



Office of the Provost

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024

Office of the Provost
James Madison University

MSC 7607
Alumnae Hall, Room 102
91 Alumnae Drive
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
540.568.3429

James Madison University
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Background

As specified in The Faculty Handbook section: III.E.1 the following documents establish written procedures and criteria for initial, annual, promotion and tenure evaluations. They are the result of decisions made by the tenure-track/ tenured departmental faculty of Sociology and Anthropology. Revisions were proposed by the AUPAC, or a subsection thereof, and then discussed and approved by a majority vote of tenure-track/ tenured departmental faculty; within the discussion process individual faculty members may propose new or revised procedures and criteria. In accordance with Section III.E.1.f these evaluation procedures and criteria have been approved by the academic unit faculty members, Academic Unit Head (AUH), Dean and Provost.

On 21 April, 2006 the tenure-track/tenured departmental faculty and the AUH of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved guidelines pertaining to promotion and tenure. On 4 September, 2009 the AUH and all tenure-track department faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved an amendment to the composition of the PAC. In addition, guidelines pertaining to other official evaluations of faculty members including the Initial Evaluation and Annual Evaluations were approved. On 16 March, 2012 AUH and tenure-track/tenured departmental faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved amendments regarding the composition of the PAC and voting procedures for electing the PAC. In addition, the process for soliciting outside letters by the PAC was approved. In May 2015 the AUH and tenure-track/tenured departmental faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology approved amendments that differentiated review for annual evaluation from that for promotion and tenure and the requirement to submit raw student evaluations of teaching to the dean *but not* department. In 2022 the AUH and tenure-track/tenured departmental faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology developed procedures and criteria for promotion for non-tenure-track lecturers.

Faculty members must be knowledgeable of these guidelines and procedures when preparing for various evaluations and when serving on AUPAC and/or the annual evaluation committee.

The following evaluations are mandated by the Faculty Handbook:

1. Annual evaluations of all full-time faculty (Section 1)
2. Initial Evaluation of new full-time faculty (Section 2)
3. Midpoint/Pre-tenure Review Guidelines (Section 3)

4. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Section 4)

Guidelines and procedures for serving on the AUPAC as well as the duties of the AUPAC Chair are contained in Section 5.

These guidelines direct faculty to the relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook which is online at <https://www.jmu.edu/faculty/handbook/index.shtml> All faculty are responsible for understanding the policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure as these are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Questions concerning these guidelines and procedures should be directed to the AUH and, if applicable, to the AUPAC Chair of your program.

Section 1 – Initial Evaluation

Section III.E.3 of the Faculty Handbook (p. 33) outlines the policies and procedures governing the Initial Evaluation.

The Initial Evaluation is the responsibility of the AUH, and will be conducted early in the second semester of the faculty member's first year.

Following the Faculty Handbook, III.E.3. Initial Evaluation, during a new faculty member's first semester of full-time employment at JMU, the AUH will provide information about the department's evaluation procedures and criteria. The initial evaluation will be conducted during the new faculty member's second semester. The AUH will schedule an evaluation meeting with the faculty-member during the second semester. The faculty member's performance during the first semester will be discussed, as well as professional needs as perceived by both the AUH and the faculty member. The AUH may request information from the faculty member before or after the meeting for evaluation purposes. The AUH will provide the faculty member with a written initial evaluation within 14 days of the meeting. The evaluation will state whether the faculty member's overall performance has been acceptable or unacceptable. The initial evaluation process will be completed by the end of the third week of the semester. A copy of the evaluation is to be signed by the faculty-member and AUH and sent to the Dean. If the faculty member declines to sign the evaluation, this is to be noted on the evaluation when it is sent to the Dean. Nonrenewal of an appointment of an untenured first-year faculty member will usually result from an unacceptable performance as determined in the initial evaluation.

The AUPAC of the faculty member's program (Sociology or Anthropology) will review the faculty member's performance if it is evaluated as unacceptable by the AUH. The AUPAC review will be completed and sent to the Dean within seven days of receiving the unacceptable performance review and the recommendation for non-renewal.

Example:

Prof. Doe is a first-year full-time tenure-track faculty member in anthropology. Early in the second semester the Academic Unit Head will ask Prof. Doe to provide a very brief statement of their teaching and scholarship and will evaluate them on the basis of this statement, course evaluations, classroom observation, syllabi, and other relevant material. The AUH will meet with Prof. Doe and provide them with a written evaluation that is either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory.” An unsatisfactory evaluation will result in a recommendation to the Dean that Prof. Doe’s appointment not be renewed. Prof. Doe’s performance will then be reviewed by their program’s PAC, and a separate review and recommendation sent to the Dean within seven days.

Bob Jones is a new faculty member in sociology on a one-year full-time appointment. They will also undergo an initial evaluation following the same procedures outlined above for Jane Doe.

Section 2 – Annual Evaluation

Section III.E.4 of the Faculty Handbook outlines the policies and procedures governing Annual Evaluations. Every full-time faculty member, whether tenure track or non-tenure track, undergoes an annual evaluation and is responsible for understanding university and departmental guidelines pertaining to the annual evaluation.

Although the annual evaluation is the responsibility of the Academic Unit Head who provides each faculty member with a written annual evaluation and evaluation conference, the annual evaluations in our department are conducted by the Head, the Program Coordinators, and one additional tenure-track (but not necessarily tenured) faculty from each program who constitute the five-person Annual Evaluation Committee (AEC)—Service on this committee is rotated among tenure track faculty who serve for a two-year term. The AEC meeting is open for all departmental faculty to attend, though faculty may not attend their own evaluation.

Faculty members submit their annual evaluations by completing the [Annual Report of the Faculty](#), a form that has been devised by departmental faculty. The form is divided into the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service each of which is subdivided into categories of “Excellent +,” “excellent,” “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory.” The Annual Report Form clearly specifies those activities that fall into each of these three categories enabling the faculty member to get a clear sense of their performance rating. The Annual Report is an assessment of that year’s activities, while the Promotion and Tenure document is a synthetic assessment of the entirety of the candidate's record during the promotion period as a whole. The Annual Report assesses year-to-year effort, while the Promotion and Tenure document is more focused on accomplishments or outputs over time.

In addition, faculty members submit a **Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan** in which they outline anticipated teaching, scholarly, and service plans for the next academic year. The relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service for an individual faculty member shall be determined by the faculty member and the AUH prior to the start of the academic year. Unless otherwise negotiated, the standard weight within the department is 60% Teaching, 20% Scholarship, 20%

Service. The annual evaluation is submitted to the evaluation committee between May 1 and May 15.

The purpose of evaluation of faculty members at James Madison University 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 allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review. A faculty member's pattern of prior annual evaluations is considered during a candidate's application for promotion. Candidates should keep in mind, however, that promotion and tenure standards are different from those employed in the annual evaluation, and the annual evaluation committee is different from, and has a different evaluative mission than, the AUPAC that considers promotion and tenure requests.

Following the Faculty Handbook, III.E.4.d., the AUH will schedule an evaluation conference with all full-time faculty individually to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the AUH. The conference may be cancelled by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the AUH, if both agree on the terms of the preliminary evaluation.

Once the faculty member receives their annual evaluation letter, they may appeal using the procedure specified in Section III.E.4.g. "Annual Evaluation Appeal Procedures" of the Faculty Handbook: "Before the AUH submits the official written evaluation to the dean, there must be an opportunity for the faculty member to review and appeal the evaluation to the body designated by the academic unit. The faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing.

Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available."

Section 3 – Midpoint/Pre-tenure Review Guidelines

Section III.E.4m of the Faculty Handbook outlines the policies and procedures governing the Midpoint (or Pre-tenure) Review. Following the Handbook, the AUPAC and AUH must independently review the accomplishments of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period, typically during the **second semester of the third year** of candidacy.

The AUPAC and AUH will separately evaluate the candidate's work in teaching, research and service. The written evaluations will identify any aspects of the candidate's work in which improvement is needed to be on course to receive tenure and/or promotion. The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to provide the faculty member with an evaluation of their progress towards tenure and/or promotion from both the AUH and members of the program PAC, some of whom may be involved in the tenure and promotion decision, and to give the faculty member experience in crafting a promotion and tenure document. To that end, the faculty member will submit a pre-tenure review packet that follows the **Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (see Section 4)**. This packet will be thoroughly reviewed by the program PAC and AUH, who will prepare written evaluation of the faculty member's progress to date and identify

areas that the faculty member needs to address when submitting their tenure and promotion application.

The exact timing of the review shall be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the AUH and program PAC Chair.

Faculty on less than a six-year tenure stream (as determined by contract on initial hiring) may or may not undergo a pre-tenure review pending consultation with the AUH and program PAC. It can also be an option if the faculty member requests. The pre-tenure review will be conducted by the AUPAC and AUH consistent with the tenure and promotion process.

A midpoint review is also available to candidates for promotion to full professor or for promotion in the lecturer track. None of these reviews are required, however.

Examples:

Prof. Smith is a tenure-track sociologist in their third year of full-time teaching at JMU. Their first year, however, was on a non-tenure track appointment that was later converted to a tenure line appointment for which they were subsequently hired. Their employment contract states that they will be eligible for tenure after completing their sixth year of tenure-track employment. They have consulted with the AUH and Sociology PAC Chair and they have decided that Prof. Smith will undergo a pre-tenure review in the second semester of their fourth year of teaching (which is their third year for tenure purposes).

Prof. Adams is in their first year as a senior assistant professor, tenure track, in anthropology. They bring four years of teaching and research experience from a previous position and have negotiated a tenure decision to be made after their third year at JMU. They will thus submit a tenure and promotion application to the Anthropology PAC in the fall semester of their third year. They will have an initial evaluation in the second semester of their first year at JMU and annual evaluations but will not undergo a pre-tenure review unless they request to receive an AUPAC evaluation prior to submitting a P&T application.

Section 4 – Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Section **III.E.6** of the Faculty Handbook describes the standards and procedures for promotion to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Section **III.E.7** outlines the standards and procedures for tenure. Every faculty member must know these standards and procedures since they govern the evaluation process for tenure and promotion. Promotion and tenure standards differ slightly and, therefore, involve two separate decisions although recommendations for both are made at the same time.

As a general rule Assistant Professors will apply for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure provided they have been in the rank of assistant professor for the customary 5-year period at the time of application for tenure/promotion. As a general rule, a candidate who is recommended for tenure will also be recommended for

promotion. Associate Professors will be considered for promotion to Full Professor provided they have been in the rank of Associate Professor for the customary 5-year period at the time of application for promotion.

If a faculty member feels they merit promotion before completing five years in academic rank, they must present compelling evidence of accomplishment to be awarded promotion based on the [College of Arts and Letter's Compelling Case for Early Tenure or Promotion](#) criteria. The deadline for submission of this application is March 1st. Applicants are encouraged to consult with the AUH and AUPAC chair before applying early for promotion. Applicants should note that even if the AUH and AUPAC allow the faculty member to apply, it is not an indication that they will necessarily be successful. Withdrawal from an early tenure consideration (in any year earlier than the penultimate year) will not prohibit the faculty member from applying for tenure at a later date, as long as the application is submitted by the penultimate year of the probationary period.

A withdrawal of a tenure application in the penultimate year of a probationary period will be deemed a resignation effective at the end of the probationary period. See Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.7.f.

What follows are specific departmental guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship and service and advice for preparing the tenure and/or promotion packet.

Departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

As prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, the program PAC evaluates each candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. Three general questions are stressed: (1) Has the candidate demonstrated the ability to stimulate students intellectually, to contribute to scholarship, and to provide meaningful contributions through professional service? (2) Will the candidate continue to be productive in these areas? (3) In what ways has the candidate contributed to program, departmental, college, and university goals?

The Promotion/Tenure Packet

A promotion/tenure packet consists of two parts: (1) a narrative statement where the candidate addresses the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service and to which a current CV is attached; (2) a packet of supporting materials referenced in the narrative including course syllabi, a sample of exams and student handouts/exercises, publications, grant proposals, work in progress, supporting letters from colleagues and students (if any), relevant documents pertaining to service, and other materials the candidate considers important to the evaluation of their case.

On or before Oct 1 the candidate will upload their promotion/ tenure packet to an online folder created by the AUPAC chair; only the AUH and members of the AUPAC will have access to this folder and material. However, if October 1 falls on a day when the University is not scheduled to be open, or is not actually open for business (as in an emergency closing, a holiday, or a weekend), the deadline is the next day that the University is open (see Faculty Handbook II.F).

1. The Narrative Statement – this statement summarizes the candidate’s activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service.

A. Teaching:

Evaluation of teaching centers on several questions: 1) Do the candidate’s courses contain a high level of scholarly content and reflect current approaches in the discipline? (2) Does the candidate effectively convey course content and stimulate students to understand, appreciate, and produce scholarly work? (3) Is the candidate thoughtful and reflexive about their class preparation and performance? (4) How do the candidate’s courses contribute to the curricula of the program, the department and the university?

These issues should be addressed in the narrative. which should include, but not necessarily be limited to (use supplemental materials to provide evidence in support of the narrative):

1. A statement of the candidate’s pedagogical philosophy and the teaching styles (lectures, discussion, use of media, etc.) used to convey course content.
2. A description of the courses taught at JMU, the development of new courses, and how these contribute to the program and college curricula. Indicate the main features or aspects of each course you have taught/developed in terms of structure, content, and importance to the program. If applicable, describe significant revisions to courses and innovative teaching methodologies or modes of assessment.
3. A description of teaching related professional development opportunities (e.g., attendance at NEH Summer Seminars or Institutes; attendance/participation in teaching-related conferences) and how these have enhanced their teaching.
4. A description of any teaching-related grants one has written and/or received.
5. A summary of honors theses supervised or read; independent studies, internships and/or other ways that have served particular students (e.g., writing letters of recommendation that further a student’s career, informal mentoring for specific projects), and an assessment of their departmental advising activities.
6. A statement where the candidate critically reflects on their teaching and provides a self-evaluation regarding its quality.
7. A statement regarding future teaching contributions and plans.

B. Scholarship: Assessment in this area is concerned with both the quality and quantity of scholarship and centered on the following questions: (1) Is the candidate’s work of high enough quality that it reflects an understanding of the best work available in the discipline? (2) Does the work make a contribution to the scholarly tradition in which it is situated? (3) Is the work of sufficient quantity? (4) Has the candidate sought to make their work available by disseminating it

to appropriate audiences? (5) In what ways has the candidate's scholarly work been recognized by the wider scholarly community to which the candidate is contributing? (6) Has the candidate shown promise of being consistently productive? Addressing these questions in the narrative involves:

1. A statement indicating the candidate's subdisciplinary specialties and their theoretical position within these specialties. For example, if the candidate is theoretically located in political ecology, or social organization, or race/gender/class, or human biology, or techno-environmental issues, etc. clearly state the theoretical and methodological approaches taken to pursue these research areas. The goal here is to explicitly locate and define scholarly interests and approaches.
2. A summary of research activities, publications, and presentations. The candidate must show the extent to which their scholarly production has contributed to the scholarly tradition in which they work. Each scholarly product (publication, meeting presentation, work in progress, etc.) should be briefly summarized to give PAC members a good sense of the candidate's research and theoretical interests and contributions. If the publications include joint authorship, the candidate must clearly state the nature and extent of their role in the publication.
3. A summary of grant-seeking and/or contract activities that inform the candidate's scholarly work.
4. A statement indicating the candidate's past and current research and publications, future research and publication plans, including the progress made to date.
5. A brief statement evaluating the quality and quantity of the candidate's scholarly work.

C. Professional Service: Evaluation in this area concerns the extent to which service activities reflect the candidate's scholarly, teaching and professional interests and the role these have played in furthering personal, program, departmental, college and university goals. This section of the narrative should address:

1. The candidate's involvement in JMU-related service activities at the program, departmental, college and university levels. The candidate should assess their specific roles in these activities as opposed to giving a mere listing of committee memberships.
2. The candidate's involvement in community service organizations that reflect their professional interests (e.g., lectures given to a local community organization that is based on the candidate's scholarly expertise; involving students in community projects; serving as a board member or consultant to an organization).
3. If the candidate holds an office in a state/regional/national professional organization the candidate should address the nature of this office and how it impacts the profession. This would also include membership on an agency governing board or journal editorial board.

4. The candidate's activities as a manuscript reviewer for presses and journals and/or as a proposal reviewer for granting agencies. The candidate should list specific journals and granting agencies for whom they have reviewed.
5. A description of any other service activities not addressed above that the candidate thinks is important to an evaluation of their service to the university and the scholarly community.
6. A brief assessment of the candidate's overall service activities and anticipated future service roles.

2. The Supporting Materials Portfolio

This portfolio should be divided into three sections for teaching, scholarship, and professional service respectively. Each section should contain materials that support and/or are directly referenced in your narrative statement and CV. The packet should, at a minimum, contain the following materials:

A. Teaching – Course syllabi; a representative **sample** of exams and student assignments/handouts; testimonials, if any, from students regarding teaching performance or other impacts the candidate has made on students; peer reviews of teaching, if any; any other written materials that help the PAC evaluate your teaching.

Consideration of teaching performance may include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation, evaluation by peers and/or academic unit heads, and student evaluations. Student evaluations may only be utilized as a formative tool or as part of a teaching portfolio. For example, candidates may highlight how they used information from student evaluations of teaching to improve the effectiveness of their pedagogy.

B. Scholarship – All published work; all written work currently being evaluated for publication (including appropriate documentation of submission/receipt and its current review status); papers presented at professional meetings; documentation of awards, if any, received for published work; professional panels one has chaired and/or served as discussant; grant proposals written (including those that have not been funded as these may reflect sound scholarship and scholarly development); manuscripts in progress that are sufficiently far along to be evaluated; any other written or scholarly work that enables the PAC to evaluate scholarship.

C. Professional Service – Outline or description of public lectures given; letters or other supporting documents indicating performance in service roles; any documentation that highlights service activities.

3. Evaluation Considerations

Because of the diversity of programs within the department and because candidates, even within programs, vary greatly in the manner in which they inspire students, produce scholarly work, and serve the professional community, it is impossible to provide a specific formula that will cover all tenure cases. The Guidelines below, in conjunction with those provided by the College of Arts and Letters, are intended to give the candidate a sense of the questions asked by the PAC when evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure. These guidelines are also designed to assist the candidate in the writing of the promotion and tenure packet submitted to the PAC. It is imperative, however, that a candidate for promotion and tenure consult the program PAC chair for specific guidance on how to prepare a tenure/promotion packet. The P&T guidelines are “nested” within the general instructions for preparing the promotion/tenure packet.

Promotion and tenure candidates will be evaluated as either “excellent,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory” in each of the three areas of evaluation. Tenure recommendations require a minimum of “satisfactory” ratings in each area. Promotion to Associate Professor requires one “excellent” rating while promotion to Professor requires two “excellent” ratings. An “unsatisfactory” rating in any area will result in a recommendation against tenure or promotion.

It is important that candidates strike a balance among the three areas of evaluation. Candidates should avoid emphasizing any one area to such an extent that it hinders accomplishment in the others. For example, junior faculty often over-emphasize service activities. While junior faculty are expected to serve on various committees at the departmental and college levels, it is unwise to be overextended in this area. Annual evaluations and the pre-tenure review are intended to provide guidance on the “balance” issue.

When making the case for a rating of Excellent in teaching, scholarship, or service, candidates for promotion and/or tenure should do more than simply enumerate their various activities since their hire or last promotion. Instead, the candidate should demonstrate the significance that their professional activities have made on the department, the college, the university, the profession, and/or the community

Teaching

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology considers proficiency in the fundamentals of good classroom teaching of primary importance and expects thoughtful class preparation and performance. In addition to fulfilling their obligations as classroom instructors, faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology should demonstrate their continuing intellectual growth as teachers as well as a commitment to promoting student learning beyond the classroom

All faculty, therefore, in order to achieve at least a rating of Satisfactory in the area of teaching, must:

- Demonstrate mastery of disciplinary content as appropriate for the level of courses taught and teach with appropriate rigor for course level
- Align course instruction and assignments with department, program, and General Education objectives as appropriate

- Emphasize and integrate the teaching of research and written and oral communication skills as appropriate for the discipline or field.
- Maintain professional commitment to assigned classes by careful class preparation and the careful evaluation and timely return of student work
- Provide clear and effective instruction at all assigned course levels and formats
- Engage students intellectually

Candidates making the case for a rating of Excellent should explain how their teaching activities, either in number, breadth, depth, or quality, exceed the expectations for a Satisfactory rating. Consideration will be given to faculty members' commitment to student advising; innovations in teaching as evidenced by the reflexive and intentional development of new course work; and revisions to existing courses and teaching methodologies. Such revisions are distinct from the normal incremental changes that faculty make in the year-to-year progression of courses. Consideration will also be given to the advising of students' honors theses, internships, and independent studies, pedagogy-related presentations at professional meetings, teaching awards, teaching grants, and pedagogy related publications.

Scholarship

As a general rule, candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should regard **three published** scholarly products such as books, edited books, book chapters, peer-reviewed articles, and major review articles/essays (brief book reviews are not counted among the three) as meeting the "Satisfactory" standard for tenure and promotion, provided at least **one** of these is a significant publication in a recognized peer-reviewed journal. A scholarly book published by a recognized press **may** be sufficient to meet the "satisfactory" standard irrespective of other publications.

By "published" we mean work that is already published, has been accepted for publication, or is far enough along in the review process (as indicated by editor/reviewer comments) that there is a reasonable expectation of publication. Receipt of a book contract based on a prospectus, while an indication of future publication plans, will not be regarded as a "publication." Written portions of a book manuscript are, however, to be included in a packet for review by the PAC.

Issues and advice regarding scholarly output is given to each candidate in the pre-tenure review and is given to guide the candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion. Candidates for promotion to full professor can refer to [the tenure and promotion guidelines regarding scholarship provided by the College of Arts and Letters](#).

Candidates making the case for a rating of Excellent should explain how their scholarship activities, either in number, impact, or quality, exceed the expectations for a Satisfactory rating. Candidates should demonstrate a pattern of leadership, growth, and impact within their area(s) of scholarship—for example, with reference to their record of publications, conference presentations, grants, research fellowships, and awards.

Service

To merit a Satisfactory rating in the area of service, candidates for promotion and/or tenure must contribute in a demonstrable way to service work that is essential to the routine operations of the department, its mission, and its commitments to the College and the University. This service work includes but is not limited to:

- Serving on departmental standing committees
- Representing the department on College or University standing committees
- Or serving on special task forces, search committees, or ad hoc committees

Leadership and/or higher impact in service work (at the level of the program, department, college, university or organizations external to JMU, including professional and community service) may be cited to make a case for an Excellent rating for candidates seeking tenure and promotion to Associate, and is expected of candidates for promotion to Full in order to achieve a Satisfactory rating. The quantity, quality, impact and/or breadth of service activities, including formal leadership positions, should be cited as evidence in support of the candidate's self-evaluation.

Candidates are encouraged to review successful tenure/promotion packets (as provided by individual faculty members) for further help in crafting their narratives.

Section 5 – PAC Election Guidelines and Duties of the PAC Chairs

AUPAC Membership and Election Guidelines

All full-time, tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the AUPAC in line with the following guidelines.

- 1.** The tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department will elect the PAC during the first faculty meeting of the Fall semester. Members of the AUPAC may either self-nominate or be nominated by peers. All tenured or tenure-track faculty will then vote to approve the AUPAC. Once the AUPAC has been convened two chairs (one anthropologist and one sociologist) will be elected by the members of the AUPAC for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion.
- 2.** The PAC will be composed of eight tenured departmental faculty members, four from the sociology program and four from the anthropology program. Of these members, five will constitute a “voting” PAC for each candidate (see 3).
- 3.** Each candidate applying for tenure and promotion will have a five-member “voting PAC.” Four will be members of the same program (sociology or anthropology) as the candidate. The chairs of the AUPAC will consult with the candidate to discuss the composition of their voting PAC based on areas of expertise.

Example: An anthropologist seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor has a “voting PAC” consisting of four anthropologists and one sociologist from the department.

Therefore, the eight member PAC votes to exclude three sociologists from the candidates “voting PAC.”

4. A candidate can also request that a member of the JMU faculty outside the department with expertise in their field of study or knowledge of their teaching contributions serve as a voting member of the PAC. In this case, the candidate will provide the PAC a list of names of people from outside academic units from which the PAC will select one to join the committee. The PAC will then vote to replace an existing committee member with the faculty member from outside the department.

5. Non-JMU faculty may not serve on the PAC, but a candidate can ask the “voting PAC” to solicit outside letters evaluating the qualifications of a candidate from non-JMU faculty who have professional knowledge of the candidate’s specialties.

A. The candidate can provide the “voting PAC” with a list of outside faculty who can act as reviewers. The names should be drawn from comparable institutions and should not be former advisors, post-doc supervisors, or close personal friends.

B. The list of names should be three times greater than the number of outside letters the candidate is asking the “voting PAC” to review. Example, if the candidate requests two outside reviewers then six names will be forwarded to the committee.

C. External letters are confidential and are not provided to the candidate. The final list of outside reviewers who provide letters on behalf of the candidate is also confidential.

D. The candidate will provide a list of reviewers to the “voting PAC” within a week after the “voting PAC” is constituted. The Chair of the voting PAC will solicit the outside letters within a week after the candidate provides this list. .

E. Outside letters will be used to assist the committee in arriving at a decision but the letters cannot, in and of themselves, form the primary basis for a tenure decision.

6. Faculty members may not serve on a PAC for recommendations/decisions where there is any professional or personal conflict of interest with a candidate (e.g., a spouse, domestic partnership etc.).

7. PAC recommendations/decisions are required for the following: pre-tenure review, promotion and tenure evaluations.

A. Pre-tenure review evaluations will result in a letter from the PAC that will be given to the candidate and placed in the candidate’s personnel file. The letter will summarize the PAC’s evaluation and outline recommendations to the candidate to aid in progress toward tenure and promotion.

- B. Promotion recommendations: Associate Professors and Professors only participate in and vote on promotions. Favorable recommendations require a simple majority of the PAC.
- C. Tenure decisions: Tenured faculty from the Department are eligible to vote on tenure decisions. Favorable recommendations require a simple majority of the PAC.

8. Members of the AUPAC serve one-year terms. They may serve repeat terms. In considering AUPAC composition the department will seek to balance broad representation and individual faculty members' workloads.

In addition to the above processes of evaluation. The PAC—or subsection thereof—will hear appeals to annual evaluation and convene an adhoc committee of departmental faculty to develop initial drafts of document revisions as needed.

Duties of the Program PAC Chairs

- 1.** PAC Chairs are responsible for meeting with all new full-time faculty in their program and program faculty who are candidates for pre-tenure review, promotion and/or tenure. This meeting will familiarize faculty with the guidelines and procedures for the various evaluations contained in this document as well as relevant sections of the faculty handbook. Faculty members are responsible for understanding these guidelines and procedures.
- 2.** PAC chairs will schedule PAC meetings in consultation with PAC members and coordinate the selection of the “voting PAC.” They are tasked with coordinating candidates' evaluation letters and submitting them to the dean's office.
- 3.** PAC chairs will be the contact persons for candidates undergoing evaluations, although a candidate is encouraged to consult with other PAC members regarding their candidacy.
- 4.** Liaise with Vice Provost for Faculty and Curriculum's office regarding AUPAC policies and oversee the development of document revisions as necessary.