

School of Communication Studies

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2025



Personnel Guidelines for the School of Communication Studies

Prepared by the AUPAC April 2024
(Approved by SCOM faculty on 4/26/2024)

Section One

AUPAC



Section One
Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC)
Bylaws and Guidelines
(Revised and approved by faculty April 2024)

I. The Purpose of the AUPAC

The Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) of the School of Communication Studies (SCOM) is a composite of elected peer advisory bodies, accountable to both the faculty of the School and the administration regarding the development and assessment of faculty qualifications and the maintenance of standards regarding performance of the School's faculty.

In accordance with the JMU Faculty Handbook, the AUPAC advises the Academic Unit Head (AUH) on matters of personnel and assists faculty on matters of their academic development.

In the School of Communication Studies, AUPAC duties include:

- A. Communicating with faculty and administration about the manner in which faculty can meet evaluation criteria in areas of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and professional service;
- B. Assessing the suitability of criteria and evidence used to evaluate faculty performance and qualifications;
- C. Forwarding AUPAC recommendations for faculty tenure and/or promotion to the appropriate administrator (e.g., AUH, dean);
- D. When requested by a faculty member or the AUH, providing feedback on performance as evidenced in areas of teaching, scholarly achievements and professional qualifications, and professional service;
- E. Assisting faculty in the development and achievement of academic goals that promote successful and rewarding participation in the academic culture of the School;
- F. Facilitating the process of faculty appeals of annual evaluations;

- G. Nominating faculty for College and University-level awards for which a letter from the AUPAC is required.

The AUPAC is not charged with making decisions regarding merit.

To accomplish these functions and goals, the AUPAC may be comprised of several sub-committees, including the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTAC).

II. Membership of the AUPAC

The AUPAC is comprised of nine elected members of the SCOM faculty: one lecturer, one assistant professor, three associate professors, three professors, and one associate or full professor. Members of the AUPAC serve terms of two years. Once a member has served their two-year term, they are not eligible to serve again for a two-year period¹. Members of the AUPAC are to be faculty in “good standing.” To be in good standing is to have the previous annual performance evaluation from the AUH be at least “Satisfactory” in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and professional service. Any member during formal review for remediation for having failed to meet minimum criteria for annual performance will not be allowed to participate in evaluation of faculty seeking tenure and promotion.

- A. The AUH will identify all faculty who are eligible to be put on the ballot for election to AUPAC. Any faculty member who is eligible will be added to the ballot. SCOM faculty will vote on those listed, and this vote will determine who will serve on the AUPAC. This voting will occur at the end of the spring semester (for the following year’s AUPAC membership). All tenured, tenure-track, and RTA faculty are eligible to vote on this ballot.
- B. The chair of the AUPAC will be a member of the tenured faculty and will serve a one-year term as chair. The vice-chair will be a member of the tenured faculty and will serve a one-year term as vice-chair before taking on the role of chair in their next year of service to the AUPAC. The vice-chair will be elected using the school’s processes for elected committee chairs. This election will be held at the end of the Spring semester. The chair of the AUPAC will oversee processes for mid-point, tenure, and promotion reviews, and the delegation of other tasks to subcommittees as needed; the vice-chair will oversee processes for award nominations and submissions.
- C. Committee membership in the AUPAC entails regular and timely participation in all AUPAC committee activities. Members of the AUPAC may be recommended for removal for the

¹This two-year period of ineligibility may be shortened or eliminated when there are not enough eligible members of the faculty to be presented on the ballot to fully populate the AUPAC.

remainder of a particular academic year for a pattern of non-contribution. It is the responsibility of the AUPAC Chair to conduct a meeting of the AUPAC to discuss whether a committee member should be removed and if 75% of the AUPAC so decide, the AUPAC Chair presents the Committee's recommendation to the AUH regarding the removal of the member(s) from further deliberations of the AUPAC.

1. The non-contributing member, scheduled for removal, may appeal to the AUPAC within 10 business days of notification within a nine-month contract schedule to reverse the recommendation for removal for the balance of the particular academic year. In cases of appeals, the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) will serve as the body to hear the case. The AUPAC Chair will forward the non-contributing member's statement to the FAC Chair as well as a statement from the AUPAC that describes the grounds for removal.
 2. To file an appeal, members must first present their case in writing to the AUPAC before a removal appeals hearing can be scheduled. The FAC must vote to uphold the appeal of the member scheduled for removal from the AUPAC with a 2/3 majority.
 3. If a hearing regarding non-removal is scheduled, the FAC decision must be supported by a 2/3-majority vote.
- D. Committee members must recuse themselves from participation in AUPAC deliberations when there is a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest is described in the JMU Faculty Handbook, Section III.A.5.
- E. Members of the AUPAC who are on leave for 12 weeks or more during their appointment to the committee will be replaced by someone of the same rank via an election.

III. Responsibilities of the AUPAC

- A. A subcommittee of the AUPAC, composed of five members of the faculty, will constitute the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC). The duties of the PTAC regarding evaluation of faculty materials for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure are outlined in Section Two.
- B. An individual faculty member may request optional advisory feedback from the AUPAC in accordance with the timelines and guidelines presented in this document. The AUPAC may

also give feedback to an individual faculty member as requested by the AUH in accordance with the timelines and guidelines presented in this document.

C. The AUPAC may make changes to this evaluation and governance document and bring those changes to the faculty for a formal vote of a simple majority (at any point during the academic year). The changes will be enacted and recorded in the document after the formal vote from faculty to approve the changes. The Provost, Dean, AUH, and Faculty may suggest changes to the document and ask the AUPAC to consider these changes. To make changes to the AUPAC documents, the changes will need approval from the faculty and AUH, the dean, and then the provost.

D. The AUPAC will facilitate processes for faculty appealing the Annual Evaluation performed by the AUH.

As per the JMU Faculty Handbook, the AUPAC is responsible for developing a faculty process for appealing faculty evaluations other than that of requests for promotion and/or tenure. The Faculty Handbook does not specify the nature of the process. What follows is set procedures and bylaws recommended by the AUPAC for faculty appeal as a formal process.

1. If a faculty member disagrees with the content of the written Annual Evaluation by the AUH, the concluding assessment for each of the areas of performance, or the overall evaluation of performance, they should first bring their concerns to the AUH in an Evaluation Conference. The faculty member should describe the grounds for their concerns at the meeting as well as bring additional evidence that would support their case. The faculty member and AUH should then work cooperatively toward some resolution to the dispute.
2. If a satisfactory resolution is not reached at the Evaluation Conference and the Final Annual Evaluation letter is still under dispute by the faculty member, the faculty member has seven business days² to file an appeal with the AUPAC. The written Letter of Appeal should include:
 - a. A statement articulating those parts of the written evaluation that are being appealed and a description of those forms of evidence that are provided to support the appeal.

² A business day is considered any consecutive day during which the faculty member is under contract. No appeals will be heard during the period between May 20 and August 15. That period will be considered to be one business day for the purposes of an appeal. The Appeals Committee will only convene during the academic year during which faculty are contracted.

- b. A statement describing which path the faculty member would like to take in pursuing the appeal (See below, Item 4. Options for Appealing).
- c. Evidence in the form of documents that the faculty member intends to rely upon shall be attached to the request for a hearing, submitted to the AUPAC, and may include, but is not limited to, the faculty member's personnel records, recommendations from the AUPAC, AUH or dean, and any other records appropriate to provide substantiation of the faculty member's arguments.

3. Appeals Committee

The AUPAC serves as the Appeals Committee to review the submitted Letter of Appeal and evidence to determine if pursuant action is warranted. The committee will decide by majority vote whether an appeal will be considered. The AUPAC will only consider documentation related to that which is being appealed. The primary criteria for determining the legitimacy of the appeal is evidence that (1) the faculty member and AUH made a good faith effort to follow the procedures toward resolution, (2) the faculty member adhered to the guidelines for timely submission of the Letter of Appeal, (3) the faculty member included all relevant materials in their Letter of Appeal, and (4) a resolution was not previously agreed upon by the faculty member and the AUH. The AUPAC will not render judgment on whether the appeal is warranted based on their evaluation of the appeal as reasonable or on the likelihood that a pursuant committee will be able to render assistance or a judgment. The chair of the AUPAC will notify the faculty member of their decision.

4. Options for Appealing

In the Letter of Appeal, the faculty member should articulate which path they would like to follow in pursuing an appeal: (1) a facilitated conversation or (2) a hearing.

a. Facilitated Conversation

The faculty member can seek to have their appeal addressed through conversation facilitated by two trained facilitators supplied by the JMU Office of Human Resources. The conversation would occur between the faculty member, the AUH, and the trained facilitators. The chair of the AUPAC is responsible for contacting the Office of Human Resources, requesting the participation of two trained facilitators, and arranging the time and location for the facilitated conversation. Members of AUPAC are prohibited from being present at the facilitated conversation.

i. A facilitated conversation typically includes four phases:

1. Introduction to the process, the ground rules, and the role of the facilitators
2. Defining and clarifying the issues

3. Answering questions and solving problems

4. Implementing solutions

- ii. The outcomes of the facilitated conversation could include: (1) better understanding of the two parties' positions, (2) an oral agreement, and/or (3) a written agreement. Both parties, the AUH and the faculty member, must agree as to whether any written agreements are binding or non-binding.
- iii. If the outcome of the facilitated conversation is deemed unsatisfactory for the faculty member, the faculty member may continue their appeal and request to present their case before a Hearing Committee.

b. Hearing

The faculty member can seek to have their appeal addressed through a hearing body at the outset of the appeal or after a facilitated conversation. The faculty member will be given an opportunity to present their case, including the presentation of relevant evidence, at the hearing and answer any questions by the Hearing Committee. The hearing is open unless the faculty member requests it be closed. Deliberations of the Hearing Committee are closed and a decision to dismiss or uphold the appeal will be determined by majority vote. A letter describing the decision will be written to the faculty member, the AUH, and the dean. The dean determines the resolution for the appeal informed by the recommendation of the Hearing Committee.

- i. The Hearing Committee will be composed of five people via random selection of the entire faculty, apart from those members currently serving on the AUPAC. A Hearing Committee is not a standing committee and will be newly composed for each appeal under consideration.
- ii. The faculty member may ask the AUPAC that a member of the Hearing Committee be removed for conflicts of interest at the time the Hearing Committee is composed.
- iii. Each Hearing Committee will elect a chair. The chair will be responsible for arranging the hearing, overseeing the hearing process, and communicating the outcomes of the hearing with the faculty member, the AUH, and the dean.
- iv. In the case of conflict of interest, members appointed to the Hearing Committee may recuse themselves and ask another member be appointed in the case of conflict of interest.
- v. All members of the Hearing Committee must be present at the hearing. If a member of the Hearing Committee cannot attend the scheduled hearing, another faculty member will be selected as a member of the Hearing Committee. If a member of the Hearing Committee fails to attend the hearing, the hearing and deliberations will proceed without them unless the faculty member objects.

5. Timeline for Appeals
 - a. The AUH will forward preliminary Annual Evaluation letters to faculty between August 15 and October 1. If an Annual Evaluation letter is delivered to a faculty member during the summer months when the faculty member is not under contract, that faculty member will have seven business days to appeal starting on August 15.
 - b. The completed appeals process will take place any time after August 15 and no later than October 20. A decision made by the Hearing Committee must be forwarded to the dean prior to November 1 of that academic year.

- E. The AUPAC is required to participate in the remediation process for any tenured faculty member whose annual performance has been reviewed as “unsatisfactory” for two of the three most recent annual evaluations by the AUH. The Faculty Handbook outlines this process:
 1. The AUPAC and dean will be notified by the AUH of a recommended remediation.
 2. The AUPAC will review the tenured faculty member’s performance over the past three years and make an independent evaluation of whether their performance has been “unsatisfactory” or “satisfactory” overall. The AUPAC shall submit its written evaluation to the dean by November 30, with copies to the AUH and faculty member concurrently. The evaluation shall include a justification of the AUPAC’s conclusions, using the academic unit’s criteria. A conclusion that performance has been unsatisfactory must be supported by substantial evidence. (See JMU Faculty Handbook III.E.8.c.)
 3. The AUPAC will collaborate with the AUH in developing remediation plans. (See JMU Faculty Handbook III.e.8.g.)
 4. The AUPAC will provide an independent review of the faculty member’s completion of the remediation plan. (See JMU Faculty Handbook III.E.8.j.)

IV. First Contract Year Evaluation and Conference

- A. During the beginning of a new continuing contract faculty member’s second full semester, the AUH will provide an evaluation and set up a conference. The evaluation will include an observation of teaching (completed during their first semester), review of teaching materials (from their first semester), as well as review of research materials (from their first semester). The purpose of the conference is to discuss the evaluation and goal setting.

- B. In preparation for the conference, the faculty member should submit their FAR (Faculty Activity Report), FAP (Faculty Activity Plan), CV (curriculum vitae), and syllabi to the AUH.
- C. The AUPAC will not provide an evaluation for faculty in their first year, unless requested by the faculty member and/or the AUH.
- D. During the first year of their contract, faculty are expected to be “Acceptable” overall.

V. Guidelines for Annual Performance Evaluations³

A. Definition of Annual Performance Evaluation (APE)

The University requires a faculty member’s work performance be assessed and evaluated annually in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications, and professional service. Every full-time faculty member undergoes an annual evaluation and is responsible for understanding the University’s and the School’s guidelines pertaining to that annual evaluation.

The purpose of the APE is “to promote professionalism, to encourage performance at the highest levels and to indicate areas in which improvement is needed. Evaluations are also used in making personnel decisions, including the allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment and initiation of post-tenure review” (JMU Faculty Handbook III.E.).

Faculty members submit evidence of their work performance to the AUH annually in the form of an academic portfolio. The AUH’s assessment of the evidence includes both an evaluation of each of the areas (“Excellent,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory”) and an *overall* evaluation of a faculty member’s ongoing work performance (“Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory”), which is copied to the Dean.

The APE criteria are used primarily to determine annual salary increments and adjustments, if any, and are not directly linked to promotion and/or tenure decisions.

However, APEs are included and used in the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process. Promotion and tenure standards are different from those employed in the annual evaluation, and the APE has a different evaluative mission than the AUPAC’s evaluation that considers promotion and/or tenure requests. Even though the APEs are submitted as part of P&T process, the

³ The guidelines for performance evaluations set the criteria for the AUH annual evaluation of faculty. These guidelines also set parameters for the AUPAC to provide feedback, and for the sub-committees of the AUPAC to provide evaluations.

types of evidence accepted for the APE may be different than the types of evidence that meet P&T guidelines. For information on P&T criteria, see the School's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee Guidelines (Section Two).

B. Role of the AUPAC in Annual Evaluation Process

1. The AUPAC has no role in the Annual Evaluation Process.

C. Summary of Activities and Accomplishments

1. According to the JMU Faculty Handbook, "By the deadline established by the academic unit, each faculty member shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments during the previous 12 months in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH for review and evaluation purposes" (Section III.E.4.b).

D. Faculty Activity Plans

1. All members of the faculty are required to provide the AUH with an annual Faculty Activity Plan that includes general and specific goals for each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications, and professional service for the upcoming academic year.
2. "The relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service for an individual faculty member must be determined by the faculty member and the AUH prior to the start of the academic year. The agreement should be shared with the AUPAC. An academic unit may have standard relative weights for the three performance areas, which will apply if individual negotiations are not agreed upon by the faculty member and the AUH. The agreement on weights may be renegotiated during the year under appropriate circumstances" (JMU Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.4.a.).

VI. Annual Academic Portfolio Requirements

A. Contents of the Academic Portfolio

1. Faculty member must submit to the AUH:

- a. Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The FAR contains a report of faculty activities during the year under evaluation in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and professional service. Faculty members are responsible for demonstrating their achievements and progress in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and professional service
- b. Faculty Activity Plan (FAP). The FAP contains a report of proposed faculty activities during the year following the academic review in the areas of teaching, scholarship/professional development, and professional service
- c. Curriculum Vitae
- d. Previous APE letters from the AUH (three consecutive years)
- e. Quantitative and qualitative evaluations for each course taught
- f. Syllabus for each course taught

2. AUH Access

- a. AUH has access to grading distributions

B. Access to Academic Portfolios

1. When required by the bylaws, members of the AUPAC can assess faculty portfolios and are to maintain strict confidentiality regarding the content of their deliberations on all matters under consideration.
2. If needed, the School will provide members of the AUPAC access to these digital files for the duration of their appointment on the Committee.

VII. Materials for Optional Advisory AUPAC Feedback

- A. When requesting advisory feedback from the AUPAC, a faculty member has the option of including additional documentation to allow for a more thorough response. Additional evidence should be submitted in a portfolio along with required documents (VI.A.1.).
 1. For teaching, additional evidence might include: summary of classroom observation(s), sample exams, project assignments, lecture materials, advising materials, etc.
 2. For scholarship and professional qualifications , additional evidence might include copies of presentations, papers, journal articles, books, course and workshop materials, licensures, etc.

3. For service, additional evidence might include reports/documents produced by one's committees, documentation of committee participation, thank you letters, awards, evidence of additional advising, etc.

B. Provision of AUPAC Feedback

1. The AUPAC will produce a typed summary of advisory feedback for the faculty member in their teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications , and/or professional service. Faculty may request advisory feedback in one or more areas.
2. This document will not evaluate whether each category is excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.
3. This document will not be shared with the AUH.
4. The intent of this AUPAC feedback is to provide supportive guidance to faculty members, not evaluation.

VIII. Guidelines for Performance Evaluations³

"A factor in determining overall annual performance must be the relative weight associated with each of the areas of performance" (Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.). Per the Faculty Handbook, relative weights should be used only in overall evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory) not in evaluating each individual area (teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications , service). Standards for evaluating each of the individual areas follow in VIII.B.-D.

A faculty member receives a numerical score relative to the AUH evaluation of each performance area: three points for excellent, two for satisfactory, and zero for unsatisfactory. The overall evaluation of performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is determined by summing the weighted evaluation scores per area. To calculate overall evaluation score, multiply the relative weight by each area score and sum the total. A score of 2 or higher will receive a satisfactory overall evaluation. Scores below 2 will receive an unsatisfactory overall evaluation.

Details regarding how annual performance evaluations are used to make decisions and weight faculty comparatively for the purpose of awarding merit can be found in the School of Communication Studies Merit Policy document (approved 2/28/2014).

A. Evaluation of Teaching

Effective teaching in the School of Communication Studies involves developing students' understanding of communication processes, providing students with opportunities to develop communication skills, and fostering academically rigorous and positive learning environments that pursue the University's mission. Effective teaching performance is not restricted to the classroom, as it may include activities that develop positive mentoring and advising relationships, innovative curricula and academic programming, and leading co-curricular initiatives. Quantitative and qualitative student comments should only be one part of how faculty are evaluated on teaching. Process as well as outcome should be considered in the evaluation of faculty teaching.

Evidence of Teaching Performance

1. Faculty must provide evidence of teaching performance by submitting the following materials:

- Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
- Faculty Activity Plan (FAP)
- Quantitative student evaluations and qualitative student comments
- Grade distributions for classes taught
- Syllabi

Faculty members working toward promotion and/or tenure should also review criteria and guidelines by the School and College for securing promotion and tenure, particularly as those guidelines and criteria for evaluating teaching may differ from guidelines and criteria outlined here for the Annual Performance Evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluating Performance in Teaching

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding that one's performance in the area of teaching is satisfactory or excellent for the year. What follows is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. These standards should be applied appropriately in light of the nature and level of the course.

1. Satisfactory Performance in Teaching

A *satisfactory* evaluation of teaching performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

- a. Course syllabi clearly state learning objectives, course requirements, course content and instructional policies, demonstrate appropriate rigor, and course description reflects catalog description;
- b. Course material description in FAR narrative and syllabi reflect that the faculty member is keeping up-to-date and is teaching current information;
- c. Grade point distributions, descriptions of assignments, as well as FAR and FAP, indicate academic rigor appropriate for the course and level;
- d. Provides timely and accurate advising communication;
- e. Qualitative student evaluations indicate general satisfaction and scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near a rating of “average” to “above average.”*

*...student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated (Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.b (1) Teaching)

2. Excellent Performance in Teaching

An *excellent* evaluation exceeds that of a satisfactory performance. An excellent evaluation of teaching performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FAR how they have met some of the following criteria.

- a. Substantial revision of existing courses or developed new courses and/or programs;
- b. A variety of course preparations were successfully taught, demonstrating breadth of expertise and teaching adaptability to meet school demands;
- c. Syllabi and course materials indicate innovative, reflective, and engaged assignments that provide a rigorous and challenging experience that reflects the catalog description of a course;
- d. Students are provided with learning opportunities outside the classroom (e.g. field trips, engagement with outside organization);
- e. Innovative teaching strategies and assignments have been implemented;
- f. Reflection on teaching methods and practice is demonstrated;
- g. A comprehensive rationale for grade distribution linked to their pedagogy and philosophy of teaching is given;
- h. Grade point distributions, descriptions of assignments, graded student work, and copies of examinations indicate academic rigor appropriate for the course and level and reflection upon prior teaching experiences;
- i. Teaching workshops on campus and at relevant professional associations have been developed and given;

- j. Teaching, advising, or mentoring awards have been received;
- k. Grants for developing curriculum materials or instructional strategies and techniques have been received;
- l. Participation in or direction of undergraduate honors theses or research projects is evidenced;
- m. Participation in or direction of graduate theses or projects is evidenced;
- n. Participation in graduate comprehensive exams/comprehensive assessment is evidenced;
- o. Participation in training to learn innovative teaching methods and curriculum development is evidenced (e.g., CIT and CFI workshops);
- p. Proactive advising and/or the creation of special advising materials is demonstrated;
- q. Participation in independent studies with graduate or undergraduate students;
- r. Qualitative student evaluations report valuable learning experiences such as challenging assignments, and realizations of practical applications, and scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near "excellent"*;
- s. Student outcomes are presented at conferences.

*...student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated (Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.b (1) Teaching)

B. Evaluation of Scholarly Achievements and Professional Qualifications

Scholarship is a systematic and disciplined process of academic inquiry and production. Effective scholarly achievements contribute to the discovery and development of knowledge and inquiry to the field of communication studies through communications made available to the academy and accessible to the general public for scrutiny and review.

Professional qualifications are necessary skills, recognized accomplishments and valued associations that afford one's status as being qualified to perform desired tasks in an organization. Continued development of professional qualifications is necessary for the production of scholarship and maintenance of currency in the classroom. Membership in a professional association in the area in which faculty members are researching or teaching is considered *necessary* but not *sufficient* as evidence for their continued development of professional qualifications.

Effective scholarly achievements and continued professional qualification are not simply a matter of academic publication and professional training, but may also include activities that translate communication knowledge to lay audiences, continue one's own education and development of specialized knowledge so as to complement their field of study, and apply communication research and criticism toward generating solutions to community problems (e.g., community engaged research).

Evidence of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

1. In their FAR, faculty must submit the following as evidence of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications:

A written description of an ongoing or developing line of research inquiry in the field of communication studies and/or a description of continued professional qualification. A written statement articulating specific professional goals and recognized professional accomplishments in terms of both scholarly achievement and professional qualifications.

Faculty working toward promotion and/or tenure should also review criteria and guidelines by the School and College for securing promotion and tenure, particularly as those guidelines and criteria for evaluating teaching may differ from guidelines and criteria outlined here for the Annual Performance Evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluating Performance in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding that one's performance in the area of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications is satisfactory or excellent for the year. What follows is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. Evaluations of performance in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications must consider rank. Faculty should articulate in their FAR how they have met some of the following criteria.

1. Satisfactory Performance in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications⁴

A *satisfactory* evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.

⁴ Indicators evidenced should be appropriate to the rank of the faculty being reviewed.

- a. Evidence of ongoing scholarship or developing line of research inquiry in communication studies or the scholarship of teaching and learning, including, but not limited to: data collection, grant writing, professional development and certification, and preparation of manuscripts for publication, even if such scholarship does not result in a refereed conference paper presentation or publication in a given academic year. Awarding of satisfactory scholarship on this basis may only occur once in any given three-year period. Evidence must be provided to document the particular activities, such as excerpts from data collected, works in progress/revision, and revisions of grant applications;
 - b. Organization and facilitation of seminars, webinars, workshops, or short courses at state, regional, national, or international conferences;
 - c. Panel presentation(s) of scholarship at state, regional, national, or international conferences;
 - d. Presentation(s) of refereed manuscript of scholarship at state, regional, national, or international conferences;
 - e. Publication of scholarship in non-refereed regional journals or books;
 - f. Receipt of internally supported research grant;
 - g. Receipt of internally supported grant for research training and development, or training and development in the scholarship of teaching and learning;
 - h. Attendance at a workshop designed to enhance discipline-related teaching (e.g., short course or webinar in teaching undergraduate research methods or the Basic Course Conference at ECA);
 - i. Documented participation in professional development activities that are commensurate with the agreed upon goals for scholarly achievements and professional development in the annual activity plan;
 - j. Academic-based research that benefits and engages the community.
2. Excellent Performance in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications⁵
- An *excellent* evaluation exceeds that of a satisfactory performance. An excellent evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria.
- a. Refereed manuscript recognized as a “top paper” at a regional, national, or international conference;
 - b. Multiple paper presentations at national and regional conferences;

⁵ Indicators evidenced should be appropriate to the rank of the faculty being reviewed.

- c. Successful defense of a culminating research project (e.g., thesis, doctoral dissertation, etc.) or examination of licensure leading to the award of graduate degree beyond that possessed at the start of one's appointment contract;
- d. Regional, national, or international recognition or award for past scholarly activity;
- e. Publication of an article or chapter in a collection or anthology that highlights the faculty member's status as an expert in their area of study in the communication discipline;
- f. Publication of an article or chapter in a collection or anthology that has been refereed by scholars relevant to the communication discipline or is published by a recognized university press;
- g. Publication of scholarly article in refereed regional, national or scholarly outlet for communication studies research and criticism, or within a specific domain of communication inquiry;
- h. Publication of scholarship in refereed state journals recognized for their outstanding scholarship (e.g., document rejection rates, etc.);
- i. Publication of a refereed scholarly book or textbook relevant to communication studies⁶;
- j. Receipt of externally supported research grants or fellowships of regional, national, or international significance;
- k. Editor of a regional, national, or international journal of communication studies or communication related scholarship.

C. Evaluation of Professional Service

Professional service is an essential component of the University mission and the responsibility of all faculty. Service can be both intramural and extramural. Service by faculty to the University, state, nation, and world in their special capacities as scholars should be recognized and rewarded.

Within the University, professional service includes participation in department, college, and University committees, and any involvement in aspects of University governance and academic citizenship. University, college, and departmental committee leadership roles are seen as more demanding than those of a committee member or just regularly attending faculty meetings.

⁶ Publication of a refereed scholarly book or textbook would constitute multiple indicators for *excellent*.

Extramural professional service includes participation in professional and disciplinary organizations both as an elected office holder and/or a member; serving as a paid⁷ or unpaid consultant/speaker to individuals, businesses, agencies, governmental and non-governmental organizations; representing the University, college, school, or discipline on governmental, non-governmental or private sector bodies; and/or building collaborative programs locally, regionally, statewide, nationally or internationally.⁸

Evidence of Professional Service Performance

1. In their FAR, faculty must provide evidence of service by submitting the following materials:

A summary of activities performed in all committee assignments.

Faculty working toward promotion and/or tenure should also review criteria and guidelines by the School and College for securing promotion and tenure, particularly as those guidelines and criteria for evaluating teaching may differ from guidelines and criteria outlined here for the Annual Performance Evaluation

Criteria for Evaluating Performance in Professional Service

1. Satisfactory Performance in Professional Service

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding that one's performance in the area of professional service is satisfactory or excellent for the year. What follows is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence professional service performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area.

A *satisfactory* evaluation of professional service performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FAR how they have met some of the following criteria.

- a. Regularly attends and constructively participates in School, College, and/or University committees;
- b. Advises student organizations or co-curricular activities beyond those directly related to teaching duties;

⁷ Service activities that result in compensation greater than honoraria are not counted toward annual performance in service.

⁸ Definition modified from the University of Idaho's Faculty Handbook, Chapter 1, 1565.

- c. Participates in ongoing campus programs that contribute to service and outreach activities of the School, College, and/or University;
- d. Serves on committees or participates in the organizational activities of discipline-related local, regional, and/or state organizations;
- e. Serves as a manuscript reviewer for regional, national, and/or international communication-related conference planning;
- f. Serves as a manuscript reviewer for scholarly books and/or textbooks.

2. Excellent Performance in Professional Service

An *excellent* evaluation exceeds that of a satisfactory performance. An *excellent* evaluation of professional service performance is based on indicators such as those in the following list. Faculty should articulate in their FARs how they have met some of the following criteria:

- a. Serves on and constructively contributes to work-intensive committees at the School, College, and/or University level;
- b. Serves as the chair of School, College, and/or University committees and demonstrates effective leadership;
- c. Advises student organizations or co-curricular activities that results in exceptional student success or service to the School, College, University, or discipline;
- d. Successfully participates in, leads, designs and/or implements ongoing campus programs that contribute to instructional, service and/or research activities of the School, College and/or University;
- e. Holds office in discipline-related regional, national, and/or international organizations;
- f. Provides significant discipline-related expertise to the School, College, University, discipline, and/or community;
- g. Receives award or other honor for service to the School, College, University, and/or discipline, for JMU alumni outreach, and/or for service to the community;
- h. Secures funding or other resources for service activities that directly support ongoing activities of the School, College, and/or University.
- i. Serves on the editorial board of a communication-related journal or completes multiple ad hoc manuscript reviews for journals or scholarly books.
- j. Facilitates workshops or events as a Madison Teaching or Research Fellow.

IX. Definitions for Contract Periods and Academic Year

A. Contract Period

Following the JMU Faculty Handbook, the contract period for most full-time instructional faculty begins two weeks (10 business days) prior to the first day of the Fall semester and ends two weeks (10 business days) following Spring commencement. For example, the contract period for faculty during the 2023-2024 Academic Year is August 9, 2023 - May 23, 2024.

Accordingly, the timelines for submitting and reviewing required evaluation materials are designed to honor faculty contract periods while meeting conditions of the JMU Faculty Handbook.

B. Academic Year

The performance academic year, or simply Academic Year (AY), is the annual period by which faculty performance is to be evaluated. The AY is June 1 – May 31, with the exception of new faculty who should consider August 15 – May 31 as the AY for their first year.

Accordingly, portfolio content should include materials from the period of June 1 – May 31. Faculty in their first year should include materials from the period of August 15 – May 31.

X. Performance Evaluation Timelines for AUH

January 10	Portfolios of First-Year Faculty Due Faculty members in their first year of appointment submit mid-year FAR and FAP for evaluation. The AUH will schedule an evaluation conference. The AUH may request additional materials to review for first-year faculty.
Late-January	Mid-Year Evaluations for First-Year Faculty The AUH will provide the faculty member a written initial evaluation within seven days of the evaluation conference.
Friday of the Third Week of Spring Semester	Mid-Year Evaluation Process by the AUH Finalized The initial evaluation process shall be completed by the end of the third week of spring semester. The AUPAC shall be notified if the AUH determines the faculty's performance was unsatisfactory for the first semester and thus a

nonrenewal of contract. The AUPAC is then required to review the faculty member's performance.

Late January – Early February

AUPAC Review (if necessary) of First-Year Faculty

If the AUPAC conducts a review of first-year faculty then the AUPAC review must be completed and sent to the dean within seven days of receiving a recommendation of non-renewal of a first-year faculty member from the AUH.

June 1

Academic Portfolios Due to AUH

All faculty members must submit a FAR and FAP that represents work from the previous AY for Annual Evaluation by the AUH. This is due no later than June 1, but can be submitted earlier.

June 1 – September 30

AUH Reviews Submitted Materials, Begins Meetings with Faculty, and Conducts Annual Evaluations

October 1

Annual Evaluations due to Faculty

The AUH must have provided all faculty members with a written copy of their Annual Evaluation. *Note: Faculty have seven business days after receiving their Annual Evaluation to file an appeal with the AUPAC.*

October 21

Appeals Process Completed

Appeals process for any faculty appeal must be completed.

October 28

Signed Annual Evaluations to the Dean

Annual Evaluation letters must be signed by the AUH and faculty and submitted to the dean.

November 15

The Dean Makes a Decision Regarding an Appeal

XI. Advisory Feedback Timelines for AUPAC

Faculty may request feedback from the AUPAC at any time as long as there are at least seven weeks remaining in the semester. Faculty may request feedback no more than once every other year. To request feedback a faculty member should contact the chair of the AUPAC. A three-person subcommittee will meet with the faculty member to determine what they would like feedback on and discuss the best way to gather data and provide feedback. This might include a teaching observation. Following the process of gathering information the three-member subcommittee of the AUPAC will develop some written feedback for the faculty member and will meet again with the faculty member face-to-face to discuss the feedback.

Section Two

PTAC



Section Two
Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee
(A Subcommittee of the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee)
Guidelines
(Revised and approved by faculty April 2024)

I. The Purpose and Membership of the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

The School's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) is a subcommittee of the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) and a peer advisory body accountable to both the faculty of the School of Communication Studies (SCOM) and the administration regarding the development and assessment of faculty qualifications toward tenure and/or promotion and the maintenance and communication of standards regarding performance of the School's faculty.

To accomplish its tasks:

1. The PTAC is comprised of seven elected members of the faculty (or more to ensure odd-numbered membership) to the AUPAC. The composition of the PTAC will include three associate professors, three professors, and one associate or full professor.
 - a. Only faculty at the ranks of Associate and Full Professor may vote on candidacies for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
 - b. Only Full Professors may vote on candidacies for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.
 - c. Only tenured faculty may vote on tenure applications, in accordance with the JMU Faculty Handbook.
 - d. If the PTAC has fewer than five members at the rank (or higher) for which a faculty member is applying, then an *ad hoc* PTAC committee will be formed. Faculty at the rank (or higher) for which the faculty member is applying will be sought inside the School first, If there are remaining spots to be filled, then the process outlined below will be followed to fill the remaining spots.
 - (1) The faculty member will provide the PTAC with a list of five faculty members outside the School whom they believe are qualified to consider the application. The PTAC will also provide the faculty member with five faculty members outside the School whom they believe qualified to consider the application.
 - (2) The PTAC will choose one or two voting members of the committee from the faculty member's list and notify the faculty member of its choice. The faculty member will

choose one or two voting members from the PTAC's list and notify the PTAC chair of their choice.

- (3) The PTAC chair will then contact the Dean of the College to request those two-four members be invited to participate in the *ad hoc* promotion committee. In the event the ad hoc committee requires an odd number of faculty from outside the School or only requires one additional member, the PTAC will draw the single member or the second and third members from the faculty member's list of potential members.

2a. The PTAC is required to provide a comprehensive review of all tenure-track faculty after the third year of their probationary periods and in the year they are expected to apply for tenure and/or promotion, or earlier if the faculty member believes they have a compelling case for tenure and/or promotion or if they began their contract with a shortened probationary period.

2b. The PTAC is also required to provide a mid-point review of all non-tenure-track assistant professors seeking promotion. Candidates in these lines should submit their materials when they desire a mid-point review, but not until after their third year.

2c. At the mid-probationary or mid-point review, the PTAC determines whether the progress of a faculty member is appropriate for expecting timely and suitable progression for promotion and tenure, if applicable. At the promotion-seeking review, the PTAC determines whether the faculty member should be recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure (tenure-track candidates) or promotion to associate professor (non-tenure-track candidates). Faculty seeking more timely evaluation and guidance may choose to present their materials for review by the PTAC as frequently as annually. The PTAC is required to give directly to the dean and to the faculty member each of the PTAC's assessments of the faculty member's progress towards promotion and/or tenure.

3. The PTAC will provide a comprehensive review of applications of associate professors for promotion to full professor when such applications are initiated by a faculty member. These evaluations and the resultant PTAC recommendation of whether the faculty member should be promoted to full professor will be given directly to the dean and faculty member.

4. The PTAC will regularly update policies and guidelines regarding expectations for "excellent" and "satisfactory" work in each of the evaluation areas for each of the ranks. Such revisions must be considered at least once in every three-year period following the acceptance of this document. While these updates serve the purpose of maintaining contemporary standards for faculty performance, the PTAC will presume that faculty moving through their tenure-track probationary period are evaluated with the standards of their initial contracts. In the case of those seeking promotion from associate professor to full professor, the standards that were in effect during their promotion to associate professor are presumed. Faculty, alternatively, may choose to have their promotion evaluated with the most recent standards approved by the School. Faculty who choose

the most recently approved standards for their evaluation must provide the AUH with a written letter which clearly indicates their acceptance of the new standards.

5. The PTAC will present any changes made to the criteria for tenure and/or promotion to all faculty in continuing-lines for their approval. Changes in the criteria for tenure and/or promotion require the approval of two-thirds of the current faculty in the professor ranks.

6. The PTAC will provide materials, and otherwise keep faculty in the professor ranks well informed regarding the best practices for documenting their progress towards tenure and/or promotion.

7. Each member of the PTAC will adhere to a strict code of professional ethics. In all conversations with individuals who are not members of the PTAC, each member will take every effort to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of all discussions regarding all and any personnel considerations.

8. The PTAC will attempt to arrive at consensus through a process of discussion. However, any member can request an issue be put to a vote. For issues not related to a tenure and/or promotion recommendation, a quorum will be defined as greater than 50% of the membership voting (where members absent from a physical meeting will be permitted to vote electronically). Then a decision is reached by simple majority.

In the case of tenure and/or promotion decisions, members of the PTAC must be present during the deliberations for their vote, if called for, to be considered. There must be a quorum of at least 2/3 present to initiate deliberations of tenure and/or promotion applications. Faculty on leave may relinquish their obligations to participate in tenure and/or promotion evaluation and recommendation.

IIA. Timelines for Mid-point Evaluation for Promotion and Promotion and Tenure

August 15 Faculty in tenure-track lines should submit their portfolio materials to the PTAC by the August prior to the start of their fourth year. The submission of these materials is for the purpose of a third-year review.

Faculty in non-tenure track assistant professor lines seeking promotion should submit their portfolio materials to the PTAC by this August date when they desire a mid-point review to be conducted.

An evaluation letter will be given to the AUH and the faculty member by October 1.

IIB. Timelines for Evaluation for Promotion and Promotion and Tenure

September 1 Notification of intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure due to AUH

September 1 – Formation of ad hoc Tenure and/or Promotion committee [if

October 1	<i>necessary]</i>
	As identified in I.1.c. of this section, if the subcommittee of eligible faculty to make recommendations on tenure is fewer than five persons, the AUPAC Chair will form an ad hoc committee for tenure review. The membership of the ad hoc committee will be finalized and approved by the dean by October 1.
October 1	Tenure and/or Promotion Application Due Application materials for tenure and/or promotion must be submitted.
October 1 – November 15	PTAC Reviews Applications and Makes Recommendations
	The PTAC reviews tenure and/or promotion applications and writes independent recommendations to the dean. The AUH does the same during this time period.
November 15	Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendations Due to Dean
	PTAC tenure and/or promotion recommendations are sent to the dean, with the faculty member and AUH copied.
US	Tenure and/or promotion recommendations by the AUH are sent to the dean, with the faculty member and PTAC copied.

III. Submission of Materials for both Mid-Point and Application for Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews

The Submission

Part A: General

1. Cover Sheet: name; academic unit; current rank and title(s); desired action (promotion to specific rank, promotion with tenure, tenure only, etc.); year of appointment to present rank; rank and date of JMU initial appointment; other ranks held at JMU and years in each.
2. Personal Statement

The SCOM AUPAC requires a statement of no more than 10 single-spaced pages providing adequate detail regarding the quality and significance of the faculty member's work in each area so as to make a case demonstrating how they have met or exceeded SCOM criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The statement must describe ongoing or developing lines of research inquiry

in the field of communication studies, and must also include a written statement articulating specific professional goals and recognized professional accomplishments. This statement should make evident the promise of continued productivity and development in each area.

Faculty members may note here any mitigating circumstances that might otherwise be overlooked by a reviewing body, such as years credited toward the tenure appointment, application for early tenure, or stoppage of the tenure clock.

3. Annual Evaluations

1. Copies of each of the AUH's annual evaluation letters.
2. Copies of each FAR submitted to the AUH. [NOTE: This material provides context for interpreting annual evaluations.]
4. PAC evaluation (signed by the PAC chair and delivered to the dean's office).
5. Curriculum Vita
6. Numbered list of publications/creative works for the review period specified in the SCOM and CAL guidelines. The list, given in reverse chronological order, shall include full publication details for work that has appeared, including volume, issue, and page numbers. If published electronically with no page numbers, a word count should be given. If you choose to list work in progress, please provide exact details about the item in question (under review; revise and resubmit; accepted pending minor revisions, etc.). Please be prepared to supply supporting documents if requested. Scans or PDFs of full article-length publications/creative works for the review period specified in the guidelines should accompany this list.

Part B: Evidence of Effectiveness in the Area of Scholarship/Professional Qualification.

This part may include any materials or additional statements related to research, scholarship, and professional qualifications not already included in Part A.

Part C: Evidence of Effective Teaching.

Required material for this section is to include, in the following order:

1. Quantitative evaluations for courses taught during probationary period. (If applying for promotion to Professor, provide these materials for the five years prior to this application.)
2. Qualitative evaluations for the previous four semesters.
3. Grade distributions of courses taught during probationary period. (If applying for promotion to Professor, provide these materials for the five years prior to five this application.)

4. A representative sample of course materials from three JMU courses taught including syllabi, assignments, and other relevant materials. (If applying for promotion to Professor, provide these materials for the five years prior to this application.)

Part D: Evidence of Performance in Service Activities.

This section may include any materials or additional statements related to the indicators of performance achievement and activities in service.

Part E: Ancillary Material.

This optional section is for material that supports a faculty member's tenure and/or promotion case by complementing the three required areas of evaluation. This might be material that does not neatly fit into one of those sections, such as professionally related activity performed outside of the University and/or academic setting.

Submitting Material for Tenure & Promotion Review

The faculty member is to submit a secure file (e.g., Microsoft OneDrive, USB) containing a PDF with a linked table of contents containing the above materials to the chair of the AUPAC or a designated member of the PTAC no later than October 1. That person will make the materials securely available electronically to the members of the PTAC and the AUH.

Using the criteria for evaluating applications for promotion and/or tenure, the PTAC will review and evaluate the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications, and professional service.

The written evaluation will be delivered to the faculty member, AUH, and dean by November 15. It is advised that the faculty member meet with the AUH shortly after receiving the written evaluation to discuss its content and any recommended course of action.

IV. Guidelines for Promotion and/or Tenure

JMU's Faculty Handbook's section III.E.2.b. specifies the following areas shall be considered in all performance evaluations: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. In SCOM, these three areas are understood as essential to the institutional mission of providing high quality education to students and encouraging students' intellectual curiosity, their participation in a research culture, and their acceptance of the ethic of engaged citizenry.

A recommendation for promotion to associate professor requires an excellent rating in either teaching or research, and satisfactory ratings in the other two categories. For promotion to full professor, faculty must receive ratings of excellent in two categories and a satisfactory rating in the third category. To be assessed as excellent in the categories of teaching, scholarship and

professional development, and professional service for promotion to professor, faculty must demonstrate important contributions in those areas under evaluation.

A recommendation for tenure requires an excellent rating in either teaching or research, and satisfactory ratings in the other two categories. According to the JMU Faculty Handbook, to be awarded tenure, a faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for associate professor. RTA assistant professors are eligible for promotion but not for tenure.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

Effective teaching in SCOM involves developing students' understanding of communication processes, providing students with opportunities to develop communication skills, and fostering academically rigorous and positive learning environments that pursue the University's mission. Effective teaching is not limited to the classroom and may include activities that develop positive mentoring and advising relationships, innovate curricula and academic programming, and lead co-curricular initiatives.

The School's teaching activities are further distinguished through their basis within the academic discipline of communication.

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor must provide the PTAC with printouts of quantitative student evaluations and grade distributions for courses taught for their probationary period. Faculty members seeking promotion to professor must provide printouts of quantitative student evaluations and grade distributions for the five years prior to their application. In addition, all faculty seeking promotion should provide copies of written student evaluations for the previous four semesters.

Faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion are encouraged to invite observation by their assigned mentors *or other designated individuals*. Peer observers may submit formal reports of their observations *using the AUPAC-designed observation guidelines*, which are shared and discussed with the faculty member prior to submission. Submission of a peer evaluation report on the part of any faculty member is optional.

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding one's performance in the area of teaching as being satisfactory or excellent for the period under review. What follows is a list of indicators and guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. In the evaluation of teaching factors such as course content, number of students in the class, level and demands of the course, and instructional modes are considered. Faculty uncertain as to the applicability of an activity towards promotion and/or tenure should consult the PTAC before the onset of the activity.

Satisfactory Performance in Teaching

- Course syllabi state learning objectives, course requirements, course content and instructional policies.
- Course materials, such as syllabi, readings, assignments and activities indicate appropriate rigor for the course level and describe content that reflect the catalog description of a course.
- Course materials exhibit disciplinary currency.
- Grade point distributions, students' descriptions of assignments, graded student work, and copies of examinations indicate academic rigor appropriate for the course level.
- Appropriate teaching strategies and technique are demonstrated during classroom observations.
- Students report the provision of appropriate academic advising and career counseling.
- There is an absence of recurring comments, across classes, from students describing substantial flaws in teaching performance, such as but not limited to: failure to return graded assignments in a timely manner, failure to return emails, not attending regular office hours, etc.
- Participates in professional development activities for enhancing instructional effectiveness.
- Qualitative student evaluations reporting valuable learning experiences such as challenging assignments, realization of practical applications, and indications of intellectual growth and scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near a rating of "average" or "above average."*

*...student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated (Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.b (1) Teaching)

Excellent Performance in Teaching

- A record of effective pedagogy in such activities as the substantial revision of existing courses, development of new courses and programs, or significantly impacting curriculum development.
- Successfully taught a variety of course preparations, demonstrating breadth of expertise and teaching adaptability to meet School demands.
- Course materials, such as syllabi, readings, assignments and activities indicate innovative assignments that provide a rigorous and challenging learning experience.
- Develops and provides teaching workshops on campus and at relevant professional associations.
- Receipt of teaching, advising or mentoring awards.
- Receipt of grants for developing curriculum materials or instructional strategies and techniques.

- Direct honors' theses or independent student research.
- Mentor student research projects toward conference presentation or other publication formats.
- Completes intensive workshops or coursework that promote innovative teaching methodologies and curriculum development.
- Classroom observation of teaching as excellent.
- Qualitative student evaluations reporting outstanding learning experiences, high expectations for learning, significant skill development, or otherwise offers praise for an instructor's ability to successfully construct a positive learning environment.
- Qualitative student evaluations indicate general satisfaction and scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near a rating of "average" to "above average."*

*...student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated (Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.b (1) Teaching)

B. Evaluation of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

Scholarship is a systematic and disciplined process of academic inquiry and production. Effective scholarly achievements contribute to the discovery and development of knowledge and inquiry to the field of communication studies through communications made available to the academy and accessible to the general public for scrutiny and review.

The School values both individual and collaborative research and scholarly activities. In the following lists, the term publication refers to both printed and electronic mediums.

Effective scholarly achievements and continued professional qualification are not simply a matter of academic publication and professional training, but may also include activities that translate communication knowledge to lay audiences, continue one's own education and development of specialized knowledge so as to complement their field of study, and apply communication research and criticism toward generating solutions to community problems (e.g. community engaged research).

The following are general standards for evaluation. Faculty members are expected and encouraged to argue for the significance and disciplinary relevance of their work, particularly in the categories below. "Refereed" is defined as a peer-reviewed manuscript vetted by at least an editor and/or members of a review board. This definition includes both invited and competitively selected manuscripts. In addition to providing evidence of vetted review, faculty members are encouraged to provide evidence of vetting rigor so as to demonstrate the quality of the referee process. Faculty uncertain as to the applicability of an activity towards promotion and/or tenure should consult the PTAC before the onset of the activity.

Evidence of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

Faculty must submit as evidence of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications:

1. A written description of ongoing or developing lines of research inquiry in the field of communication studies.
2. A written statement articulating specific professional goals and recognized professional accomplishments.
3. Examples of *evidence in support* of the described lines of inquiry. The following are examples of appropriate evidence:
 - Completed and published scholarly books and/or textbooks;
 - Manuscripts of refereed entries, essays or research articles published in professional and academic journals at the state, regional, national and/or international level;
 - Manuscripts of refereed chapters published in scholarly books and/or anthologies;
 - Drafted scholarly books and/or textbooks, as contracted for publication;
 - Completed applications and acceptance letters for funded grants that provide support for *original or continuing* research;
 - Edited serials, journals, and/or published proceedings;
 - Manuscripts of non-refereed entries, essays and/or research articles appearing in professional publications;
 - Manuscripts of refereed conference papers presented at state, regional, national and/or international conferences;
 - Manuscripts or other speaking materials of conference presentations of communication research and/or criticism delivered at state, regional, national and/or international conferences;
 - Manuscripts or other materials presenting the scholarship of teaching and learning delivered at state, regional, national and/or international conferences (e.g. Great Ideas for Teaching, or G.I.F.T.);
 - Manuscripts and/or other speaking materials of conference presentations of communication research and/or criticism delivered at state, regional, national and/or international conferences.

Secondary evidence that may be included:

- Materials collected from or report of participation in University-sponsored faculty development programs (e.g., Center for Faculty Innovation) that enhance production of academic research or scholarship of teaching and learning;
- Materials (e.g. workshops, reports, analyses, etc.) developed and disseminated as a Madison Research or Teaching Fellow that enhance production of academic research or scholarship of teaching and learning;

- Materials collected from or report of participation as an attendee of seminars, webinars, short courses and/or workshops at regional, national and/or international conferences that enhance production of academic research;
- Awards and/or recognition for outstanding scholarship (e.g. Madison Scholar; Top Paper and Debut Paper awards; award for influential journal article, book chapter, or book; member of regional, national or international journal editorial board);
- Licensure, certification, and/or advanced professional training in skill area that enhances professional qualifications in applications of communication research to teaching and outreach;
- Materials (e.g. workshops, reports, analyses, etc.) developed and disseminated in campus programming open to the public that presents original scholarship in communication studies, applications of communication research, or the scholarship of teaching and learning;
- Materials (e.g. workshops, reports, analyses, etc.) developed for and disseminated in community programming that presents analysis of localized communication processes, or performs applications of communication research to localized problem situations.
- Materials prepared and presented at panels, seminars, webinars, short-courses and/or workshops organized and facilitated for attendees of regional, national and/or international conferences that enhance production of academic research or scholarship of teaching and learning;

Satisfactory Scholarly Activity for Review of Assistant Professors Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty members may receive a satisfactory evaluation of their research and scholarly achievement if their materials provide evidence of a record of continuing scholarly/creative agenda and the promise of future productivity.

For an assistant professor applying for promotion to meet minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation of scholarly achievement, CAL requires the following: a book published by a recognized press; a monograph published by a recognized press; edited volumes published by a recognized press; at least three scholarly essays or creative works in media of international, national, or regional distribution including refereed journals, refereed electronic publications, or chapters in books, juried or refereed competitions; and/or the receipt of a major external scholarly grant.

In addition to the College requirements, the School requires an assistant professor applying for promotion to achieve a minimum of three additional refereed publications or conference papers.

Faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor will include in their application materials printed copies of at least three referred articles and any combination of three additional refereed publications or conference papers. These materials must have been published and/or

presented during the faculty member's probationary period. The minimum of three communication related scholarly works should be published at the regional, national and/or international level. The minimum of three refereed communication related presentations must have been presented at conferences at regional, national and/or international level. Scholarly books or book chapters, state refereed journal articles, and major external scholarly grants may also be used as part of the assessment provided the material has been refereed, or is published by a recognized university press, or an otherwise recognized publisher of scholarship. Faculty must be prepared to submit evidence of the suitability of their publishing outlets.

Additionally, faculty are encouraged to provide evidence assisting the PTAC in evaluating scholarship in the following formats, which may count as evidence toward satisfactory or excellent scholarship: 1) Publication of an article or book chapter in a collection or anthology; 2) Publication of a textbook; 3) Editor of a collection or anthology. For such works to constitute scholarship, faculty must provide evidence that the work is contracted after a peer-review process.

Excellent Scholarly Activity for Review of Assistant Professors Applying for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty may receive an excellent evaluation of their research and scholarly achievement if their materials provide evidence of a record of continuing scholarly/creative agenda and the promise of future productivity.

To meet minimum criteria for excellent evaluation of scholarly achievement, the School expects achievement beyond the minimum criteria for satisfactory. The faculty member is responsible for making the case for excellence and this case can be based on quantity, quality or impact.

Satisfactory Scholarly Activity for Promotion to Full Professor:

To meet minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation of scholarly achievement, CAL requires the following: a book published by a recognized press; a monograph published by a recognized press; edited volumes published by a recognized press; at least three scholarly essays and/or creative works in media of international, national, and/or regional distribution including refereed journals, refereed electronic publications, or chapters in books, juried or refereed competitions; and/or the receipt of a major external scholarly grant.

Faculty seeking promotion to full professor will include in their application materials printed copies of at least three refereed articles and any combination of three additional refereed publications or conference papers. These materials must have been published and/or presented during the faculty member's consecutive five-year period. The minimum of three communication related scholarly works should be published at the regional, national and/or international level. The minimum of three refereed communication-related presentations must have been presented at conferences at regional, national and/or international level. Scholarly books or book chapters, state refereed journal articles, and/or major external scholarly grants may also be used as part of the assessment provided the material has been refereed, or is published by a recognized university press, or an

otherwise recognized publisher of scholarship. Faculty must be prepared to submit evidence of the suitability of their publishing outlets.

Faculty may receive a satisfactory evaluation of their research and scholarly achievement if their materials provide evidence of a record of continuing scholarly/creative agenda and the promise of future productivity.

To meet minimum criteria for satisfactory evaluation of scholarly achievement, CAL requires the following: a book published by a recognized press; a monograph published by a recognized press; edited volumes published by a recognized press; at least three scholarly essays or creative works in media of international, national, or regional distribution including refereed journals, refereed electronic publications, or chapters in books, juried or refereed competitions; and/or the receipt of a major external scholarly grant where the faculty member is the principal investigator, or a co-principal investigator.

In addition to the College requirements, the School requires a minimum of three additional refereed publications or conference papers.

Additionally, faculty are encouraged to provide evidence assisting the PTAC in evaluating scholarship in the following formats, which may count as evidence toward satisfactory or excellent scholarship: 1) Publication of an article or book chapter in a collection or anthology; 2) Publication of a textbook; 3) Editor of a collection or anthology. For such works to constitute scholarship, faculty must provide evidence that the work is contracted after a peer-review process.

Excellent Scholarly Activity for Promotion to Full Professor:

Faculty may receive an excellent evaluation of their research and scholarly achievement if their materials provide evidence of a record of continuing scholarly/creative agenda and the promise of future productivity. The faculty member is responsible for making the case for excellence and this case can be based on quantity, quality or impact.

C. Evaluation of Professional Service

Faculty in SCOM are expected to engage actively in service. There are many possible indicators of one's performance in the area of service. To actively participate in mandatory committee assignments would be considered necessary for receiving a *satisfactory* evaluation, but not sufficient for *excellent*.

The following is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence service performance. The lists are neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, and consequently are not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. Faculty uncertain as to the applicability of an activity towards promotion and/or tenure should consult the PTAC before the onset of the activity.

Satisfactory Professional Service

Faculty may receive a *satisfactory* evaluation of their service if their materials provide evidence of several of the following indicators:

- Regularly attends and actively participates in School, College, and/or University committees and demonstrates competence in that role;
- Successfully advises student organizations or co-curricular activities beyond those directly related to teaching duties;
- Participates in ongoing campus programs that contribute to service and outreach activities of the School, College, and/or University;
- Provides students with learning opportunities not associated with the faculty member's teaching duties;
- Serves on committees or participates in the organizational activities of discipline-related local, regional, and/or national organizations and demonstrates competence in that role;
- Successfully provides discipline-related expertise to the School, College, University, community, and/or discipline;
- Applies for funding or other resources for service activities that directly support on-going activities of the School, College, University and/or discipline.

Excellent Professional Service

Faculty may receive an *excellent* evaluation of their service if their materials provide evidence of several of the following indicators.

- Exceptionally advises student organizations or co-curricular activities beyond those directly related to teaching duties that results in exceptional student success;
- Successfully implements ongoing campus programs that contribute to instructional, service and/or research activities of the School, College or University;
- Serves on committees or participates in the organizational activities of discipline-related national and/or international organizations and demonstrates competence in that role;
- Holds office in discipline-related regional, national, and/or international organizations and demonstrates success in that office;
- Provides discipline-related expertise to the School, College, University, and/or discipline well beyond the duties of the faculty member;
- Receives an award or honor for service to the School, College, University, discipline, and/or community;
- Secures funding or other resources for service activities that directly support on-going activities of the School, College, University, and/or discipline;
- Faculty may also attain excellence in service with evidence of active participation in multiple time-intensive endeavors related to service for the School, College, University, community, and/or discipline.

V. Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion

The School abides by the College's policy for early tenure and promotion (See Appendix A).

Section Three

Lecturer Promotions



Section Three

Promotion Process for RTA Lecturer Positions (Revised and approved by faculty April 2024)

Principles Guiding the Crafting of this Document [to frame faculty discussion but also as a kind of “legislative intent” to keep with the document when considering future edits to it]:

1. In general, our goal was to align this new lecturer promotion process with existing processes, particularly for tenure and promotion, already in place in the School of Communication Studies. As a result, elements (like the timeline from notification of intent to apply to the submission of the AUPAC’s letter to the Academic Unit Head and the Dean) remain the same across the board.
2. Because of the teaching-intensive expectations for those in lecturer lines, it was necessary to consider which of the tenure-stream promotion criteria (primarily for research but also to a lesser degree for service) should also be used for this lecturer promotion process, which may need to be modified or removed, as well as any that may need to be added to the existing criteria.
3. Especially in this transition period when these new lecturer ranks are put into place, the goal should be to recognize and champion the various forms of labor in/for the department over the several previous years, and to maximize flexibility about when a lecturer may seek to apply for promotion. Because current lecturers did not know that this process would eventually happen, nor what exactly they would be required to do to achieve such a promotion, the SCOM AUPAC believes that these criteria should not serve in any substantial way as a call to take on significant new vectors of academic labor in any of the three areas of evaluation. In the future, when these criteria are already in effect at the beginning of a lecturer’s contract term, these guidelines can assist with the mentoring process from the start. Since no one will be eligible for principal lecturer at the time these guidelines are initially enacted, the criteria and years in service/timeline provided in this document should apply as indicated.
4. Unlike a tenure-track Assistant Professor line, in which a specific timeline is established such that failure to be evaluated positively may affect one’s continued employment, there is no such timeline or expectation for a lecturer line. As a result, we have opted not to include a formal third-year probationary review process (a faculty member’s progress at earlier stages should instead be considered in concert with the colleague’s mentor and the AUH; as stipulated in the overarching AUPAC guidelines, faculty also always have the opportunity to ask for and have their work reviewed by the AUPAC in order to assess progress).
5. We would expect this document to be revisited in accordance with other changes in SCOM, CAL, and/or JMU. For instance, if we were to begin hiring a significant number of RTA lecturers, like we had done in the past, that would serve as a good moment to consider review committee composition, evaluation criteria, and so forth.

I. Description of Lecturer Ranks

The responsibilities of a faculty member appointed to one of the lecturer ranks are focused on undergraduate education, with an expectation that the faculty member's appointment is *primarily and substantially dedicated to their teaching responsibilities*. As a result, the teaching load for a lecturer in the School is four courses each semester. Lecturer appointments also include expectations for student advising, departmental service, and scholarly activities and development of professional qualifications.⁹ In light of the expectations set forth in lecturer appointments, the evaluation and promotion process places considerable emphasis on the evaluation of teaching. Evaluation criteria for the lecturer ranks in the areas of teaching, professional development, and service are outlined in this section and are unique to the lecturer ranks. Tenure will not be awarded at any of these ranks.

Rank Definitions:

Lecturer: The rank of lecturer is used for individuals within the academic unit whose primary responsibility is teaching. Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers, participate in professional service activities, and be engaged in activities that support professional development. Lecturers may perform other tasks as required by the department, including, but not limited to: student advising, revising courses and curricula, and other administrative duties. Lecturers must have earned a minimum of a master's degree in their discipline, or related field, and have work experience and/or professional certifications that meet Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and other departmental/college accreditation requirements.

Senior Lecturer: In addition to the requirements of lecturer, the rank of senior lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of mastery teaching and service performance, and provide evidence of continued professional development in their field of study. Scholarly achievements (including, but not limited to, scholarship and publication) are not typically an expectation of a lecturer, but such accomplishments may be considered as part of the evaluation for promotion. In addition, senior lecturers may be tasked with mentoring colleagues and undergraduate students, assisting with the development of courses or curricula, and may have a sustained record of external outreach.

Principal Lecturer: In addition to the requirements of senior lecturer, the rank of principal lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and service performance, evidence of recognition (e.g., awards, etc.) in the areas of teaching and/or professional service, and evidence of continued professional development in their field of study. In addition, a principal lecturer may be expected to have a considerable role in mentoring colleagues and undergraduate students, leading course development or curricula changes, and guiding special instructional initiatives.

II. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer and to Principal Lecturer

II.A. Senior Lecturer

In addition to the requirements for lecturer, appointment at the rank of senior lecturer is contingent upon substantial professional achievements, evidenced by excellence in teaching, with an appropriate combination

⁹ The handbook refers to "Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications" as one unified category for evaluation (along with the other two major areas: Teaching and Professional Service). For lecturer promotion pathways in particular, lecturers may want to delineate and describe each separately, and the AUPAC should be receptive to promotion materials that articulate this category in differing ways.

of service and scholarship achievement/professional qualifications, and normally a graduate degree in a relevant discipline.

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

II.B. Principal Lecturer

In addition to the requirements for senior lecturer, appointment at the rank of principal lecturer is contingent upon recognition of outstanding professional accomplishment, evidenced by excellence in teaching, with an appropriate combination of service and scholarship achievement/professional qualifications, and normally a graduate degree in a relevant discipline.

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. Specific Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications, and Professional Service

In evaluating teaching and professional service for lecturer-line promotions, the School employs the same guidelines utilized for professor-line promotions, which provide a series of potential indicators by which a candidate may argue in favor of having achieved satisfactory performance in teaching and/or professional service, and another set of indicators for advocating for excellence in teaching and/or professional service.

For scholarly activities and professional qualifications, the criteria for lecturer promotion are in some ways inspired by the kinds of activities recognized for associate professor and professor, but substantially revised to account for the substantial difference in contract responsibilities.

Teaching

Effective teaching in the School involves developing students' understanding of communication processes, providing students with opportunities to develop communication skills, and fostering academically rigorous and positive learning environments that pursue the university's mission. Effective teaching is not limited to the classroom and may include activities that develop positive mentoring and advising relationships, innovate curricula and academic programming, and lead co-curricular initiatives.

The School's teaching activities are further distinguished through its basis within the academic discipline of communication.

Applicants for promotion to senior lecturer and principal lecturer must provide the PTAC with printouts of quantitative student evaluations and grade distributions for courses taught for their probationary period. Applicants for promotion must provide printouts of quantitative student evaluations and grade distributions for the *five* years prior to their application. In addition, all applicants should provide copies of written student evaluations for the previous four semesters.

Applicants seeking promotion are encouraged to invite observation by their assigned mentors *or other designated individuals*. Peer observers will submit formal reports of their observations *using the AUPAC-designed observation guidelines*, which are shared and discussed with the observed faculty

member prior to their submission. Submission of a peer evaluation report on the part of any faculty member is optional.

There are many indicators and combinations of indicators for concluding one's performance in the area of teaching as being satisfactory or excellent for the period under review. What follows is a list of indicators and guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence teaching performance. The list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, and consequently not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. In the evaluation of teaching factors, such as course content, the number of students in the class, the level and demands of the course, and instructional modes, are considered. Applicants uncertain as to the applicability of an activity towards promotion should consult the PTAC before the onset of the activity.

Satisfactory Performance in Teaching

- Course syllabi state learning objectives, course requirements, course content and instructional policies.
- Course materials, such as syllabi, readings, assignments and activities indicate appropriate rigor for the course level and describe content that reflect the catalog description of a course.
- Course materials exhibit disciplinary currency.
- Grade point distributions, students' descriptions of assignments, graded student work, and copies of examinations indicate academic rigor appropriate for the course level.
- Appropriate teaching strategies and technique are demonstrated during classroom observations.
- Students report the provision of appropriate academic advising and career counseling.
- There is an absence of recurring comments, across classes, from students describing substantial flaws in teaching performance, such as but not limited to: failure to return graded assignments in a timely manner, failure to return emails, not attending regular office hours, etc.
- Participates in professional development activities for enhancing instructional effectiveness.
- Qualitative student evaluations reporting valuable learning experiences such as challenging assignments, realization of practical applications, and indications of intellectual growth and scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near a rating of "average" or "above average."*

*...student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated (Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.b (1) Teaching)

Excellent Performance in Teaching

- A record of effective pedagogy in such activities as the substantial revision of existing courses, development of new courses and programs, or significantly impacting curriculum development.
- Successfully taught a variety of course preparations, demonstrating breadth of expertise and teaching adaptability to meet School demands.
- Course materials, such as syllabi, readings, assignments and activities indicate innovative assignments that provide a rigorous and challenging learning experience.
- Develops and provides teaching workshops on campus and at relevant professional associations.
- Receipt of teaching, advising or mentoring awards.
- Receipt of grants for developing curriculum materials or instructional strategies and techniques.
- Direct honors' theses or independent student research.
- Mentor student research projects toward conference presentation or other publication formats.
- Completes intensive workshops or coursework that promote innovative teaching methodologies and curriculum development.
- Classroom observation of teaching as excellent.
- Qualitative student evaluations reporting outstanding learning experiences, high expectations for learning, significant skill development, or otherwise offers praise for an instructor's ability to successfully construct a positive learning environment.
- Qualitative student evaluations indicate general satisfaction and scores for quantitative student evaluations of overall instructor and course ratings fall near a rating of "average" to "above average."*

*...student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated (Faculty Handbook, III.E.2.b (1) Teaching)

Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications

The AUPAC expects that, for each stage of lecturer promotion (to senior lecturer and then to principal lecturer), the applicant will furnish a minimum of six professional accomplishments/enhancements to one's professional standing.

Evaluation of Scholarship and Professional Development

Scholarship is a systematic and disciplined process of academic inquiry and production. Effective scholarly achievements contribute to the discovery and development of knowledge and inquiry to the

field of communication studies through communications made available to the academy and accessible to the general public for scrutiny and review.

The School of Communication Studies values both individual and collaborative research and scholarly activities. In the following lists, the term publication refers to both printed and electronic mediums. Effective scholarly achievements and continued professional qualification are not simply a matter of academic publication and professional training, but may also include activities that translate communication knowledge to lay audiences, continue one's own education and development of specialized knowledge so as to complement their field of study, and apply communication research and criticism toward generating solutions to community problems (e.g. community-engaged research).

The following are general standards for evaluation. Applicants are expected and encouraged to argue for the significance and disciplinary relevance of their work, particularly in the categories below. "Refereed" is defined as a peer-reviewed manuscript vetted by at least an editor or members of a review board. This definition includes both invited and competitively selected manuscripts. In addition to providing evidence of vetted review, faculty members are encouraged to provide evidence of vetting rigor so as to demonstrate the quality of the referee process. Applicants uncertain as to the applicability of an activity towards promotion should consult the PTAC before the onset of the activity.

Evidence of Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

The candidate seeking lecturer promotion should provide a written statement articulating recognized professional accomplishments and progress toward enhancing one's professional standing. This should be followed by examples of *evidence in support* regarding those accomplishments and that progress on professional standing. The following are examples of appropriate evidence

- Licensure, certification, and/or advanced professional training in skill area that enhances professional qualifications in applications of communication research to teaching and outreach.
- Materials (e.g. workshops, reports, analyses, etc.) developed and disseminated in campus programming open to the public that presents original scholarship in communication studies, applications of communication research, or the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Materials (e.g. workshops, reports, analyses, etc.) developed for and disseminated in community programming that presents analysis of localized communication processes, or performs applications of communication research to localized problem situations.
- Materials collected from or report of participation in University-sponsored faculty development programs (e.g., Center for Faculty Innovation) that enhance production of academic research or scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Materials (e.g. workshops, reports, analyses, etc.) developed and disseminated as a Madison Research or Teaching Fellow that enhance production of academic research or scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Materials collected from or report of participation as an attendee of seminars, webinars, short courses, or workshops at regional, national, or international conferences that enhance production of academic research.
- Awards and recognition for outstanding scholarship (e.g. Madison Scholar; Top Paper and Debut Paper awards; award for an influential journal article, book chapter, or book; member of regional, national or international journal editorial board).

- Manuscripts of non-refereed entries, essays, or research articles appearing in professional publications.
- Manuscripts of refereed conference papers presented at state, regional, national, and international conferences.
- Manuscripts or other speaking materials of conference presentations of communication research and/or criticism delivered at state, regional, national, and international conferences.
- Manuscripts or other materials presenting the scholarship of teaching and learning delivered at state, regional, national, and international conferences (e.g. Great Ideas for Teaching or G.I.F.T.).
- Manuscripts or other speaking materials of conference presentations of communication research and/or criticism delivered at state, regional, national, and international conferences.
- Materials prepared and presented at panels, seminars, webinars, short-courses, or workshops organized and facilitated for attendees of regional, national, or international conferences that enhance production of academic research or scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Edited serials, journals, and published proceedings.
- Drafted scholarly books or textbooks, as contracted for publication. Completed applications and acceptance letters for funded grants that provide support for *original or continuing* research.
- Manuscripts of refereed chapters published in scholarly books and anthologies.
- Manuscripts of refereed entries, essays, or research articles published in professional and academic journals at the state, regional, national, and international levels.
- Completed and published scholarly books or textbooks.

As indicated above, the standard set forth in this document to attain satisfactory performance level is that there must be evidence included and described in one's promotion application materials of six items that involve professional accomplishments (such as a conference presentation) and/or work that contributes to enhanced professional standing (additional coursework or degree, campus institute, etc.).

The applicant is responsible for making the case regarding whether they believe this body of work is deserving of satisfactory or excellent, and this case can be based on quantity, quality, impact, some combination of these, or some other similar standard of support and differentiation. Because of the variability involved in these professional steps (with a 1-day institute being much less comparatively than a scholarly article or doing formal additional coursework), it is also particularly important that the applicant makes the case for the overall quality of this set of professional actions.

Professional Service

Faculty in SCOM are expected to engage actively in service. There are many possible indicators of one's performance in the area of service. To actively participate in mandatory committee assignments would be considered necessary for receiving a *satisfactory* evaluation, but not sufficient for *excellent*.

The following is a list of indicators and potential guidelines for assessing a range of achievements and activities that evidence service performance. The lists are neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, and consequently are not intended to be used as a metric for calculating success in this area. Faculty uncertain as to the applicability of an activity towards promotion should consult the PTAC before the onset of the activity.

Satisfactory Professional Service

Faculty may receive a *satisfactory* evaluation of their service if their materials provide evidence of several of the following indicators:

- Regularly attends and actively participates in School, College, and/or University committees and demonstrates competence in that role;
- Successfully advises student organizations or co-curricular activities beyond those directly related to teaching duties;
- Participates in ongoing campus programs that contribute to service and outreach activities of the School, College, and/or University;
- Provides students with learning opportunities not associated with the faculty member's teaching duties;
- Serves on committees or participates in the organizational activities of discipline-related local, regional, and/or national organizations and demonstrates competence in that role;
- Successfully provides discipline-related expertise to the School, College, University, community, and/or discipline;
- Applies for funding or other resources for service activities that directly support on-going activities of the School, College, University and/or discipline.

Excellent Professional Service

Faculty may receive an *excellent* evaluation of their service if their materials provide evidence of several of the following indicators.

- Exceptionally advises student organizations or co-curricular activities beyond those directly related to teaching duties that results in exceptional student success;
- Successfully implements ongoing campus programs that contribute to instructional, service and/or research activities of the School, College or University;
- Serves on committees or participates in the organizational activities of discipline-related national and/or international organizations and demonstrates competence in that role;
- Holds office in discipline-related regional, national, and/or international organizations and demonstrates success in that office;
- Provides discipline-related expertise to the School, College, University, and/or discipline well beyond the duties of the faculty member;
- Receives an award or honor for service to the School, College, University, discipline, and/or community;
- Secures funding or other resources for service activities that directly support on-going activities of the School, College, University, and/or discipline;
- Faculty may also attain excellence in service with evidence of active participation in multiple time-intensive endeavors related to service for the School, College, University, community, and/or discipline.

IV. Composition of Review Committee and Process for Seeking Promotion

Composition of Promotion Committee:

The AUPAC will be responsible for reviewing candidate materials for promotion to the ranks of senior and principal lecturer. For the purpose of making decisions regarding lecturer promotion, when possible, at least one member of the AUPAC should be a faculty member in SCOM who holds the rank of senior or principal lecturer. If there is not already such an individual on the committee, the AUPAC Chair will, if applicable, ask a faculty member in SCOM with that rank to serve in an ad hoc capacity for the purpose of considering this specific case.

Process for Seeking Promotion:

For those in the rank of lecturer with at least five years in that rank, the decision regarding when to apply for promotion is made by the individual faculty member, in consultation with the AUH, and can be as soon as the upcoming academic year. Early promotion after four years in rank may be considered in accordance with CAL's compelling case for early promotion (Appendix A).

There is no formal requirement nor informal expectation that lecturers should seek promotion to senior lecturer or principal lecturer.

Parallel to the timeline for existing tenure and/or promotion processes in SCOM, a faculty member seeking promotion to senior lecturer or principal lecturer must notify the AUH of their intent to apply **by no later than September 1**.

By **no later than October 1**, the faculty member should submit a USB drive containing a PDF with a linked table of contents containing necessary materials to the AUPAC Chair or a designated member of the PTAC, who will then make the materials securely available electronically to the PTAC and the AUH.

Using the criteria for evaluating applications for promotion, the PTAC will review and evaluate the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities and professional qualifications, and professional service. The written evaluation will be delivered to the faculty member, AUH, and dean **by November 15**. It is advised that the faculty member meets with the AUH shortly after receiving the written evaluation to discuss its content and any recommended course of action.

If a lecturer is not granted promotion to senior lecturer (or if a senior lecturer is not granted promotion to principal lecturer), they are eligible to reapply as early as the next academic year.

If a candidate would like to appeal a promotion decision, the existing SCOM and CAL policies are applied.

Appendices

Appendix A.

College of Arts and Letters Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion

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

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

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

The associate dean will choose the above mentioned “prominent people in the discipline” from lists submitted by the faculty members and her/his colleagues in the department/school; the associate dean will then solicit those recommendations. Outside reviews will be held confidential and not be shared with the faculty member. The faculty member waives the right to see the recommendations by submitting an early application.

Appendix B.

School of Communication Studies Merit Policy Approved 2/28/14

Merit:

The JMU Faculty Handbook refers to merit as: “Funds disbursed by the commonwealth to the university for annual salary adjustments are to be allocated principally on the basis of performance (merit). Annual adjustments in the salaries of faculty members are not an entitlement but rather reflect continued meaningful contributions in the three areas of expected faculty member performance (i.e., for an instructional faculty member, teaching, scholarship and service). This system of salary adjustment is intended to encourage all faculty members toward continuous performance improvement” (Section III.I.2).

Eligibility: Any SCOM faculty member who is required to perform and be annually evaluated in all three areas of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service) as a condition of their continued appointment.

Merit Policy:

All eligible faculty members in the School of Communication Studies will be considered for merit provided they accurately complete and submit the SCOM Merit Worksheet when merit is available to the School, and by the due date specified by the AUH. Guidelines afforded by the JMU Faculty Handbook offer that when funds are made available to distribute as merit pay, the distribution is to be made relative to faculty members’ annual evaluated performances, and that past performances may be taken into account when multiple years have passed between merit periods. Accordingly, the ordering of merit to be distributed among faculty is determined using merit scores reflective of an individual’s performance for each year under review, as calculated by formulas of the SCOM Merit Worksheet formulas and using data from a faculty member’s submitted FAP and the AUH’s Annual Performance Evaluation. The merit scores of all eligible faculty applicants are ranked from high to low, and grouped into three (3) cohorts of similar scores. Merit funds are then divided into three parts and distributed to eligible faculty in proportion of their salary. While a single overall annual evaluation rating of “unsatisfactory” does not disqualify a faculty member from submitting the SCOM Merit Worksheet and receiving merit, particularly when that faculty member has demonstrated a sustained record of excellent performance between merit periods, such negative evaluations may nonetheless be considered by the AUH prior to merit allocation.

Performance Evaluations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Ratings for annual performance in teaching, scholarship, and service will be determined by the Annual Performance Evaluation completed by the AUH, submitted to the Dean, and returned to the faculty member.

Completing and Submitting the SCOM Merit Worksheet

Eligible faculty members must accurately complete and submit the SCOM Merit Worksheet so as to be considered for merit pay. Faculty members are to enter data beginning with the most recent past academic year, and concluding with either the year merit was last available, or the year they first became eligible for merit, whichever is the most recent.

The procedure follows:

- Faculty members will reference their FAP (Faculty Activity Plan) for each year to be considered for merit.

- For every year to be considered, faculty will enter the weighted percentage on record in the FAP for each of the performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Faculty will then refer to the Annual Performance Evaluation submitted by the AUH for each year to be considered so as to ascertain the evaluation rating issued that year for each area of performance. The evaluation rating for each area is to be entered numerically on the SCOM Merit Worksheet as Excellent (6 points), Satisfactory (3 points), and Unsatisfactory (0 points).
- Faculty then multiply each of the weighted categories by the corresponding evaluation scores so as to produce a merit score for the year.

Example

- Teaching: (category weight) x (evaluation score) = (.45) x (Excellent * 6) = 2.7
- Scholarship: (category weight) x (evaluation score) = (.40) x (Satisfactory * 3) = 1.2
- Service: (category weight) x (evaluation score) = (.15) x (Excellent * 6) = .9
TOTAL = 2.7 + 1.2 + .9 = 4.8 merit points for this particular year.
- A faculty member's Total Merit Score is determined by summing the total merit points for each particular year of eligibility between periods of available merit funds. For instance, if it has been three years between periods of available merit funds, then a faculty member would determine their Total Merit Score using no more than three years of eligibility.

Annual Weighting for Each Category

Weighting for each category of evaluated performance (teaching, scholarship, service) is determined between the individual faculty member in consultation with the AUH when submitting the annual FAP. No category percentage should exceed or be less than the values determined in the AUPAC guidelines.

Awarding of Merit Pay

Total Merit Scores from all submitted SCOM Merit Worksheets are to be tabulated and ordered from highest to lowest score, and then grouped into three (3) cohorts of similar scores so as to indicate three orders of merit pay. Faculty members are to be sent an anonymized version of this ordered listing so that they may confirm their place in the ordering of scores. The AUH will assign merit pay to the faculty in the following manner:

- Faculty members in the first category receive 1.33 times the standard dispersion of available merit money.
- Faculty members in the second category receive 1.0 of the standard dispersion of available merit money.
- Faculty members in the third category receive .67 of the standard dispersions of available merit money.

Faculty Appeal

The annual evaluation of faculty performance, the determination of merit, and the decision by the AUH of an eligible faculty member as disqualified from merit consideration, are three separate matters. Disagreement with the AUH annual performance evaluation must follow guidelines of the JMU Faculty Handbook and SCOM AUPAC for appropriate and timely appeal. All others contests of the merit process will follow the AUPAC guidelines regarding faculty appeal.