rubrics, assessments)
6. Continued professional development (on & off campus workshops)/ grants (support for continued professional growth)
7. Letters of support from professional peer and colleagues
8. Letters and comments from former and current students (clarify whether the items were solicited or unsolicited)
9. Course evaluations** (Qualitative scores and original reports required)

** indicates a required source of evidence in the annual dossier regardless if it is selected as an evaluation criterion*

*** indicates a required source of evidence in the annual dossier if it is self-selected as an evaluation criterion*

5.1.a.iii Assessment Guidelines for Teaching

The Department of Kinesiology utilizes a rubric to help faculty identify and demonstrate areas of accomplishment in teaching. The Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#) offers faculty members the opportunity to demonstrate proficiency across multiple areas, including pathways that demonstrate teaching which meets or exceeds expectations. Criteria are presented in such a manner as to assume that a faculty member first establishes that they meet expectations, then continues to offer evidence to justify exceeding expectations if desired. If a faculty member has failed to meet expectations, they should continue to the sections for "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" benchmarks.

Meeting and exceeding expectations:

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - Utilizing the metrics detailed in the Kinesiology Annual Evaluation Rubric, the faculty member has documented that they have completed at least 6 of the criteria for "Meets Expectations".

Exceeds expectations (excellent) - In addition to satisfying the requirements for "Meets Expectations", the faculty member has documented completion of at least 2 criteria from the "Exceeds Expectations" column. At least one of the two criteria must be from the teaching portion.

- *Please note that certain domains (Student evaluations, Positive Learning Environment, and Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices) may not be used as a criterion for both meeting and exceeding expectations. Faculty must select at which level they wish to document any of these domains.*

Exceptional (excellent) - In addition to satisfying the requirements for both "Meets Expectations" and "Exceeds Expectations", the faculty member has documented completion of at least 1 criterion from the "Exemplary" column.

- *Please note that certain domains (Student evaluations, Positive Learning Environment, and Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices) may not be used as a repeated criterion for meeting or exceeding expectations and exemplary teaching. Faculty must select at which level they wish to document any of these domains.*

Needs improvement* (satisfactory) - Utilizing the metrics detailed in the Kinesiology Annual Evaluation Rubric, the faculty member has documented that they have completed between 3 to 5 of the criteria for "Meets Expectations", along with a written plan as to how they will work towards achieving at least 6 criteria in the following academic year.

Unsatisfactory* (unsatisfactory) - Utilizing the metrics detailed in the Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#), the faculty member has failed to document they have completed at least 3 the criteria for "Meets Expectations" or articulate any reasonable plan by which they will work towards achieving at least 6 criteria in the following academic year.

1. If this rating is continued from the previous semester, post-tenure review is required.
2. Operationally, this category is not employed before an individual has received a "below expectations" rating in the teaching category on a previous annual evaluation within the last three years, regardless of rubric score. An unsatisfactory in teaching automatically triggers the post-tenure review process.

* *See the Faculty Handbook for details regarding post-tenure review.

5.1.b Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications Evaluation Criteria for Annual Reviews

In the Department of Kinesiology, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications are broadly defined as activities that involve the systematic uncovering of information within an academic discipline. Contributions to the body of knowledge within the discipline may range from theoretical/abstract pursuits to applied/clinical investigations. In evaluating scholarly productivity, the quality and quantity of scholarship are considered (see Appendix E). While a reasonable level of productivity is expected and encouraged, quality is more heavily weighted in the evaluation. Quality may be substantiated by the reputation of the publication(s) and/or conference(s) in which the scholarship is presented, by the fact that the scholarly contributions were peer reviewed and/or the subsequent impact of the scholarly work as indicated by citations or other recognition of merit.

A longitudinal plan for scholarly achievement and professional qualifications must exist. This plan should be congruent with the mission and resources of the institution, the college and the academic unit. It should be reasonable/achievable and

updated annually. Scholarly projects and anticipated progress toward dissemination should be specified in the plan. If a project is a collaborative effort, the faculty member's contribution (in percentage) should be estimated. Dissemination of the scholarly information should be the focus of the evaluation, although the normal delays associated with the review process should be taken into consideration. Although the criteria below suggest that faculty can 'meet expectations' in scholarship in a particular year without any manuscripts accepted for publication, an absence of published scholarly papers will not meet 'satisfactory' performance during a tenure/promotion evaluation period of 5-6 years. (Minimum weight of 10%)

5.1.b.i Criteria for Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications

- Demonstrate a history of continuous involvement in scholarship.
- Create and maintain an organized plan that:
 - identifies the area of scholarly inquiry
 - highlights a systematic approach to answering questions within area of inquiry
 - shows the potential of the scholarship to contribute to the body of knowledge within the faculty member's discipline.
- Provide evidence of dissemination.

5.1.b.ii Sources of Evidence for Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications

Effective scholarly achievement and professional qualifications have many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:

- Publication of original scholarship in quality peer-reviewed journals and other professional media (books, professional internet sites, etc.). Cite only with acceptance date not publication.
- Presentation of original scholarship at professional conferences, workshops, etc.
- Professional recognition of scholarly work (citations, awards, etc.).
- External funding to support scholarship.
- Internal grant funding
- Editorial contributions to peer-reviewed journals and other professional media
- Reports of progress. These reports indicate the progress made on a scholarly project during the assessment period. A report should be completed for each project still under progress.

5.1.b.iii Assessment Guidelines for Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - The faculty member has:

1. a demonstrated history of continuous involvement in scholarship
2. an organized plan for scholarship
3. presented evidence of disseminating scholarly work and/or securing funding for scholarship within current academic year
4. In order to meet expectations, presentations and publications must be disseminated through professional media, but do not need to be peer-reviewed.

Exceeds expectations (excellent) - In addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member has:

1. worked as a primary contributor to a manuscript published in a peer-reviewed journal within the current academic year, or
2. made significant progress, as judged by PAC, toward fulfilling the annual goals for disseminating peer-reviewed scholarship and/or securing external funding (e.g. the faculty member may have submitted two or more manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals; the faculty member has delivered multiple notable talks at established national meetings)

Exceptional (excellent) - In addition to exceeding expectations, the faculty member has:

1. a published peer-reviewed manuscript that is of exceptional quality, or
2. published multiple peer-reviewed manuscripts within the current academic year, or
3. secured external funding to support scholarship that can be broadly disseminated

Needs Improvement (satisfactory) - The faculty member has:

1. an organized plan for scholarship, but
2. not provided a history of continuous involvement in scholarship, or
3. not presented evidence of disseminating scholarly work.

Unsatisfactory (unsatisfactory) - The faculty member fails to:

1. provided an organized plan for scholarship, and
2. contributed to scholarship during the evaluation period

** note: evaluation ratings for Tenure and Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory*

5.1.c Service Evaluation Criteria for Annual Reviews

The Department of Kinesiology requires that all faculty members make service contributions within the university and values service to the community and professional organizations. Service includes, but is not limited to: departmental program coordination; serving on search committees; mentoring and advising students; supervising students outside of a faculty member's assigned course

load; other committees within the university; and service to community/ educational/ professional organizations (see Appendix E). Committee and organizational leadership responsibilities are valued by the department. (minimum weight of 10%)

The priority regarding service is that departmental needs are met. Therefore, faculty members, particularly senior faculty, may be asked to and are expected to serve essential needs should they arise.

Given that junior faculty members (both tenure-track and RTA) have additional loads in establishing themselves in teaching and scholarly achievements and professional qualification, the service expectations are adjusted for these faculty members. These adjustments are noted below:

- In the 1st – 3rd years at JMU, service expectations are reduced to 50% of those required of senior faculty (7th year of service and beyond) hours for each level of evaluation (as noted below).
- For the 4th – 6th years at JMU, service expectations are increased to 75% of those required of senior faculty (7th year of service and beyond) hours for each level of evaluation (as noted below).
- If a faculty member negotiates to bring in years of service upon hiring, those years will be counted here (e.g. if a faculty member is hired and negotiates counting 3 years of prior work towards tenure / promotion, they will be considered as being in their 4th year for their first year at JMU)

5.1.c.i Criteria for Service

1. Contribute to internal service requirements in an equitable fashion as needed by the department.
 - Internal service refers to department, college, and university level committee membership and/or leadership requirements. It also includes activities undertaken as part of one's role at JMU, e.g. acting as a representative of the university during university programs, center-related service work, etc.
2. Contribute to the larger community and / or profession.

5.1.c ii Sources of Evidence for Service

Effective service has many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:

1. Committee minutes.
2. Reports or other work products.
3. Letters from chairs and/or colleagues.
4. Other documented evidence of community, educational, consultancies or professional service.

Criteria are presented in such a manner as to assume that a faculty member first establishes that they meet expectations, then continues to offer evidence to justify exceeding expectations if desired. If a faculty member has failed to meet

expectations, they should continue to the sections for “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” benchmarks.

Benchmarks for internal service may be exempted for any given faculty member, upon agreement with the AUH, if that faculty member has taken a significant role in a professional organization or other service role. The faculty member and AUH should agree to the anticipated timeline and adjusted benchmarks in writing.

5.1.c.iii Assessment Guidelines for Service

Meets expectations (satisfactory) –

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year: at least 50 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year: at least 75 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond: at least 100 hours of service

Exceed expectations (excellent) –

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year:
 - at least 75 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership -or-
 - at least 100 hours of service overall
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year:
 - at least 112.5 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership -or-
 - at least 150 hours of service overall
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond:
 - at least 150 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership -or-
 - at least 200 hours of service overall

A reflection must be provided for the leadership component and should address the faculty member’s own role, as well as the impact and/or productivity of the organization or committee.

Exceptional (excellent) –

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year:
 - at least 125 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year:
 - at least 187.5 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond:
 - at least 250 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership

A reflection must be provided for the leadership component and should address the faculty member's own role, as well as the impact and/or productivity of the organization or committee.

Needs Improvement (satisfactory) -

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year: at least 25, but less than 50 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year: at least 37.5, but less than 75 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond: at least 50, but less than 100 hours of service

Unsatisfactory (unsatisfactory) - Faculty member attains less than 50 hours of service.

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year: less than 25 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year: less than 37.5 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond: less than 50 hours of service

5.2 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The following outlines Department of Kinesiology policy and procedure information as it relates to promotion and tenure.

5.2.a Tenure and Promotion Timeline and Standards

Key policies from the Faculty Handbook:

The promotion of an instructional faculty member shall be determined by merit regardless of the distribution of faculty by academic rank within the academic unit. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for promotion. If a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, they must present compelling evidence of accomplishment to be awarded promotion.

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.

III.E.6.b. (1) The faculty member may apply for promotion, or the AUPAC or AUH may nominate a faculty member for promotion. A written nomination must be made by September 1. The faculty member shall be informed if the AUPAC or AUH has nominated the faculty member and shall have the option to accept or decline the nomination without prejudice. A nomination from the AUPAC or AUH does not guarantee a successful application for promotion and/or tenure. The faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH and AUPAC by October 1. Failure by the faculty member to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments by the October 1 deadline shall constitute a refusal of a nomination or withdrawal of an application, and no consideration of promotion is required.

5.2.b Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Procedures

During the September Kinesiology Faculty opening meeting, committees are formed for tenure and promotion reviews of any eligible faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion during the upcoming academic year.

- For Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor – all tenured faculty members are assigned to at least one related review committee, with one committee member serving as the Review Committee Chair (appointed by self-nomination, approval of review committee member, and majority vote)
- For Promotion to Full Professor – all fully promoted tenure-track faculty members are assigned to at least one related review committee, with one committee member serving as the Review Committee Chair (appointed by self-nomination, approval of review committee member, and majority vote)

The Review Committee Chair receives and disseminates the eligible faculty member's summary of activities and scoring spreadsheets (used to indicate performance ratings for each of the three pillars using the University's three-category scoring system as well as notes to support the assigned ratings) to each review committee member.

During a review period, the committee members independently review the faculty member's summary of activities, complete the rating spreadsheet, and send their completed spreadsheets to the Review Committee Chair.

The review committee meets to discuss ratings and final decisions regarding the tenure and/or promotion of the eligible faculty member. Based on the submitted review spreadsheets and committee discussion, the Review Committee Chair drafts a letter in support of or expressing a lack of support for the promotion of the faculty member in question and submits the letter to the CHBS Dean.

Independent of the review committee process, the AUH completes their own review of all eligible faculty members' summaries of activity, rates the individuals using the University's three-category scoring system, drafts a letter in support for or expressing lack of support for the promotion of the faculty member in question, and submits their letter to the CHBS Dean.

The written recommendations of the Review Committee Chair and AUH must include a justification of their conclusions. The recommendations must be submitted to the Dean by November 15, and a copy of both recommendations must concurrently be provided to the faculty member. After the dean has received both the Review Committee and AUH recommendations, the Dean will provide a copy of the Review Committee's recommendation to the AUH and a copy of the AUH recommendation to the Review Committee Chair (*see Faculty Handbook section III.E.6.b[5]*).

For Tenure and Promotion processes and timelines related to the Offices of the CHBS Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Visitors see Faculty Handbook sections III.E.6.b(6) through III.E.6.b(9).

5.2.c Tenure and Promotion Decision Appeals

In any appeal permitted by Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.6.b.(9) or Section III.E.7.f.(9), the faculty member must submit a written notice of appeal to the Faculty Appeals Committee within 30 days setting forth the grounds for the appeal and a summary of the arguments and evidence they intend to present at a hearing. Upon receipt of an appeal, the chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee must promptly send an acknowledgment of the receipt to the faculty member and must notify the President, Provost, Dean, and AUH. If an appeal is filed, the provost must appoint a person to serve as the respondent, representing the administration in the appeal process. (for appeals processes and timelines related to the Faculty Appeals Committee, Offices of the CHBS Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Visitors see Faculty Handbook sections III.E.6.b[11] through III.E.6.b[12] and section III.E.7.f.[9] through III.E.7.f.[12]).

5.2.d Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Criteria

Evaluative criteria outlined in sections 5.1a-5.1c are also used for Tenure and Promotion evaluations. While the Department of Kinesiology uses a standard set of evaluative criteria for both yearly and cumulative (Promotion and Tenure) evaluations, it should be noted that the evaluation for promotion and/or tenure for

each section will not necessarily be made by averaging annual scores. For example, averaging a “3.5” for annual reviews in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications over the period of time evaluated for promotion and/or tenure does not ensure that the candidate will be deemed “Excellent” in that area. Several factors could raise or lower the evaluation when the years are looked at in the aggregate. Some examples include:

- while teaching evaluation scores may be low in early-career transition years if the faculty member demonstrates a reliable increase in teaching evaluations over time, the resulting cumulative score could be higher than the annual review score averages
- while credit in annual evaluations is given for papers submitted/in progress if only a small portion of this work is published over the cumulative period, the resulting cumulative score could be lower than if many of those projects were completed/published
- while credit in service is primarily dependent on the quantity of service accumulated, for ratings of Excellent, leadership-role breadth and depth will be considered but does not necessarily have to span the full promotion period
- While a score of 1.0 or “Needs Improvement” would be considered satisfactory in a single year, multiple ratings of “Needs Improvement” may represent unsatisfactory performance when considered over an entire evaluation period.

In addition to the scores, faculty members will provide a written narrative summarizing their breadth and depth of work in each of the three areas.

(note: evaluation ratings for Tenure and Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory)*

5.3 Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review

Mid-Tenure Review Process:

- Prior to the first day of classes of the spring semester of a faculty member’s third year, faculty will compile a dossier following the P&T guidelines (see Section 9) that reflects their first two and a half years of work.
- PAC members will evaluate the work and assign a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent for each of the three criteria (teaching, scholarship, service). Ratings are due to the AUH by February 15th.
 - These ratings will reference both how a faculty member is performing in regard to the annual performance criteria, but also the trajectory they are on in regard to criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- While consultation between PAC and the AUH is allowed, the AUH will conduct an independent review of all materials.

- The AUH will meet with the faculty member to distribute and discuss the assessment by March 15th.
- These reviews are submitted to the Dean as a matter of record.

5.4 Criteria for Early Promotion/Tenure

Under normal circumstances, faculty will submit materials for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in their 6th year on the faculty (i.e. after completion of 5 full years of service). There is a precedent for submitting promotion/tenure materials earlier than this time (e.g. in the 5th year, rather than the 6th). Similarly, it is possible for faculty to submit materials for promotion to Professor in their 5th year at the Associate Professor rank. However, early application for promotion/tenure is considered an exception reserved for those who have demonstrated exemplary performance. Information is provided below to clarify when consideration for early application for promotion and tenure may be appropriate. If a faculty member feels they are qualified to do so, they are encouraged to meet with the PAC committee and Department Chair prior to preparing detailed documentation, to ascertain whether their qualifications would be appropriate for consideration of early promotion/tenure.

Faculty are evaluated in three domains: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. As outlined in the JMU Faculty Handbook, faculty must be deemed to be "Excellent" in at least one of these domains, and "Satisfactory" in all other domains to obtain tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. To obtain promotion to Professor, faculty must be deemed to be "Excellent" in at least two domains, and "Satisfactory" in the remaining area. The Kinesiology Department currently evaluates annual performance of faculty using a 5-point scale (0 = Unsatisfactory, 1 = Needs Improvement, 2 = Meets Expectations, 3 = Exceeds Expectations, 4 = Exceptional). Levels 1 & 2 correspond to the "Satisfactory" rating described in the faculty handbook, while levels 3 & 4 correspond to "Excellent" ratings.

Faculty that clearly demonstrate compelling evidence for early promotion and/or tenure may apply prior to the penultimate year of their probationary period. To be considered for early application for promotion and tenure, faculty must demonstrate a level of performance that is distinctly superior to those who would meet promotion and tenure expectations during the traditional timeframe.

5.4.a Criteria for early consideration of tenure/promotion to Associate Professor

- At least one domain must be rated as "Exceptional" for the evaluation period (i.e. comparable to a rating of 4 in the annual evaluations¹).

- The other two domains must be rated as "Exceeding Expectations" (i.e. comparable to a rating of 3 in the annual evaluations).

(note: evaluation ratings for Tenure and Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory)*

5.4.b Criteria for early consideration of promotion to Full Professor

- At least two domains must be rated as "Exceptional" for the evaluation period (i.e. comparable to a rating of 4 in the annual evaluations²).
- The final domain must be rated as "Exceeds Expectations" or higher (i.e. comparable to a rating of 3 in the annual evaluations).

(note: evaluation ratings for Tenure and Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory)*

6 RENEWABLE TERM APPOINTMENT (RTA) PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND PROMOTION

RTA faculty members at JMU are assigned roles that are primarily teaching in nature, with appropriate duties in service and scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. These guidelines have been developed to reflect the innate teaching responsibilities of the role. While teaching is considered the primary role for these faculty members, they are expected to contribute to service needs, while also seeking continued professional development and/or scholarly achievement

6.1 Annual Performance Review Guidelines

The following outlines Department of Kinesiology policy and procedure information as it relates to the annual review process.

6.1.a Teaching Evaluation Criteria for Annual Reviews

The Department of Kinesiology regards teaching as the most important aspect of our professional responsibilities. Teaching involves instructional planning and assessment, including in-class and out-of-class activities (e.g., office meetings devoted to course tutoring).

(Minimum weight of 75%)

6.1.a.i Criteria for Teaching

1. Engage in instructional planning that provides students with clearly aligned course objectives, content, and evaluation metrics.
2. Maintain up-to-date professional knowledge.
3. Utilize a variety of instructional approaches and educational experiences to enhance learning.
4. Engage in culturally responsive teaching and equitable practices.
5. Create a positive learning environment.
6. Provide regular, meaningful feedback to students throughout the semester.
7. Communicate regularly and respectfully with students.

6.1.a.ii Sources of Evidence for Teaching

Faculty will submit evidence that documents accomplishment for each item they have selected on the Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#).

These sources of evidence may include, but are not required or limited to:

1. Course syllabi*
2. Evidence of engagement in activities related culturally responsive teaching and equitable practices*
3. Peer classroom observations
4. Examples of student work

5. Course materials (e.g., PowerPoint presentation, assignments & rubrics, assessments)
6. Continued professional development (on & off campus workshops)/ grants (support for continued professional growth)
7. Letters of support from professional peer and colleagues
8. Letters and comments from former and current students (clarify whether the items were solicited or unsolicited)
9. Course evaluations**

* indicates a required source of evidence in the annual dossier regardless if it is selected as an evaluation criterion

** indicates a required source of evidence in the annual dossier if it is self-selected as an evaluation criterion

6.1.a.iii Assessment Guidelines for Teaching

The Department of Kinesiology utilizes a rubric to help faculty identify and demonstrate areas of accomplishment in teaching. The Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#) offers faculty members the opportunity to demonstrate proficiency across multiple areas, including pathways that demonstrate teaching which meets or exceeds expectations. Criteria are presented in such a manner as to assume that a faculty member first establishes that they meet expectations, then continues to offer evidence to justify exceeding expectations if desired. If a faculty member has failed to meet expectations, they should continue to the sections for "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" benchmarks.

Meeting and exceeding expectations:

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - Utilizing the metrics detailed in the Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#), the faculty member has documented that they have completed at least 6 of the criteria for "Meets Expectations".

Exceeds expectations (excellent) - In addition to satisfying the requirements for "Meets Expectations", the faculty member has documented completion of at least 2 criteria from the "Exceeds Expectations" column. At least one of the two criteria must be from the teaching portion.

- Please note that certain domains (Student evaluations, Positive Learning Environment, and Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices) may not be used as a criterion for both meeting and exceeding expectations. Faculty must select at which level they wish to document any of these domains.

Exceptional (excellent) - In addition to satisfying the requirements for both "Meets Expectations" and "Exceeds Expectations", the faculty member has documented completion of at least 1 criterion from the "Exemplary" column.

- Please note that certain domains (Student evaluations, Positive Learning Environment, and Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices) may not be used as a repeated criterion for meeting or exceeding expectations and exemplary teaching. Faculty must select at which level they wish to document any of these domains.

Needs improvement (satisfactory) - Utilizing the metrics detailed in the Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#), the faculty member has documented that they have completed between 3 to 5 of the criteria for “Meets Expectations”, along with a written plan as to how they will work towards achieving at least 6 criteria in the following academic year.

Unsatisfactory* (unsatisfactory) - Utilizing the metrics detailed in the Kinesiology Annual [Evaluation Rubric](#), the faculty member has failed to document they have completed at least 3 the criteria for “Meets Expectations” or articulate any reasonable plan by which they will work towards achieving at least 6 criteria in the following academic year.

1. If this rating is continued from the previous semester, post-tenure review is required.
2. Operationally, this category is not employed before an individual has received a “needs improvement” rating in the teaching category on a previous annual evaluation within the last three years, regardless of rubric score. An unsatisfactory in teaching automatically triggers the post-tenure review process.

6.1.b Scholarly Achievements and/or Professional Qualifications Evaluation Criteria for Annual Reviews

RTA faculty in the Department of Kinesiology are expected to engage in continual professional development, as demonstrated through obtaining and maintaining professional qualifications that enhance their work within the Department of Kinesiology and/or engaging in scholarly work. (Minimum weight of 5%)

6.1.b.i Criteria for Scholarly Achievements and/or Professional Qualifications

- Pursuit of professional qualifications and/or development
 - Create and maintain an organized plan that:
 - Identifies potential areas for deepening professional practice and qualification within the faculty member’s discipline
 - Indicates tentative timeline for certifications or qualifications
 - Shows the potential to connect professional development to teaching and professional practice
 - Provides evidence of pursuit of professional development
- Pursuit of scholarly achievements
 - Create and maintain an organized plan that:

- Identifies the area of scholarly inquiry
- Highlights a systematic approach to answering questions within area of inquiry
- Shows the potential of the scholarship to contribute to the body of knowledge within the faculty member's discipline.
- Provide evidence of dissemination.

6.1.b.ii Sources of Evidence for Scholarly Achievements and/or Professional Qualifications

- Meaningful professional development and qualifications can include many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:
 - Pursuit and achievement of professional qualifications that enhance teaching or practice related to the field
 - Attending conferences and/or continuing education within the field
 - Coursework / study towards maintaining current, relevant certifications related to their professional practice
- Effective scholarly achievement and professional qualifications have many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:
 - Publication of original scholarship in quality peer-reviewed journals and other professional media (books, professional internet sites, etc.). Cite only with acceptance date not publication.
 - Presentation of original scholarship at professional conferences, workshops, etc.
 - Professional recognition of scholarly work (citations, awards, etc.).
 - External funding to support scholarship.
 - Internal grant funding
 - Editorial contributions to peer-reviewed journals and other professional media
 - Reports of progress. These reports indicate the progress made on a scholarly project during the assessment period. A report should be completed for each project still under progress.

6.1.b.iii Assessment Guidelines for Scholarly Achievements and/or Professional Qualifications

The faculty member may demonstrate meeting each of the guidelines through either professional qualifications or scholarly achievement or a combination of both:

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - The faculty member has met all of the following:

1. a demonstrated history of continuous involvement in scholarship/professional development,
2. an organized plan for scholarship/professional development

3. presented evidence of pursuing professional development/continuing education and/or scholarly work throughout the year

Exceeds expectations (excellent) - In addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member has done at least one of the following:

1. attended multiple opportunities and/or one multi-day opportunity for professional development and/or completed a professional qualification
2. made measurable progress towards development of / leadership of a professional development session
3. worked as a contributor to development of a manuscript intended for a peer-reviewed journal within the current academic year, and/or a proposal for funding

Exceptional (excellent) - In addition to exceeding expectations, the faculty member has done at least one of the following:

1. attended a high number of or a particularly in-depth professional development
2. lead a peer-reviewed professional development session
3. worked as a primary contributor towards development of a peer reviewed manuscript or successful funding proposal

Needs Improvement (satisfactory) - The faculty member has:

1. an organized plan for scholarship / professional development, but
2. not provided a history of continuous involvement in scholarship/professional development, or
3. not presented evidence of pursuing professional development or disseminating scholarly work.

Unsatisfactory (unsatisfactory) - The faculty member fails to:

1. provide an organized plan for professional development or scholarship, and
2. pursue professional development or contribute to scholarship during the evaluation period

(note: evaluation ratings for Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory)*

6.1.c Service Evaluation Criteria for Annual Reviews

The Department of Kinesiology requires that all faculty members make service contributions within the university and values service to the community and professional organizations. Service includes, but is not limited to: departmental program coordination; serving on search committees; mentoring and advising students; supervising students outside of a faculty member's assigned course load; other committees within the university; and service to community/

educational/ professional organizations. Committee and organizational leadership responsibilities are valued by the department. (Minimum weight of 10%)

The priority regarding service is that departmental needs are met. Therefore, faculty members, particularly senior faculty, may be asked to and are expected to serve essential needs should they arise.

Given that junior faculty members (both tenure-track and RTA) have additional loads in establishing themselves in teaching and scholarly achievements and professional qualification, the service expectations are adjusted for these faculty members. These adjustments are noted below:

- In the 1st – 3rd years at JMU, service expectations are reduced to 50% for each level of evaluation (as noted below).
- For the 4th – 6th years at JMU, service expectations are increased to 75% for each level of evaluation (as noted below).
- If a faculty member negotiates to bring in years of service upon hiring, those years will be counted here (e.g. if a faculty member is hired and negotiates counting 3 years of prior work towards tenure / promotion, they will be considered as being in their 4th year for their first year at JMU)

6.1.c.i Criteria for Service

1. Contribute to internal service requirements in an equitable fashion as needed by the department.
 - a. Internal service refers to department, college, and university level committee membership and/or leadership requirements. It also includes activities undertaken as part of one's role at JMU, e.g. acting as a representative of the university during university programs, center-related service work, etc.
2. Contribute to the larger community and / or profession.

6.1.c.ii Sources of Evidence for Service

Effective service has many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:

1. Committee minutes.
2. Reports or other work products.
3. Letters from chairs and/or colleagues.
4. Other documented evidence of community, educational, consultancies or professional service, including service related awards.

Criteria are presented in such a manner as to assume that a faculty member first establishes that they meet expectations, then continues to offer evidence to justify exceeding expectations if desired. If a faculty member has failed to meet expectations, they should continue to the sections for "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" benchmarks.

Benchmarks for internal service may be exempted for any given faculty member, upon agreement with the AUH, if that faculty member has taken a significant role in a professional organization or other service role. The faculty member and AUH should agree to the anticipated timeline and adjusted benchmarks in writing.

6.1.c.iii Assessment Guidelines for Service

Meets expectations (satisfactory) –

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year: at least 50 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year: at least 75 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond: at least 100 hours of service

Exceed expectations (excellent) –

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year:
 - at least 75 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership -or-
 - at least 100 hours of service overall
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year:
 - at least 112.5 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership -or-
 - at least 150 hours of service overall
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond:
 - at least 150 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership -or-
 - at least 200 hours of service overall

A reflection must be provided for the leadership component and should address the faculty member's own role, as well as the impact and/or productivity of the organization or committee.

Exceptional (excellent) –

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year:
 - at least 125 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year:
 - at least 187.5 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond:
 - at least 250 hours of service that includes at least one example of high-level leadership

A reflection must be provided for the leadership component and should address the faculty member's own role, as well as the impact and/or productivity of the organization or committee.

Needs Improvement (satisfactory) -

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year: at least 25, but less than 50 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year: at least 37.5, but less than 75 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond: at least 50, but less than 100 hours of service

Unsatisfactory (unsatisfactory) - Faculty member attains less than 50 hours of service.

- A faculty member in their 1st – 3rd year: less than 25 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 4th – 6th year: less than 37.5 hours of service
- A faculty member in their 7th year or beyond: less than 50 hours of service

(note: evaluation ratings for Promotion are collapsed into the three-category format in the following manner: ratings of 3.0-4.0 = Excellent, ratings of 1.0-2.9 = Satisfactory, ratings of 0.0-0.9 = Unsatisfactory)*

6.2 RTA Promotion Guidelines

The following outlines Department of Kinesiology policy and procedure information as it relates to promotion for RTA Faculty.

6.2.a RTA Promotion Timeline and Standards

Key policies from the Faculty Handbook:

The promotion of an instructional faculty member shall be determined by merit regardless of the distribution of faculty by academic rank within the academic unit. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for promotion. If a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, they must present compelling evidence of accomplishment to be awarded promotion.

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.(4) Senior Lecturer. An excellent rating in teaching and at least satisfactory ratings in the second and third areas are required for promotion to senior lecturer.

III.E.6.a.(5) Principal Lecturer. Excellent ratings in teaching and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to principal lecturer.

III.E.6.b. (1) The faculty member may apply for promotion, or the AUPAC or AUH may nominate a faculty member for promotion. Written nomination must be made by September 1. The faculty member shall be informed if the AUPAC or AUH has nominated the faculty member, and shall have the option to accept or decline the nomination without prejudice. The faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH and AUPAC by October 1. Failure by the faculty member to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments by the October 1 deadline shall constitute a refusal of a nomination or withdrawal of an application, and no consideration of promotion is required.

It should be noted that the evaluation for promotion for each section will not necessarily be made by averaging annual scores. For example, averaging a "3.5" for annual reviews in scholarship over the period of time evaluated for promotion and/or tenure does not ensure that the candidate will be deemed "Excellent" in that area. Several factors could raise or lower the evaluation when the years are looked at in the aggregate.

6.2.b RTA Promotion Evaluation Procedures

During the September Kinesiology Faculty opening meeting, committees are formed for tenure and promotion reviews of any eligible faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion during the upcoming academic year.

- For Promotion to Senior Lecturer – until the department has at least one Senior Lecturer on staff, all tenured faculty members are assigned to at least one related review committee, with one committee member serving as the Review Committee Chair (appointed by self-nomination, approval of review committee member, and majority vote). Once a faculty member achieves promotion, any Senior Lecturer would serve on the review committee.
- For Promotion to Principal Lecturer – until the department has at least one Principal Lecturer on staff, all fully promoted faculty members are assigned to at least one related review committee, with one committee member serving as the Review Committee Chair (appointed by self-nomination, approval of review committee member, and majority vote). Once a faculty member achieves promotion to Senior Lecturer, any Principal Lecturer would serve on the review committee.

The Review Committee procedure for evaluating RTAs for promotion are parallel to those discussed in section 5.2.b Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Procedures.

6.2.c RTA Promotion Decisions Appeals

Appeals procedures are parallel to those discussed in section 5.2.c Tenure and Promotion Decisions Appeals

6.2.d Promotion Evaluation Criteria

Evaluative criteria outlined in sections 6.1.a-6.1c are also used for Promotion evaluations. While the Department of Kinesiology uses a standard set of evaluative criteria for both yearly and cumulative (Promotion) evaluations, it should be noted that the evaluation for promotion for each section will not necessarily be made by averaging annual scores. For example, averaging a "3.5" for annual reviews in teaching over the period of time evaluated for promotion does not ensure that the candidate will be deemed "Excellent" in that area. Several factors could raise or lower the evaluation when the years are looked at in the aggregate. Some examples include:

- while teaching evaluation scores may be low in early-career transition years if the faculty member demonstrates a reliable increase in teaching evaluations over time, the resulting cumulative score could be higher than the annual review score averages
- while credit in annual evaluations is given for pursuing professional qualifications, if only a small portion of these endeavors are achieved over the cumulative period, the resulting cumulative score could be lower than if many of those professional qualifications/endeavors were completed/achieved.
- while credit in service is primarily dependent on the quantity of service accumulated, for ratings of Excellent, leadership-role breadth and depth will be considered but does not necessarily have to span the full promotion period
- While a score of 1.0 or "Needs Improvement" would be considered satisfactory in a single year, multiple ratings of "Needs Improvement" may represent unsatisfactory performance when considered over an entire evaluation period.

7 DEPARTMENT STANDING COMMITTEES

7.1 Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC)

7.1.a Responsibilities

The AUPAC primary responsibility is to represent the faculty in the faculty review process. PAC is responsible for reviewing faculty materials, assessing performance based on the criteria of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service and providing recommendations to the AUH.

Responsibilities include;

- Examining faculty annual review materials to provide recommendations to the AUH
- Submitting recommendations to the AUH for nominations for CHBS Faculty Awards
- Examining and assessing mid-tenure review materials
- Completing in-class observations upon request
- Reviewing criteria (Section 9) annually and drafting language for any updates / changes brought by PAC members or other faculty

In the case of reviewing applications for promotion and tenure, PAC is responsible for ensuring;

- Applications to Associate Professor are reviewed by all tenured faculty in the department
- Applications to Full professor are reviewed by all full professors in the department

Any faculty member on leave has the option to participate in the review process. Faculty members do not review immediate family members / partners.

7.1.b Membership

Voting Members

- The committee consists of 3 faculty who are at the rank of associate or full professor.
- At least one member teaches in the exercise science concentration and one member teaches in the physical and health education teacher education concentration.
- Individuals serve a 3-year term, with terms staggered so AUPAC is comprised of a 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year member (with the 3rd year member serving as AUPAC Chair).
- Previous members are eligible to serve successive terms.
- The call for nominations and voting for new AUPAC member approval(s) is included as an agenda item for the August department meeting. Self-nominations of eligible faculty are solicited and discussed. A "show of hands" vote to approve the new 1st year member and any additional AUPAC member

replacements is conducted during the August department meeting. All faculty are eligible to vote.

- If the situation where a voting member is unable or unwilling to complete their duties for the entire 3-year term:
 - AUPAC member must notify all AUPAC committee members and the AUH in writing of the situation
 - The AUH will appoint an eligible faculty member to either fill-in for that year or complete the term, as appropriate.

Non-Voting Members

- Up to one (1) faculty member at the lecturer or assistant professor level may serve for up to 1 year as a non-voting member
- Priority is given to faculty who plan to go up for promotion / tenure within the next 2 years
- Non-voting members are encouraged to view all dossiers and discuss strengths and weaknesses with the PAC chair
- Faculty interested in serving as a non-voting member must submit their name in writing to the PAC chair by September 1.
- Submission for non-voting members will be reviewed by PAC and selections are announced by October 1.

7.1.c Chair

The PAC chair will be the voting member who is serving in their 3rd year of their current term.

7.1.d Procedures for Annual Review

Annual Review Process (see timeline in 3.2.a):

- Individual PAC members review and score submitted materials.
- Using the performance criteria set in Sections 9&10, each PAC member scores and provides written justification teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.
- Individual scores and average scores are compiled by the PAC chair and submitted the AUH.
- PAC members do not score themselves or immediate family members / partners.

7.1.e Procedures for Award Nominations

Award Nomination Process:

- At the completion of the annual review process each voting PAC member will submit individual nominations for each award
- While recommendations are heavily weighted on the annual dossier, consideration may also be given to the whole body of work.
- PAC will meet (in person or virtually) to determine final nominations.
- Faculty members may be nominated for the same award in consecutive years.

- In any given year, no faculty member may be nominated for more than one award.

8 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY

All full-time faculty are expected to submit their annual dossier to the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) within one week of the last day of final exams in the spring semester.

8.1 Office Hours

Faculty are asked to have a standing commitment of at least three office hours per week. Office hours may be scheduled virtually (via zoom) however, it is recommended (and encouraged) that faculty include at least some office hours on campus. The dates and times of these hours should be consistent and should be posted outside of their office and effectively communicated to students in the syllabus.

Alternately, faculty may provide students with an electronic means for scheduling meetings (e.g. via JMU's CRM or a resource like Microsoft Bookings if the faculty member does not have access to the CRM), provided that they maintain regular availability on a weekly basis.

Each semester faculty are responsible for providing the department administrative assistant with a copy of their office hours and/or means of scheduling student meetings by the end of the first week of classes. Furthermore, faculty are expected to maintain a significant presence on campus. It is not acceptable to limit campus time to classroom instruction and office hours.

8.2 Contracted Time, Vacation, etc.

JMU has their own specific [policies for faculty leave](#). There is no annual leave time for 9 and 10-month faculty. In the event that a faculty member cannot cover a class, faculty need to report that to the department head via the Faculty Absence Form ([Appendix F](#)) and obtain appropriate coverage. An electronic copy of the Faculty Absence Form is located on the Kinesiology Department Canvas site. The preference for class coverage is a substitute facilitator/lecturer. If said coverage is not possible, then faculty may cover the course via on-line lectures or assignments, although these should be kept to a minimum. An academic year appointment includes the two weeks after graduation and the two weeks before the start of the academic year. Faculty are responsible for attending any meetings, retreats, etc. during this time.

8.3 Summer School

Requests for summer school classes go out during the spring semester. Faculty can request to teach any course in the catalog, however, there are minimum enrollment requirements for faculty to receive full pay. In the event that multiple faculty want to teach more sections than can be accommodated, the course(s) will

be allocated based on: 1) regular teaching assignment during the academic year, 2) equitable distribution of summer classes, and 3) seniority.

9 EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

JMU has an [emergency procedure summary](#). All faculty are expected to become familiar with signage and equipment available in case of emergency. In any event requiring evacuation of Godwin Hall, proceed to the parking lot nearest the bookstore so that all faculty and students can be accounted for.

9.1 Signage

Emergency procedures must be posted in all exercise and lab spaces overseen by the Department.

9.2 HPL Safety Training

Any faculty member or student conducting research or testing in the Human Performance Laboratory needs to complete safety training. The CHBS policies and all relevant forms can be found on the "Human Performance Lab" Tab on the Kinesiology Department Canvas Site. For any questions about training, contact the current Director of the Human Performance Lab.

9.3 Accident Report

In the event of an accident, please consult the [risk management website](#) for appropriate steps to handle the incident. All accidents and incidents (including near misses) must be reported using the Incident Report Form ([Appendix G](#)). An electronic version of the form is located on the Kinesiology Department Canvas Site. The Incident Report must be submitted to the Kinesiology Department Office within one (1) week of the incident.

10 TRAVEL

Faculty are allotted up to \$1,500 for travel to professional meetings. In any given year, the allotment for travel may be lower than this amount based on the department budget. If less than the amounts listed above, the AUH will announce the changes during a departmental meeting. To be eligible for travel funds, the faculty member either present at the meeting or mentor a student presentation. Faculty should be familiar with both the University and the Department Travel Guidelines. The Kinesiology travel guidelines are located on the Kinesiology Department Teams Site. The University Travel Policies can be found at <http://www.jmu.edu/financemanual/procedures/4215.shtml>.

10.1 Travel Pre-Approval

Faculty planning to travel must contact the Kinesiology Administrative Assistant (KIN AA) who will enter pre-approval authorization in Chrome River. Pre-approval must be authorized PRIOR to making any travel plans and purchases. This applies to both domestic and international travel. University Policy states that travel cannot be booked more than 180 days prior to departure. Travel expenses cannot be reimbursed if preapproval has not been received prior to the start of the conference.

10.2 Travel Reimbursement

It is important for faculty to discuss plans with the KIN AA prior to airline and registration.

10.2.a Air Travel

Airline tickets can be purchased using the Department Credit card held by the KIN AA. The University restricts the types of tickets that can be reimbursed, so be sure to talk with the KIN AA prior to purchase if you plan to purchase with your own card. An itemized receipt must be obtained at time of purchase and submitted with other receipts within 7 days of your return.

10.2.b Registration Fees

Registration fees can be purchased using the Department Credit card held by the KIN AA. Faculty are expected to register by the 'Early Bird' deadline whenever possible. If the faculty member pays for registration themselves, an itemized receipt must be obtained at time of purchase and submitted with other receipts within 7 days of your return.

10.2.c Remaining Travel Costs

All remaining travels costs must be purchased by the faculty member. Meals and Incidentals will be reimbursed based on the federally established per diem rates. All other purchases (hotel, tolls, baggage, etc.) require an itemized receipt. Within one week of return, all receipts must be submitted to the KIN AA.

11 PURCHASING EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

Priority for all purchases is given to eVA approved vendors. Purchases from non-eVA vendors require pre-approval prior to purchase. Therefore, it is extremely important for faculty to consult with either the Administrative Assistant or the Equipment Manager for equipment and/or supply needs.

11.1 Program Allotments

The amount will be announced at the start of the academic year. Program coordinators will be responsible for making decisions about how to use their respective allotment. Faculty wishing to spend money on supplies, instructional materials or other items should contact the respective coordinator/director.

11.2 Purchasing of Equipment and Supplies

For all equipment purchases, faculty need to submit an eVA Order form. A copy of the form can be found in [Appendix H](#) and a 'fillable' pdf version of the form can be downloaded from the Kinesiology Canvas Site. Forms need to be submitted to the Equipment Manager who will then consult with the Administrative Assistant and AUH to ensure sufficient funds are available. Once confirmed, the Equipment Manager will oversee the purchasing process.

12 PROCEDURE FOR KINESIOLOGY HANDBOOK AMENDMENTS

These policies and procedures may be amended when necessary, using the following procedure:

- Submit the proposed policy change electronically one week prior to monthly department meeting for inclusion on the agenda under new business.
- To consider proposed policy change, a quorum of 2/3 of the instructional faculty must be present at the meeting.
- The proposer will state the current policy and reads the proposed change policy and submit a motion to consider proposed policy.
- Call to second motion.
- Discussion not to exceed 15 minutes. At the end of 15 minutes proposer calls to vote or table the proposal.
 - Vote by show of hands.
 - Simple majority of quorum rules for decision.
 - In case of tie vote the motion fails

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FACULTY ANNUAL PLAN (FAP)

At the start of each academic year, faculty must fill out and submit the Faculty Annual Plan form to the AUH. Typically, this occurs in conjunction with the Fall annual meeting. The form can be downloaded from the Department Teams Page. Below is a copy of the first page of this form.



Faculty Annual Plan 2022-23

Name: _____

This document outlines a faculty member's planned distribution of teaching, scholarship and service activities for the upcoming academic year. It will be available for use in the annual evaluation process at the end of the year. This plan is a guide and should not keep a faculty member from using her/his judgment to make changes. However, it is requested that this form be updated if substantial changes are made.

Teaching

(List of planned activities)

% Assignment _____

List of courses to be taught this Academic Year (non-KIN 100)

Course (Number & Title)	Credit Hours	# sections			New Prep? (Y/N)
		Summer	Fall	Spring	

List of KIN 100 sections to be taught this Academic Year

Semester	# Activity Sections you will teach	# TA lab sections you will oversee	# TA's under your supervision	New Prep? (Y/N)
Fall				
Spring				
Summer				

List of Goals related to Teaching

(Note: at least 1 goal needs to be included related to DEI¹. Other areas might include, but are not limited to: (a) activities you will engage in to reduce deficiencies that were highlighted in last years' review, (b) modifications you plan to make to existing courses, (c) development of a new course, (d) independent studies, honors & masters theses, (e) doctoral dissertations you plan to mentor, (f) workshops you will attend, (g) etc.)

- 1.
- 2.

Academic Advising

(Describe advising duties and provide an approximate number of advisees)

¹ Kinesiology Diversity Goal: Review the IOTHER and identify a General Standard area to focus upon in your teaching for the year. Based on your specific standard(s) within that General Standard, consider 1 learning activity [Remember you will also have 2 departmental meetings focused on DEI that will count toward your 3 learning activities for the year] that you will participate in during the academic year. [Not reported here but for your consideration - - During the academic year, implement 1 to 3 action(s) into your teaching which you will report in your Dossier at the end of the academic year.]

APPENDIX B: FIRST YEAR EXPECTATIONS



New Faculty Mentorship Plan

The new faculty members will meet monthly with the Academic Unit Head (AUH) as a group in order to assist with her/his transition to the university and to answer any questions that may arise. In August, the Departmental Administrative Assistant will be setting up our meeting times. Below is the tentative outline for the information that will be covered during the monthly meetings with the AUH.

Month	Topic(s)
August <i>(prior to the start of classes)</i>	Kinesiology Department Policies and Procedures Accessing the N-Drive and Department Canvas Site Syllabus requirements (http://www.jmu.edu/syllabus/) JMU Bookmarks for your Browser My Madison Canvas (canvas.jmu.edu) Office hours Attendance Verification (Office of Financial Aid & Scholarship) Absence and Incident Report Forms Annual Planning Document & Meeting HPL Safety Training Semester Opening Meetings New Faculty Academy (https://www.jmu.edu/cfi/career-planning/orientations/new-faculty-academy.shtml) 2022-23 Academic Calendar (https://www.jmu.edu/registrar/wm_library/2019_2020_calendar.pdf)
September	Personal Webpage (http://www.jmu.edu/kinesiology/people/index.html) Traveling to a conference IRB Training (https://www.jmu.edu/researchintegrity/irb/irbtraining.shtml) Identifying a faculty mentor Title IX Training (completed online) Summer School Scheduling TAP (https://www.jmu.edu/cfi/teaching/teaching-consultations/taps.shtml) <i>(optional)</i> Peer Scheduling and AUH Classroom Observation <i>(required)</i>
October	IRB Protocol Submission Procedure (https://www.jmu.edu/researchintegrity/irb/irbsubmit.shtml) Ordering Textbooks for Spring Lynda.com (Linked In Learning) account Mid-Semester Grades (due Tuesday, October 18) Absences Faculty Performance Criteria for Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion Student Evaluations
November	First semester evaluation process Final Exams (December 10-16) Commencement
December	Undergraduate Grading System Final Grades (due by 3pm Monday, December 19)
January	First Semester Written Evaluation by AUH Review/Update of Annual Plan
February	Professional Dossier Outline
March	Annual Evaluation Guidelines
April	TBD
May	Annual Evaluation

APPENDIX C: ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Annual Evaluation Documents/Promotion and Tenure

1. Create a Canvas course (email letsupport@jmu.edu). In the email tell them you would like a canvas draft course and you would like it to be called 'your first and last name' (example Dolly Madison)
2. After your canvas course is created you will choose a home page (make sure the radio button for Modules is selected).
3. All documents will be on the home page.
 - a. Go to Settings, click the Navigation tab and drag and drop all of the items (except home) to hide them. Make sure to click Save when you are finished.
4. Create 4 modules
 - a. Module 1: Annual Documents (you will be uploading 4 files to this module)
 - i. Vita
 - ii. [Annual Plan](#) (FAP)
 - iii. [Dossier](#)
 - iv. [Evaluation Rubric](#) EXCEL file
 - b. Module 2: Teaching
 - c. Module 3: Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications
 - d. Module 4: Service
5. Create pages for Modules 2-4 (adjust year accordingly)
 - a. Teaching
 - i. Teaching Evals and Syllabi 2021-2022
 - ii. Teaching Supplementary Materials 2021-2022
 - iii. Teaching Eval Summary 2021-2022 (Full Professors only; these are the tables)
 - b. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications
 - i. Scholarship Documents 2021-2022
 - c. Service
 - i. Service Documents 2021-2022
 - d. Note on pages: Not intended to be redundant with dossier. May be left blank if no supporting documents are relevant to that area (primarily service) and you have already provided reflections in the dossier.
6. Headings for pages:
 - a. Teaching Evals and Syllabi:
 - i. Term (e.g. Summer 2022)
 1. Course (e.g. KIN 100)

- a. Syllabi
 - i. Link to syllabi
 - b. Evaluations
 - i. Link to evaluations
- b. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications (Taken straight from dossier)
 - i. Published works
 - 1. Published
 - 2. In review / submitted
 - ii. Published Abstracts
 - iii. Grants Received / In Progress
 - iv. Grants Proposals Submitted and Not Received
 - v. Manuscript in Preparation

APPENDIX D: CHBS PROFESSIONAL DOSSIER OUTLINE

A Word version of this dossier can be downloaded from the Kinesiology Department Teams site.



Professional Dossier Outline

The College of Health and Behavioral Studies Professional Dossier Outline is to be used as a guide in organizing materials submitted for application for tenure and/or promotion. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must complete the College Dossier. By adhering to this uniform outline, candidates achieve a comprehensive submission as they provide the evidence that is required to address all department policies and criteria relating to tenure and/or promotion.

Please refer to department standards and criteria developed by the candidate's home department.

I. Personal Data

II. Distribution of Activity

- A. Teaching
- B. Research and Scholarship
- C. Service

III. Teaching

- A. Self-reflective Evaluation
- B. Teaching
- C. Evidence of Quality in Teaching
- D. Advising Load
- E. Advising Evaluations and Awards
- F. Other Supporting Data

IV. Research and Scholarship

- A. Self-reflective Evaluation
- B. Achievements
 - 1. Research
 - a. Research completed
 - b. Research in progress
 - 2. Publications
 - a. Published works
 - b. Manuscripts submitted or in press
 - 3. Presentations
 - 4. Grant/Contract Proposals
 - a. External
 - b. Internal (JMU)
 - 5. Scholarship related to Professional Practice or Performance
- C. Professional Qualifications and/or Development
 - 1. Education
 - 2. Awards, Professional Licensure

- 3. Continued Professional Development
- 4. Professional Practice
- D. Evidence of Quality in Scholarship

V. Service

- A. Self-reflective Evaluation
- B. Professional Organizations
 - 1. Membership
 - 2. Service to Organizations
 - 3. Organizational Recognitions
- C. Faculty Service
 - 1. Departmental
 - 2. College
 - 3. University
- D. Off-Campus Related Service
 - 1. Workshops, conferences, institutes, and symposia
 - 2. Consultancies
 - 3. Residencies, such as visiting scholar
 - 4. Contracts with other agencies
 - 5. Professional Community Service
 - 6. Other
- E. Other Supporting Data
- F. Evidence of Quality in Service

VI. Appendices

APPENDIX E: EVALUATION RUBRIC TEMPLATE

Faculty (both TT and RTA) need to utilize the Evaluation Rubric to document Teaching, Scholarship/Professional Qualifications and Service. A copy of your completed EXCEL file (Updated Evaluation Rubric Template.xls) must be uploaded to your Canvas site as part of the Annual Evaluation process. The most updated evaluation rubric may be found in the Kinesiology Department Teams Page.

Below are snapshots of each of the rubrics located in separate worksheets in the EXCEL File.

Teaching

Performance Standard	0 Does not meet expectations /Attains fewer than 3 of the "Meets Expectations Criteria"	1 Needs improvement Attains 3 to 5 of the "Meets Expectation" criteria	2 Meets expectations Attains 6 or more of the following	3 Exceeds expectations Attains "Meets expectations", plus 2 or more of the following	4 Exemplary Attains "Exceeds expectations" and 1 or more of the following
Student Evaluations			75% or more of students indicate that the overall quality of the instructor is at the 4 or 5 on at least 13/17 of the rating items	85% or more of students indicate that the overall quality of the instructor is at the 4 or 5 on at least 13/17 of the rating items	95% or more of students indicate that the overall quality of the instructor is at the 4 or 5 on at least 13/17 of the rating items
Positive Learning Environment			Provides regular opportunities for students to interact with each other and with the faculty member during class time and experience success around course content.	Provides regular opportunities for students to interact with each other and with the faculty member during class time with explicit scaffolding, direction on productive engagement with their course mates, and standards that create a welcoming and safe course environment.	Provides specific course activities that engage students in conversation around difficult topics, provides opportunity for peer leadership, and/or significant opportunities to build rapport amongst and with students.
Professional Knowledge			Engages in active review/revision of teaching, self-reflection of teaching	Documented evidence of incorporating new research into course materials (e.g. new ACSM guidelines, VA SOLs, etc.)	
Instructional Planning			Syllabus reflects a well thought-out course based on up-to-date content	Prepares a documented significant course redesign or new course prep (of existing course)	Prepares a new course from the ground up and shepherds through course approval process
			Course objectives, teaching/learning activities, and assessment methods are aligned	Makes significant changes and improvements to a course to increase effectiveness (e.g., infusion of technology, use of clicker technology, flipping a face-to-face class, changing instruction to accommodate course size increases)	Leads or plays major role in program or school-related initiative in teaching, (e.g., curriculum revision, course consolidation or course renewal tied to program development or improvement)
Assessment of student learning			Teaching/learning activities and assessment methods promote student understanding and the ability to apply content and solve problems as evidenced by teaching evaluations or via submission of evidence and discussion of assignments	Provides evidence of peer input on teaching (e.g., observation of a class; peer review of course materials, including online courses) and indicates changes made as a result	
			Participates in program and/or school initiatives to assess student outcomes and/or instructional impacts	Plays significant role in revisions to departmental or college-level efforts to revise or update assessment of student outcomes or instructional impacts	Leads or plays major role in developing assessments of student outcomes and instructional impacts (e.g., collaboration with CARS, leads program assessment re-design)
			Provides basic formal and informal feedback to students regarding learning goals as evidenced in evals or through other sources of evidence	Provides intensive, in-depth formal feedback to students regarding learning goals, including written and in person in ways that directly support the learning objectives of the course	
		Provides feedback to students regarding lab-based, clinical, field-based, or education experiences via direct supervision	Provides evidence for implementing a sustained intensive, high quality coaching and supervision experience for student(s) teaching courses, masters student TAs and masters students engaged in clinical/counseling training experiences (moved from advising)		
Dedication to Pedagogical Development			Participates in professional development related to teaching (e.g. attends on-line training, conference, or workshop)	Prepares and presents evidence-based sessions related to improving teaching (e.g., May Symposium)	Leads internal professional development or structured mentorship at the program, department, college, or university level related to teaching (e.g., Serve as CFI Associate)
Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	*Required		Identify at least one action from the Inclusive Teaching Higher Education Rubric (IHER), complete and document training, and document how this was implemented in the classroom	Implement/document 3 or more actions from the IHER (and/or attend and participate in an intensive (e.g. semester or year-long) training in a matter related to DEI)	Leads internal professional development at the department, college, or university level related to teaching (e.g., leading college-wide DEI initiatives)
High-Impact Teaching Practices			Provides documentation of at least one high-impact teaching practice in each course - not already accounted for above (https://www.aacu.org/node/4084)	Provides impact of two or more high-impact teaching practices in each course - not already accounted for above (https://www.aacu.org/node/4084)	Shows exceptional creativity in the way the course is taught with quantifiable feedback / evidence of implementation (uses innovative activities or assessments that improve learning, e.g. including innovative high impact learning strategies)

Template for Providing Quantitative Scores from the Student Evaluation of Teaching

		Percentage of students that scored a 4 or 5							Proportion 4+5 (each class weighted equally)	Proportion 4+5 (each student weighted equally)
Total number of valid responses		86	15	13	68	46	7			
Course Related		Rating	Course A	Course B	Course C	Course D	Course E	Course F		
C-1	The syllabus provided clear and reasonable expectations and requirements.	Strongly Agree	12	3	10	7	11	2	89.6%	87.7%
		Agree	55	9	2	60	30	5		
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	77.9%	80.0%	92.3%	98.5%	89.1%	100.0%		
C-2	The course objectives and policies were adhered to throughout the semester.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
C-3	The assignments were clear and increased my understanding of the course content.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
C-4	The evaluations and exams covered the course content.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
C-5	The course was intellectually challenging.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
C-6	Overall I rate this course:	Excellent							0.0%	0.0%
		Above Average								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Instructor Related			Course A	Course B	Course C	Course D	Course E	Course F	Proportion 4+5 (each class weighted equally)	Proportion 4+5 (each student weighted equally)
I-1	The instructor was prepared and presented the course content in a well-organized manner.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-2	The instructor was stimulating and enthusiastic.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-3	The instructor graded assignments and exams were reviewed in a timely manner.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-4	The instructor was approachable and respectful toward the students.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-5	The instructor presented the course content using a variety of teaching approaches.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-6	The instructor provided clear and understandable explanations and examples.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-7	The instructor was responsive to student questions and comments.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-8	The instructor was prompt in meeting and dismissing class.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-9	The instructor seemed interested in teaching and helping me learn.	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-10	The instructor was available to students outside the class room (may include both face-to-face and electronic communication).	Strongly Agree							0.0%	0.0%
		Agree								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
I-11	Overall, I rate this instructor:	Excellent							0.0%	0.0%
		Above Average								
		Total	86	15	13	68	46	7		
		Percentage 4+5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		

Scholarship/Professional Qualifications for Tenure Track Faculty

0	1	2	3	4
Does not meet expectations	Needs Improvement	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Exemplary
<i>Fails to attain the following:</i>	<i>Has an organized plan for scholarship, but has:</i>	<i>Attains each of the following:</i>	<i>In addition to meeting expectations, at least one of the following:</i>	<i>In addition to exceeding expectations, at least one of the following:</i>
Provided an organized plan for scholarship	Not provided a history of continuous involvement in scholarship	A demonstrated history of continuous involvement in scholarship	Worked as a primary contributor to a manuscript published in a peer-reviewed journal within the current academic year	Published a peer-reviewed manuscript that is of exceptional quality
Contributed to scholarship during the evaluation period	Not presented evidence of disseminating scholarly work	An organized plan for scholarship	Made significant progress, as judged by PAC, toward fulfilling the annual goals for disseminating peer-reviewed scholarship and/or securing external funding (e.g. the faculty member may have submitted two or more manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals; the faculty member has delivered multiple notable talks at established national meetings)	Published multiple peer-reviewed manuscripts within the current academic year
		Presented evidence of disseminating scholarly work and/or securing funding for scholarship within current academic year.		Secured external funding to support scholarship that can be broadly disseminated
		In order to meet expectations, presentations and publications must be disseminated through professional media, but do not need to be peer-reviewed.		

Scholarship/Professional Qualifications for RTA Faculty

0	1	2	3	4
Does not meet expectations	Needs Improvement	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Exemplary
<i>Fails to:</i>	<i>Has an organized plan for scholarship / professional development, but has:</i>	<i>Attains all of the following:</i>	<i>In addition to meeting expectations, at least one of the following:</i>	<i>In addition to exceeding expectations, at least one of the following:</i>
Provide an organized plan for professional development or scholarship.	not provided a history of continuous involvement in scholarship/professional development	A demonstrated history of continuous involvement in scholarship / professional development	Attended multiple opportunities and/or one multi-day opportunity for professional development and/or completed a professional qualification	Attended a high number of or a particularly in-depth professional development
Pursue professional development or contribute to scholarship during the evaluation period	not presented evidence of pursuing professional development or disseminating scholarly work	An organized plan for scholarship / professional development	Made measurable progress towards development of / leadership of a professional development session	Lead a peer-reviewed professional development session
		Presented evidence of pursuing professional development/continuing education and/or scholarly work throughout the year	Worked as a contributor to development of a manuscript intended for a peer-reviewed journal within the current academic year, and/or a proposal for funding	Worked as a primary contributor towards development of a peer-reviewed manuscript or successful funding proposal

Service

	0	1	2	3	4
	Does not meet expectations	Needs Improvement	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Exemplary
1st - 3rd year at JMU (50% reduction in expectations)	Consistent pattern of service that falls below 24 hours	Attains 25-49 hours of service	Attains at least 50 hours	Attains 75 hours and at least 1 example of high-level leadership or at least 100 hours of service overall	Attains 125 hours and at least 1 example of high-level leadership
4th - 6th year at JMU (75% reduction in expectations)	Consistent pattern of service that falls below 37.5 hours	Attains 38-74 hours of service	Attains at least 75 hours	Attains 112.5 hours and at least 1 example of high-level leadership or at least 150 hours of service overall	Attains 187.5 hours and at least 1 example of high-level leadership
7+ years at JMU	Consistent pattern of service that falls below 49 hours	Attains 50-99 hours of service	Attains at least 100 hours	Attains 150 hours and at least 1 example of high-level leadership or at least 200 hours of service overall	Attains 250 hours and at least 1 example of high-level leadership

Template for Summarizing Service Activities

University Service					
Service Assignment	Assignment Dates	Description	Time commitment breakdown	Significant Leadership Component (Y/N)	Estimated annual time commitment (hours)
Total University Service					0
External Service					
Service Assignment	Assignment Dates	Description	Time commitment breakdown	Significant Leadership Component (Y/N)	Estimated annual time commitment (hours)
Total External Service					0

GUIDELINES FOR DOCUMENTING SERVICE

The complete set of guidelines and the EXCEL file used for documentation can be downloaded from the Kinesiology Department Teams page. The images below display the first page of the guidelines and a portion of the EXCEL file that you will use to summarize your service.

Documenting service to the University and to external organizations:

- **Overview:**
 - Similar to the summary tables presented in teaching, we are asking faculty to compile all service activities within summary tables that make it easier to understand contributions and time commitments for each assignment.
 - This does not replace the self-reflective evaluation, which allows faculty to share specific improvements / innovations they've made in their respective roles this specific academic year.
- **Reflections outside the table:**
 - Faculty are welcome to provide further reflection and depth on any activity they list. However, faculty are specifically asked to provide further reflection on specific activities in addition to the table, as outlined below.
 - **High hour activities:**
 - Any activity in which the faculty engages for more than **40 hours per year** should have a further reflection component.
 - **Leadership activities:**
 - If this activity is being counted as a leadership opportunity, please provide further reflection as to your leadership role in this activity.
- **University vs. External Service:**
 - There are two tables: one for service within JMU and one for external service
 - The University table includes all service in an official JMU capacity, including at the Departmental, College, University, or other capacity
 - Examples:
 - Committee service
 - Directing JMU undergraduate or graduate programs, centers, labs, etc.
 - Volunteering for programs put on by JMU, e.g. commencement, Choices, Valley Scholars Day, Orientation, etc.
 - Coordinating events directly serving students or faculty at JMU
 - The external service table includes all service directly related to your work at JMU and the

APPENDIX F: SAMPLE FACULTY ABSENCE FORM

The WORD document of this form can be downloaded from the Department Teams site.



Faculty Absence Form

Unit Policy: In case of faculty absence, it is the faculty member's responsibility to find a qualified substitute. Classes should not be cancelled. If a qualified substitute cannot be found you need to discuss the matter with the department head (568-6145).

Faculty member's name _____ requests to be absent/change mode of delivery from classes and/or meetings

From _____ to _____ for the following reason(s):

In emergency I can be contacted at: _____

Date	Class	Time	Person Covering / Change to Zoom

TO SUBMIT THIS FORM, you can either email it to Kara *and* me OR you can give a hard copy to Kara or me. This form needs to be filled out in advance of the date that you will not be in class.

Signature-Faculty Member (can be electronic)

Date

Signature-Department Head

Date

Last Revised: 9/2/2021

APPENDIX G: SAMPLE INCIDENT REPORT FORM

The WORD document of this form can be downloaded from the Department Teams site.



James Madison University
Incident Report

Date and time of incident: _____ Location: _____

Person involved: _____ Contact info (Phone/email) _____ / _____

Please select: Employee Student Visitor Non-employee

Person reporting: _____ Contact info (Phone/email) _____ / _____

Witnesses: _____

Incident Type: _____

Describe the incident and corrective actions below (use additional pages if necessary)

Detailed incident description:

Immediate corrective actions:

Long-term corrective actions:

Academic Unit Head signature: _____

For should be submitted to the Kinesiology Office within one (1) week of incident.

Forward to: Kinesiology 261 Bluestone Drive, MSC 2302, Harrisonburg, Virginia, 22807
Office, Kara Hill, Godwin 331 (540) 568-6145, FAX: (540) 568-3338, hill2kn@jmu.edu; www.jmu.edu/kinesiology

APPENDIX H: SAMPLE EVA ORDER FORM FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

The pdf version of this form (this is a 'fillable' form) can be downloaded from the Kinesiology Department Teams site.



E-VA ORDER FORM

Please Provide the Following Information for All Orders

Vendor/Supplier			
Name:		Contact:	
Address:		Phone:	
City, ST Zip:		Fax:	
Tax ID:		Email:	

Has JMU ordered from Vendor before? Yes No Not Sure

Description/Model Number	Item Number	Quantity	Unit Price	Amount
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
			\$	\$
*If You have obtained a quote, please attach to this form.			Shipping	\$
			Total	\$

Submitted by :	Date: 2-28-20
-----------------------	----------------------

Note: JMU is Tax Exempt. Orders will NOT be processed with tax is charged.