School of Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communication

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024

Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communication Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Revised Spring 2024
Faculty Approved Fall 2024

Table of Contents

1. Initial Evaluation

The purpose of a faculty member's Initial Evaluation is for the AUH and AUPAC to provide supportive feedback that helps new faculty understand their current performance and identify areas that might benefit from support and mentorship. The Initial Evaluation follows the Annual Evaluation categories and new faculty are expected to demonstrate progress in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service.

New faculty will meet with the AUH between the third and fifth week of the faculty's first full semester of employment. In that conference, the AUH will provide the faculty member with current tenure and promotion guidelines and copies of annual evaluation materials (i.e., Annual Evaluation Worksheet, Annual Faculty Evaluation Template, and Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan). After the initial conference, the faculty member and AUH will determine a date for the AUH to visit one of the faculty member's class sections. The purpose of the class visit is to gather information for the Teaching category of the Annual Faculty Evaluation.

In the first week of the newly hired faculty's second full semester of full-time employment at JMU, the faculty will meet with the AUH to discuss the Initial Evaluation. At least one week prior to the conference (the week before classes start or before), the faculty member should submit to the AUH the following:

- Draft of the Annual Evaluation letter template, which highlights "fall semester only" accomplishments
- Faculty Annual Self-Assessment Report (SAR), listing all accomplishments
- Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP), which should include tentative information about plans for the following fall as well as information about planned activities for the current spring semester

The AUH will submit to the faculty member their Initial Evaluation letter by the end of the third week of the faculty's second full semester. The Dean will also receive a copy.

The faculty member will submit updated versions of the Annual Evaluation Worksheet, Annual Faculty Evaluation Template, and Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan as part of their regular annual review process.

2. Midpoint (Third-Year) Review of Eligible Faculty

(Eligible refers to full-time untenured and/or promotable faculty on Renewable Term Appointment [RTA])

It is recommended that regular and frequent conversations between new WRTC faculty begin during the first year of a faculty member's date of service. Such discussions should include senior faculty, members of the AUPAC, and the AUH, as necessary. It is also recommended that faculty regularly review the department's tenure and promotion criteria and discuss the department's criteria for teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and service, with the AUH and AUPAC. At the time of annual evaluation, the AUH should give the faculty member a clear idea of progress toward tenure or promotion, indicating specifically any performance areas in which the faculty member needs to improve.

Midpoint Review: Because the achievement of tenure and promotion is one of the most important milestones in a faculty member's career, faculty are required to complete an extensive review process during the third year of eligibility in a tenure-track or promotion-eligible position unless specified otherwise in the faculty member's contract. During this process, the faculty member submits a dossier of materials demonstrating satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion. While the AUH and AUPAC's recommendations are based on the standards and procedures for promotion and/or tenure, the purpose of Third-Year Review is to provide promotable faculty with a useful, formative evaluation.

The AUH and AUPAC conduct the Third-Year Review and mentor the faculty member on procedures for completing it. In preparation for Third-Year Review, faculty members should seek examples of Third-Year dossiers from colleagues, a process that can be facilitated by the AUH or the AUPAC. Each party independently reviews the faculty member's materials and composes an evaluation letter that goes directly to the faculty member.

PROCEDURE

Last Week of Fall Classes: The AUPAC Chair meets with candidates to go over procedures.

Third Monday in February: This is the deadline for the candidate to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualification, and professional service.

NOTE: While the Mid-Point Review is submitted in lieu of a full annual review, the faculty member is still required to submit Faculty Annual Self-Assessment (SAR) along with the Annual Evaluation Letter Template with self-ratings and percentages. The FAAP must be submitted with the Letter.

Materials should include narratives for contributions in areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service.

1. The **teaching narrative** should refer to the candidate's philosophy of teaching, approaches in the classroom, specific syllabi, assignments, and course evaluations.
2. The **scholarship narrative** must describe achievements and projects in progress noting, as far as possible, the expected dates of forthcoming scholarly events.
3. The **service narrative** should refer to service to the academic unit, the college, the university, and the faculty member's professional community.

The faculty member must also provide:

- CV
- All syllabi
- Sample assignments from each course
- Samples of evaluated papers from a variety of courses
- Copies of all student evaluations for all courses
- Copies of all departmental annual evaluations
- All publications: books, journal articles, creative work, etc.
- Copies of all papers presented at panels, conferences, academic proceedings
- List of events, creative performances, readings, guest lectures with documentation
- List of awards, honors, etc.
- Documentation of service to academic unit, college, university, professional and civic community

April 15: To provide a purposeful, formative evaluation, the AUH and AUPAC should independently give each person applying for promotion a cover memorandum specifying one of these four results and the reasoning behind the result:

a) The faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and/or tenure and no specific recommendations for improvement are necessary.
b) The faculty member is making progress towards promotion and/or tenure but it is recommended that improvements be made. (State specific recommendation.)
c) The faculty member is not making progress towards promotion and/or tenure but improvements may yet be made. (State specific recommendation.)
d) The faculty member is not making progress towards tenure and/or promotion, and it is recommended that additional employment contracts not be issued.

Recommendation (a) and (b) correspond to a satisfactory result. Recommendation (c) and (d) correspond to an unsatisfactory result.

The AUH will meet with the faculty member to discuss their materials and the cover memos and to conclude by offering him or her an opportunity to provide a written response to be appended

to the report. Copies of both cover memos go into the candidate's personnel file and to the Dean of the college.

NOTE: Midpoint Review is to be candid, formative, and future-oriented. However, a positive Midpoint Review does not guarantee tenure or promotion.

3. Annual Evaluation Conferences for Returning Faculty (applies to ALL ranks)

Per the *Faculty Handbook*, the AUH distributes annual evaluation letters to faculty by October 1. Evaluation Conferences take place after the faculty member receives the evaluation letter. All faculty are encouraged to meet with the AUH to discuss their annual evaluation letters and anticipated activity (FAAP) documents and to set their percentages in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service for the current academic year. The annual evaluation conference can be cancelled by mutual agreement of the faculty member and AUH. The *Faculty Handbook* also notes that, regardless of whether an Evaluation Conference takes place, there is "a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation" for a faculty member to appeal any evaluation decisions made by the AUH. See the *Faculty Handbook* for appeal information.

4. Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Faculty Annual Self-Assessment Report (SAR)
Faculty will fill out a yearly self-assessment in accordance with *Faculty Handbook* III.E.4. In conversation with this document, the AUH evaluates the quality of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service, based on the evidence provided in the Faculty Annual Self-Assessment Report and any appendices that provide concrete evidence for the faculty member's activities.

Part 1: Evaluative Summary

Faculty members should list and provide evidence for noteworthy accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service. Provide specific details and use full citations for publications. Indicate the rating (Excellent, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) that best describes performance in each area. Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service have different requirements. Indicate the relative weights for each area; these weights were set at your FAAP meeting in the fall. If you are not sure what those weights are, contact the AUH (see page 9).

Teaching

*

*

*

*

Self-evaluation rating: _____

Percentage for Teaching? _____

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

*

*

*

*

Self-evaluation rating:

Percentage for Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications? _____

Service

*

*

*

*

*

Self-evaluation rating: _____

Percentage for Service? _____

Standards and Documentation

In preparing their annual review, faculty should work from evidence to illustrate specific achievements in Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service. Faculty members should maintain those documents in case of questions and to support third-year review and tenure/promotion applications.

These lists are not exhaustive; each faculty member should include appropriate materials.

I. Teaching

Include information about the following:
- Courses taught
- Independent studies, honors theses, graduate theses, internships directed, and practicums directed.
- Student evaluation summaries

Supporting Documentation
Supporting documentation is required to provide evidence and to support the rating in teaching. This may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Curriculum development activities
- New course development
- Team teaching
- Experimental courses
- Interdisciplinary courses
- **Extensive revisions to courses** (justify in the narrative and show through the evidence what makes the revisions extensive; updating an edition or replacing one text for another is considered regular maintenance, not an extensive revision)
- Particularly innovative assignments (justify in the narrative and show through the evidence what makes assignments innovative – demonstrating a carefully considered, informed approach to revision is more important than proving the assignment worked for absolutely everyone in the class)
- Descriptions of instructional technology learned for inclusion in courses
- Class observations by colleagues, the AUH, and/or TAPS
- Discussion of student evaluations
- Attendance at or presentation of workshops or conferences devoted to the enhancement of teaching
- Teaching awards or other recognition of excellence in teaching
- Receipt of teaching grants from university, state, or national sources for instructional development

Ratings
The ratings for teaching are *Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory*, and *Excellent*.

Unsatisfactory
An *Unsatisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the requirements of a Satisfactory rating.

Satisfactory
A *Satisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied all of the following criteria:

- Teaches relevant and well-prepared material
- Receives generally favorable student evaluations
- Responds to official letters from the AUH and AUPAC regarding the preceding academic year (Responses may include evidence of change stemming from the evaluation or a statement addressing points of disagreement.)
- Meets the "working conditions" of the university's Faculty Handbook, III.A, that include, but are not limited to, providing timely feedback on student work, posting and keeping office hours, filing syllabi on time, and arranging for appropriate coverage (with the AUH) in the case of absence.

Excellent

An *Excellent* rating indicates that the faculty member has met all criteria for a Satisfactory rating and has also met two or more of the following criteria:

- Receives very favorable student evaluations
- Teaches a course for the first time
- Develops a new course
- Extensively revises courses (NOTE: will need to justify in the narrative what makes the revisions extensive; updating an edition or replacing one text for another is considered regular maintenance, not an extensive revision)
- Demonstrates exceptional contributions to teaching, Faculty may also demonstrate exceptional contributions to teaching through mentorship of teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and Writing Center Tutors. Such work should go beyond course requirements.
- Conducts workshops related to teaching
- Engages in team teaching, teaching consultations, or guest lectures
- Engages in interdisciplinary teaching
- Develops innovative/creative teaching methods (beyond course revisions)
- Chairing theses or practicums.

II. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

Faculty members should list and provide examples of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. Faculty members should be prepared to demonstrate how their work contributes to a scholarly agenda and/or to the field. Such examples may include the following:

- Publications in refereed journals, including online journals
- Publications such as books, monographs, edited volumes, including online venues

- Publications in creative and popular writing and/or publications in technical media such as manuals, computer documentation, hypertext or online help, or pedagogical/methodological training modules
- Conference presentations, online
- Conference presentations, local
- Conference presentations, regional and state
- Conference presentations, national, international
- Grants and Fellowships (include the name of project, funding organization, amount, duration of grant and purpose)
- Professional consulting, technical proofreading and editing, or proposal writing
- NOTE: Publications in predatory or pay-for-publication outlets will not be considered.

Supporting Documentation
Supporting documentation is required to provide evidence of and to support the rating in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications. Forms of supporting documentation may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- An announcement of a conference or workshop organized by the faculty member
- Letters of acceptance of an article or book for publication
- Letters of invitations for scholarly contributions based on the faculty's expertise (e.g., publications, keynote speeches, and guest lectures)
- Research grant proposal or a letter of acceptance of a proposal
- Evidence of contributions as an editor for published work (drafts and revisions, notations, author communications)
- A conference paper published in a conference proceedings
- A review, an article, or a book in published form

NOTE: Faculty members may elect to submit a publication in the academic year in which it was accepted by citing it and providing a copy of the letter of acceptance. Alternatively, they may elect to submit the work in the year that it is published.

Ratings
The ratings for professional development and scholarly achievement are *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, and *Excellent*.

Unsatisfactory
An *Unsatisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the requirements of a *Satisfactory* rating.

Satisfactory
A *Satisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied one of the following criteria:

- Presents at a refereed/juried local, state, regional, national, or international conference, including recognized online conferences
- Participates in at least one professional conference (local, state, regional, national, or international) in the discipline. "Participation" may come in the form of a panel discussion, focus group, or other comparable activity
- Prepares and submits scholarly papers for presentation at refereed/juried state, regional, national or international conferences; articles; or books for publication. A draft should be submitted in your report.
- Reaches agreed-upon benchmarks in ongoing research.
- Consults in the faculty member's academic discipline
- Serves on an editorial board of a leading state, regional, national, or international academic journal
- Prepares substantial university, state, regional, national or international grant applications or proposals. A draft should be submitted in your report.
- Organizes or makes presentations at local workshops
- Publishes notes, reviews, or other short entries in academic or professional journals, books, or reference publications

Excellent

An *Excellent* rating indicates that the faculty member has met the criteria for the Satisfactory rating and has also met one or more of the following criteria:

- Receives a research grant or funding of university, state, regional, national, or international significance
- Receives awards or other honors for excellence in scholarship from the college or university
- Receives awards or other honors for excellence in scholarship from state, regional, national, or international organizations in the faculty member's field of research or teaching
- Publishes one or more articles in a refereed journal, edited book or in an online venue. This includes online journals or letters of acceptance of an article for publication (NOTE: If a faculty member publishes two or more articles in a single year, one can be counted for the current year and the other for the following year.)
- Edits a peer-reviewed state, regional, national, or international journal centered on scholarship in the field
- Edits, develops or does substantial maintenance on technical manuals, instructions, websites or similar large-scale projects
- Editor of a book, textbook, or multimedia work published through a third-party refereed system or some other form of objective evaluative procedure or letters of acceptance of a book for publication (NOTE: The publication of such an edited work automatically qualifies the faculty member for a rating of

Excellent in the first year of its citation and at least Satisfactory for the subsequent year.)

- Publishes a large-scale print or multimodal work, monograph, or book through a third-party refereed system or some other form of objective evaluative procedure or letters of acceptance of a book for publication (NOTE: The publication of a monograph or book automatically qualifies the faculty member for a rating of Excellent for the first and second year of its citation and Satisfactory the third year.)

III. Professional Service

Faculty members must include in the report a list of the committees on which they have served, indicating their committee roles.

- University committees
- College committees
- WRTC committees
- Advisees, graduate and undergraduate
- Other, including service outside the university
- Mentors students and University Writing Center tutors beyond coursework or UWC employment requirements

Supporting Documentation
Evidence may include letters of appointment, thanks, special recognition, and committee reports. Faculty members should maintain documents demonstrating activity and specific forms of participation. Supporting documentation is required to provide evidence for and to support the rating in Professional Service.

NOTE: for WRTC committees, no documentation is required, though faculty members may include materials should they wish to. This provision is included for two reasons: (1) so that committee chairs do not have to write letters for all members each year and (2) because these committees are "in house" and their work is more visible to faculty, to the AUPAC and to the AUH.

Ratings
The ratings for service are *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, and *Excellent*.

Unsatisfactory
An *Unsatisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the requirements of a *Satisfactory* rating.

Satisfactory
A *Satisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied all the following criteria:

- Participation in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at scheduled WRTC committee and faculty meetings
- Contributions to the school through effective committee work
- External or internal work in special assignments. Such activities might include serving as an academic adviser, an adviser to a student organization, an active member of a community-literacy project, a presenter at on-campus workshops, or a consultant

Excellent

An *Excellent* rating indicates that the faculty member has met all of the criteria for satisfactory and can demonstrate a significant contribution to the mission of WRTC and/or the University through two or more of the following.

Internal Professional Service
- Directing at least two on-campus workshops
- Serving on a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Chairing a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Collaborating with colleagues to enhance, administer, or coordinate existing programs
- Developing new on-campus programs that contribute to WRTC, the college, or the university
- Organizing on-campus activities that contribute significantly to the enrichment of WRTC's mission
- Serving WRTC, the College, or the university in an administrative role

External Professional Service (NOTE: Evidence for this category might include an email inviting the faculty member to serve in such a role, and/or documentation from the journal or conference
- Serving as reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, or a book
- Serving as program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference (may count as Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications or Service, but not both)
- Serving as an officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

Community Service
- Participating on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Developing classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participating in service to the community

The above list is neither exhaustive nor restrictive. In all cases, quality of work and demands of activities should be given primary weight in evaluating faculty members. Note, too, that faculty members may earn a rating of Excellent through repeated performance in the same category of activity. For example: chairing two department committees.

Assigning Relative Weights to the Evaluation Categories

According to the Faculty Handbook (III.E.4.a. Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan):

By the deadline established by the academic unit, each faculty member shall submit a description of anticipated activities for the coming year to the AUH. 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. 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.

When faculty members submit their Self-Assessment Report (SAR), they should indicate in "Part I: The Evaluative Summary" the percentage weights they assigned to each category in evaluating their performance. The minimum weighting for each category are as follows:

Teaching:	40%
Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications:	10%
Service:	10%

When determining the weighting distribution for the SAR, faculty must use increments of 5% within each category and be certain that the total percentage equals 100%.

To arrive at a recommendation for merit increases, the Academic Unit Head (AUH) reviews the SAR and evaluates performance in teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and service according to the criteria for each category.

Assigns a rating of *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, or *Excellent* for the faculty member's performance in each category.

After the AUH has evaluated each faculty member and prepared an annual evaluation letter which includes the AUH's ratings in the areas of areas of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service, the AUH meets with each faculty member to discuss

the evaluation. Annual evaluations and faculty members' meetings with the AUH must be completed by October 1ˢᵗ of the academic year.

A faculty member may appeal his or her annual evaluation to the AUH. If the faculty member is unsatisfied with the AUH's response to an appeal, he or she may make subsequent appeals to the Academic Unit's Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) and, afterward, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters.

For further information on annual evaluation appeals see the Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.4.g. For information on salary adjustments, college allocation procedure, and academic unit allocation procedures see Faculty Handbook, Sections III.E.4.j, III.J.2.c, and III.J.2.d respectively.

5. Determining Merit Increases through the Merit Allocation Mechanism (MAM)

The MAM is designed to be objective, based on the ratings assigned faculty members by the AUH in the areas of teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and service multiplied by the percentage weights assigned by faculty members to each of the areas. All annual evaluations, meetings between faculty members and the AUH, and appeals, if any, must be completed before the AUH employs the MAM to determine merit increases.

MAM Formula and Distribution Tiers

An *Unsatisfactory* rating = 0
A *Satisfactory* rating = 1
An *Excellent* rating = 2

For example, based on the above scale, an annual evaluation break-down might resemble the following:

Teaching:	50 (weighting) x 2 (*Excellent*)	= 100
Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications:	30 (weighting) x 2 (*Excellent*)	= 60
Service:	20 (weighting) x 1 (*Satisfactory*)	= 20
	Total:	= 180

(NOTE: Total points possible equals 200.)

The amount of funds available for merit increases is derived by totaling all fulltime faculty members' annual salaries and multiplying that total by the merit increase percentage to determine the merit pool (MP). For example, if the merit increase approved by the Virginia legislature is four percent, then MP = sum of annual salaries times .04.

The following formula will be used to determine each faculty member's merit increase. Faculty members should keep in mind that whereas they may earn an *Excellent* rating in any or all of the evaluated areas, the overall annual-evaluation ratings are limited to *Satisfactory* or *Unsatisfactory*. Merit increases are only available to faculty members who earn an overall *Satisfactory* on their annual evaluations.

Distribution Tiers

Tier 1: Once the MP has been determined, the MP will be multiplied by .60. All faculty members who earn an overall *Satisfactory* will receive an equal portion of MP times .60.

The remaining .40 of the MP is then divided in half, a *Tier 2 half* and a *Tier 3 half*.

Tier 2: All faculty members who earn 151 to 200 points on their annual evaluations will have an equal portion of the *Tier 2 half* added to the merit increase they received in Tier 1.

Tier 3: All faculty members who earn 181 points to 200 points on their annual evaluations will have an equal portion of the *Tier 3 half* added to the merit increase they received in Tier 2.

6. Tenure-Track Faculty Members Promotion Guidelines

Evaluation for promotion and tenure in Writing, Rhetoric & Technical Communication is considered in the three areas outlined in the JMU *Faculty Handbook*: Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Professional Service.

Promotions in rank occur with the following criteria:

- Tenure and Assistant to Associate Professor: Five years in rank, Excellent rating in Teaching or Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications and at least Satisfactory in the other two

- Associate to Full Professor: Five years in rank, Excellent rating in teaching and one other category, and at least Satisfactory in the third

A tenure-track faculty member who applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank must present compelling evidence of accomplishment. The requirements in such cases are outlined in Section 7.

The AUH and a subcommittee of the AUPAC review all applications for tenure and promotion. The AUPAC and the AUH make separate recommendations to the Dean on each application for promotion and/or tenure.

When a faculty member applies for Associate Professor, the AUPAC – whatever the rank of each member – reviews the dossier. When a faculty member applies for Professor, a subcommittee of the AUPAC consists of three Professors with consideration to the faculty member's area of expertise. If the membership of the AUPAC does not include three Professors, an *ad hoc* committee will be formed. The three Professors, working in concert with the AUPAC, will come to a consensus about a candidate's application.

In addition to the dossier, the AUH and AUPAC consider "patterns of prior annual evaluations" in making promotion and tenure decisions, as prescribed by *The Faculty Handbook*. As such, WRTC uses a summative evaluation, wherein the preponderance of previous ratings from annual evaluations, along with the faculty member's promotion/tenure dossier, collectively determine the ratings for tenure and promotion. The ratings for tenure and promotion follow those articulated in the *Faculty Handbook* and are restricted to "Unsatisfactory," "Satisfactory," and "Excellent."

In making their evaluation for promotion or tenure, AUPAC and AUH are not limited to those materials submitted by the candidate and may conduct a review of a candidate's departmental file.

These policies can be modified with majority vote of promotion-track faculty.

The Dossier

Tenure-track faculty are evaluated across a range of activities, contributions, and accomplishments, as outlined below. Evaluation criteria reflect the diversity of faculty interests and areas within WRTC.

When applying for tenure or promotion, faculty members prepare a dossier that demonstrates their progress in Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service. The dossier includes the following in this order:

1. Cover sheet with the applicant's name, current rank, desired action for promotion, year of appointment to the present rank, and rank and date of JMU initial appointment.

2. Personal statement of 6-8 pages reflecting on accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service, plus a note about future plans:
   - Applicants should emphasize the value of their specific achievements and offer supporting documents in evidence of those achievements.
   - Applicants may elect to link evidence of accomplishments in this narrative or include evidence as appendices to the dossier
   - Printed books or evidence that cannot be delivered electronically should be physically delivered to the WRTC office for review.
3. CV
4. Copies of all departmental annual evaluations
5. Evidence of teaching efficacy, which may include
   - Syllabus and sample materials from classes
   - Copies of student evaluations from the time of last appointment
   - Optional peer observations and evaluations
   - Examples of innovative and noteworthy assignments
6. All publications: books, journal articles, creative work, etc.
7. List of presentations, events, creative performances, readings, guest lectures with documentation; faculty are encouraged to include papers and/or presentations materials from panels, conferences, and academic proceedings
8. List of awards and honors
9. Documentation of service to academic unit, college, university, professional and civic community

Format

Applicants should submit by email or sharing platform a PDF of the dossier to the Dean, AUH, and AUPAC.

Timeline

Sept. 1:   The faculty member notifies the AUH in writing their intention to apply for tenure and promotion

Oct. 1:   The applicant submits the dossier to the Dean, AUH, and AUPAC

Nov. 15:   The AUH and AUPAC submit their respective signed letters of recommendation to the Dean, with copies to each other and the applicant. The reviewing bodies may submit their copies to the unit administrative assistant, who will prepare the mailing of both letters

RATINGS

The AUPAC and AUH evaluate the quality of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service. Though the following ratings and evidence resemble annual evaluations, the evaluation process for promotion and tenure is different; it is a cumulative review. The faculty member may receive Excellent ratings in one area during an annual evaluation but may receive a Satisfactory rating during the tenure and promotion evaluation.

Teaching: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence in the categories below to support a Satisfactory rating in teaching:

- Teaches relevant and well-prepared material
- Receives generally favorable student evaluations
- Works to improve teaching by attending conferences, courses, or workshops
- Responds appropriately to annual evaluations, providing evidence of change or satisfactorily addressing disagreement
- Meets the "working conditions" outlined in the university's *Faculty Handbook*, including advising students, keeping office hours, and meeting classes as scheduled

Teaching: Excellent

In addition to the items listed under "Satisfactory," a faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in two or more of the categories below to support an Excellent rating in teaching. Evidence should demonstrate effectiveness and commitment beyond meeting course, mentoring, or advising requirements:

- Receives favorable peer evaluations
- Receives generally superior student evaluations*
- Develops new courses or significantly revises existing courses
- Demonstrates an exceptional contribution to teaching through mentorship of teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and/or Writing Center tutors
- Chairs theses or practicums
- Conducts teaching-related workshops that have a significant impact on the work of other teachers
- Develops creative teaching methods, including (but not limited to) significant engagement in team or interdisciplinary teaching, or service as a guest lecturer or consultant. Other examples might include the innovative

use of outside resources and instructional alternatives such as guest speakers, field trips, visiting artists and scholars
- Implements innovative technology in courses
- Demonstrates superior achievement in academic advising, directing internships, career counseling, independent studies, or mentoring students
- Enhances instructional development by securing university, state, or local grants in support of teaching
- Earns teaching awards or other recognition of excellence in teaching

*Teaching evaluations may be used in conjunction with other evidence to show Satisfactory in teaching or Excellence in teaching, but they cannot be used as the sole measure of teaching.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence of at least one of the following to support a Satisfactory rating in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications:

1. A book published by a recognized press.
2. An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field.
3. At least three published articles, scholarly essays, or creative works in refereed or objectively evaluated journals or competitive, professional media. This includes book chapters, refereed online venues or recognized electronic publications, and juried or refereed competitions.
4. The receipt of a major grant or a participation in national or international program of recognized, organized research may also be considered.

NOTE: While the annual guidelines allow faculty members to earn Satisfactory ratings *without* publication in an individual academic year, a faculty member cannot earn promotion and/or tenure without this cumulative evidence of publication.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications: Excellent

In addition to the items listed under "Satisfactory" above, a faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in two or more of the categories to support an Excellent rating in professional and scholarly achievement:

- A published article, scholarly essay, or creative work in refereed or objectively evaluated journals or competitive, professional media. This

includes book chapters, refereed online venues or recognized electronic publications, and juried or refereed competitions.

- A book published by a recognized press.
- An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field. (If the faculty member is both the editor and contributor, this counts for two years.)
- Presentations at a refereed/juried state, regional, national, or international conference, including recognized online conferences
- Significant participation in professional conferences (state, regional, national, or international) in the faculty member's discipline. "Participation" may come in the form of a panel discussion, focus group, or other comparable activity
- Consultations to improve the faculty member's academic discipline
- Serving on an editorial board of a leading state, regional, national, or international academic journal or serving as editor of an online journal
- Organizing or presenting at local, regional, national, or international workshops
- Publishing notes, reviews, or short entries in academic or professional journals, books, or reference publications
- Application or receipt of a significant research grant or funding
- Receiving awards or other honors for scholarship
- Editing technical manuals, instructions, or websites for professionals in the faculty member's field

NOTE: Letters of acceptance for recent or forthcoming work may be submitted and evaluated in the promotion or tenure application.

Professional Service: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence from the following items as appropriate to support a Satisfactory rating in professional service:

- Participates in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at scheduled WRTC faculty meetings and activities
- Serves actively on at least two department, college, or university committees
- Service in comparable special assignments, either internally or externally, which may have been substituted for committee assignments

Professional Service: Excellent

In addition to the requirements for Satisfactory, a faculty member should provide evidence as appropriate of one item or more from the categories below to support an Excellent rating in professional service:

Internal Professional Service

- Directing multiple on-campus workshops
- Performing significant service on additional WRTC, college, university, or *ad hoc* committees
- Excellent performance as chair of a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Developing new on-campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of WRTC, the college, or the university
- Organizing on-campus activities that contribute significantly to the enrichment of WRTC's mission

External Professional Service

- Serving as reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, or a book
- Serving as program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference
- Serving as an officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

Community Service

- Participating on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Developing classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participating in service to the community

7. Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion

If a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, they must present compelling evidence of accomplishment to be awarded promotion. WRTC follows the Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion guidelines outlined by the College of Arts and Letters regarding criteria for early tenure and promotion.

8. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Promotion Guidelines

The AUPAC and AUH evaluate the quality of Teaching, Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, and Service.

Non-tenure-track faculty members must earn an Excellent rating in teaching to be considered for promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer.

Non-Tenure-Track Promotion

- Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: Five years in rank, Excellent rating in teaching and at least Satisfactory in the other two categories
- Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer: Five years in rank, Excellent rating in teaching and one other category, and at least Satisfactory in the third

A non-tenure track faculty member who applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank must present compelling evidence of accomplishment. The requirements governing such cases are outlined separately.

PROMOTION GUIDELINES: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Teaching: Excellent

Non-Tenure-Track faculty members being evaluated for promotion should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in four or more of the categories below to support an Excellent rating in teaching within the evaluation period (typically, the previous five years*). Evidence should demonstrate effectiveness and commitment beyond meeting course, mentoring, or advising requirements:

- Receives favorable peer evaluations
- Develops new courses (special topics, new curricula for major)
- Revises assigned courses, ensuring they are current in the discipline
- Improves teaching through participation in conferences, courses, or workshops (faculty members will need to demonstrate that they have applied this knowledge and/or new methodologies in their courses)
- Develops creative teaching methods, including (but not limited to) significant engagement in team or interdisciplinary teaching or the

innovative use of outside resources and instructional alternatives such as guest speakers, field trips, or visiting artists/scholars

- Conducts teaching-related workshops at the departmental, university, or disciplinary level Makes contributions to assessment that impact teaching across the unit, college, and/or university
- Serves as a consultant or invited guest speaker on teaching or on areas of expertise
- Demonstrates significant, regular contributions to student consultation efforts ("tutoring") through work at the Writing Center, Learning Centers, or Libraries (evidence may include student testimonials, peer and/or supervisor evaluations)
- Plays an active role in student success and achievement by writing letters of recommendation and/or nominating student work for conferences, publication, or awards
- Takes on teaching courses new to the faculty member
- Promotes equity, access, and inclusion in one's teaching methods and/or course content
- Publishes pedagogical materials such as a teaching-related note, commentary, curricular material, or article in a refereed publication (may be used to support Teaching or Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications, but not both)
- Maintains a pattern of generally favorable student evaluations
- Contributes to teaching excellence through mentorship of teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and/or adjunct faculty
- Demonstrates achievement in academic advising, internship, career counseling, or independent studies
- Enhances instructional development by securing university, state, or local grants in support of teaching
- Earns teaching awards or other recognitions in teaching
- Chairs theses or practicums
- Serves as a reader for student theses, practicums, or graduate internships

NOTE: Non-tenure-track faculty members whose hiring precedes JMU's introduction of the RTA promotion path to Senior Lecturer may include evidence from the previous 10 years.

As non-TT faculty members are expected to devote the majority of their energies to teaching, there is no requirement or benchmark of peer-reviewed or otherwise objective publications to be considered for promotion. However, non-TT faculty must have earned annual ratings of Satisfactory or Excellent in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications in each of the previous five years leading to promotion.

Non-TT faculty members being evaluated for promotion must include a summary and evidence of continued scholarly and/or professional development in their application.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development: Satisfactory

A faculty member applying for promotion should provide evidence that they have actively kept abreast of current issues and best practices in teaching and in the discipline. This can include participation in a range of professional development activities, such as the following:

- Participates in and/or attends disciplinary conferences on the local, regional, national and/or international levels
- Participates in and/or attends workshops devoted to teaching or disciplinary content and/or methods
- Conducts research for creative or scholarly work
- Authors and submits proposals for conferences, workshops, or publications
- Develops teaching or disciplinary materials such as a teaching-related note, commentary, curricular material, or article in a refereed publication

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development: Excellent

A mainstay of the Excellent rating in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development is the *production and dissemination of disciplinary knowledge*. Senior Lecturers who wish to apply for Principal Lecturer may provide evidence of at least one of the following to support an Excellent rating in Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications within the evaluation period:

- Regular (at least three) presentations at regional, national, or international conferences
- Receipt/award of a research or teaching grant
- Creation of teaching or research materials or a creative work that is disseminated to a large audience
- Recognition as an expert in the field through interview requests, invitations to speak at professional events, and similar activities
- A book published by a recognized press
- An edited volume or monograph published by a recognized press, including technical manuals. This may also include establishing, editing, or maintaining a professional website recognized for significant contributions in the field
- Publication of a scholarly article, book chapter, or longer creative/professional work in a refereed or objectively evaluated publication, including selective conference proceedings

- Publication of several (at least three) shorter academic, civic, or literary pieces in an objectively evaluated reputable online or print periodicals (to include letters to editors, commentaries, guest editorials, introductions to texts, etc.)
- Participation in a local, national, or international program of recognized, organized research/intellectual work

NOTE: Letters of acceptance for recent or forthcoming work may be submitted and evaluated in the promotion or tenure application.

Professional Service: Satisfactory

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should provide evidence from the following items as appropriate to support a Satisfactory rating in professional service:

- Participates in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at faculty meetings and activities
- Serves actively regularly on assigned department, college, or university committees
- Serves in comparable special assignments, either internally or externally, which may be substituted for committee assignments

Professional Service: Excellent

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion should provide evidence of as many items as appropriate in one or more of the categories below to support an Excellent rating in professional service:

Internal Professional Service

- Directs on-campus workshops, brown bags, or related activities
- Make regular contributions to two department, college, or university committees as assigned
- Performs service on additional WRTC, college, university, or *ad hoc* committees
- Chairs a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Organizes on-campus programs or activities that contribute to the enrichment of WRTC
- Conducts peer evaluations, including class observations and consultations
- Advises majors as assigned
- Serves as adviser for new majors, minors, transfer, or first-year students

- Recruits students to the major through participation in open houses, CHOICES, and other recruitment activities

External Professional Service

Serves in a professional capacity for such activities as:

- Reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, a book, or competitions
- Reviewer or class-tester of texts and materials for a publisher
- Reviewer/evaluator of student-produced materials for competitions or course equivalency credit
- Program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference
- Officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

Community Service

- Participates on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Develops classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participates in service to the community

9. Non-Tenure-Track Rank Descriptions

Lecturer: Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers, participate in professional service activities, and engage in activities that support professional/scholarly 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 the discipline, or related field, and have work experience and/or professional certifications that meet SACSCOC and other departmental/college accreditation requirements.

Senior Lecturer: The Senior Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of expert teaching and provide evidence of continued service and professional/scholarly development in their field of study. Scholarly achievement (e.g., scholarship and publication) is not a requirement, but such accomplishments may be considered as part of the evaluation for promotion. Senior Lecturers may be tasked with mentoring colleagues and undergraduate students, assisting with the development of courses or curricula, and have a sustained record of external outreach.

Principal Lecturer: The Principal Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and excellence in either service or professional/scholarly development in their field of study. In addition, a Principal Lecturer may be expected to have a considerable role in mentoring colleagues and graduate teaching assistants, leading course development or curricular changes, and guiding special instructional initiatives.

10. Appeals

If a faculty member is denied tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member can appeal the decision following the expectations articulated in *The Faculty Handbook* under Section III.E.7.f.(9-11).

11. Purpose and Membership of AUPAC

The Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) of the School of Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communication (WRTC) reviews faculty qualifications and helps maintain standards regarding performance of the School's faculty in tenure-track and renewable term appointment (RTA) positions.

The AUPAC is elected annually by all full-time members of the department, as stated in the *Faculty Handbook*. The AUPAC works independently of the AUH in conducting Third-Year Reviews and in reviewing applications and making recommendations for promotion and tenure. All decisions of the AUPAC require only a majority vote.

AUPAC consists of three tenured members, one tenured or tenure-track member, and one nontenure track member. A list of qualifying faculty in each rank is distributed in advance of a vote so faculty can distribute nominations; members are determined by a majority vote, and each member serves a two-year term. AUPAC is accountable to both WRTC faculty and administration.

Eligibility, Election, and Terms

Members are elected by faculty to two-year terms. All full-time tenured, tenure-track and nontenure track faculty (RTAs) are eligible. Faculty occupying hybrid or shared positions with other units are also eligible, provided the voting faculty is informed of their status prior to election. The AUPAC should include at least three tenured faculty, the minimum necessary in order to carry out its responsibilities in tenure decisions. One position on the AUPAC is reserved for a non-tenured faculty member.

In cases where there are not enough tenured faculty on the AUPAC or within the department to carry out the AUPAC's duties in tenure decisions, candidates may nominate tenured faculty

from other departments to serve on their tenure subcommittee. The AUH consults with the AUPAC on whether to accept this nomination or to seek another appointment.

Faculty members may be elected to consecutive terms. For reasons of continuity, no more than three AUPAC members should rotate out of the AUPAC at one time.

The AUH is not eligible to serve on the AUPAC.

The chair is elected by the members of the AUPAC and serves two years in that role. The chair then remains on the AUPAC for an additional year to advise the newly elected chair. The chair's term may not extend beyond two years (i.e., a person elected chair in their second year serves one year as chair, and then advises one year).

The AUPAC consists of five members plus the former chair (up to six). The former chair does not retain voting rights.

The AUPAC chair keeps track of members' terms and calls for election of new members in the spring. New AUPAC members are elected by a simple majority vote of full-time faculty. Fulltime faculty occupying hybrid or shared appointments with WRTC may also vote.

The AUH does not vote in AUPAC elections.

An incoming AUPAC chair is elected by the AUPAC at the end of spring semester. The chair must have tenure.

Confidentiality and Conduct

All members of the AUPAC are expected to adhere to the strictest code of professional ethics regarding the confidentiality of all their deliberations regarding individual faculty (e.g., performance evaluations and promotion decisions). Confidentiality restrictions do not apply to deliberations about general policies and procedures. Failure to maintain confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the AUPAC or for a misconduct charge under *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.A.25.

The AUPAC may by majority vote of the committee as a whole remove a member of the committee for violation of AUPAC rules. Any such action is subject to review by the AUH and the dean.
AUPAC members may not participate in evaluations, recommendations, or decisions concerning family members, spouses, or domestic partners.

If for any reason a faculty member is unable to fulfill their duties, the chair will seek an immediate replacement by calling for nominations and holding a majority faculty vote.

Duties of AUPAC Members

1. AUPAC recommendations/decisions are required for the following: Third-Year Review, promotion and/or tenure evaluations, and appeals of annual reviews.

2. The AUPAC works independently of the AUH in reviewing applications and making recommendations for third-year review, promotion and/or tenure. All AUPAC members should observe as a group one class taught by faculty members under third-year review and candidates for promotion and/tenure before preparing recommendations.

3. The AUPAC advises faculty members in the preparation and submission of annual reviews to the AUH.

4. In addition, the AUPAC is responsible for hearing appeals of annual reviews made by faculty members. Faculty members have a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. In such cases, the AUPAC works with faculty members and the AUH to address disagreement. If necessary, the AUPAC conducts an independent review of the faculty member's materials utilizing the department's evaluation guidelines. The AUPAC may recommend that the AUH's evaluation be upheld or modified. This written recommendation is provided to the faculty member and the AUH, who may then alter the original evaluation or leave it unchanged. Both the AUH's evaluation and the AUPAC's written review are then forwarded to the dean and retained in the faculty member's personnel file.

Duties of Chair

1. The chair is responsible for meeting with all faculty who are candidates for Third-Year Review, promotion and/or tenure. This meeting is to familiarize faculty with the guidelines and procedures for the various evaluations as well as the relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty members are responsible for understanding these guidelines and procedures. The chair meets with upcoming candidates for promotion and/or tenure by the end of classes spring semester (The fall notification deadline is September 1). The chair meets with candidates for Third-Year Review by the last week of classes in the fall.

2. AUPAC chairs will schedule AUPAC meetings in consultation with AUPAC members.

12. Appendix

12.A   Compelling Case for Early Tenure and Promotion