

## Department of Nursing

### Criteria for Nursing Faculty Promotion

The promotion of a faculty member is determined by merit. Teaching, creative scholarship and professional qualifications, and professional service are the bases for evaluating candidates for promotion. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in rank at James Madison University before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for recommendations. The doctorate is the terminal degree in nursing and best prepares the faculty member for the faculty role and for promotion in that role.

**Promotion to Assistant Professor:** Faculty must achieve Standard Professional Performance in all three of the following areas. Expectations for promotion include:

#### Teaching:

- Teaching shows evidence of current and in-depth knowledge in area of nursing specialization
- Demonstrates knowledge of current professional practice in area of nursing specialization
- Demonstrates current knowledge and active participation in curriculum development, teaching/learning strategies, and educational evaluation.
- Demonstrates knowledge and skill in evidence-based teaching
- Establishes effective student/faculty relationships
- Participates effectively in indirect teaching activities
- Demonstrates evidence of effective collegial relationship with clinical practicum sites.

#### Service:

- Participates in university wide meetings, seminars, and forums
- Participates in service activities that enhance functioning effectiveness of faculty or reputation of the school (Examples: educational and service programs in the community to improve health outcomes).
- Actively participates in the recruitment and mentoring of new faculty
- Actively serves in a leadership position in the department, college, and university task forces and/or committees.
- As an active member of professional organizations, makes professional contributions and advocates for the profession.
- Contributes substantively to activities that support the mission and goals of the department

**Creative Scholarship (as defined by the AACN Position Statement, March 1999):**

- Facilitates evidence-based practice and utilization of research findings into teaching activities
- Shows evidence of outcomes of independent or collaborative scholarship projects (For examples of scholarship activities, see Performance Criteria and Standards for Annual Review\ Scholarship)

**Promotion to Associate Professor:** Faculty demonstrate consistent exemplary achievement in at least one of three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; evidence of substantial accomplishment in each of the other two categories. Expectations for promotion include:

**Teaching:**

- Teaching shows evidence of current and in-depth knowledge in area of nursing specialization
- Demonstrates knowledge of current professional practice in area of nursing specialization
- Assumes leadership role in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation
- Serves as a consultant and/or guest lecturer in areas of clinical expertise
- Demonstrates knowledge and skill in evidence-based teaching
- Creates an environment supportive of effective faculty/student relationships
- Participates effectively in indirect teaching activities
- Demonstrates evidence of effective collegial relationship with clinical practicum sites
- Assists students in the design and implementation of independent study, honors thesis and/or creative scholarship related to clinical practice (ex. Directed Studies)
- Mentors/supports less experienced faculty in the teaching role

**Service:**

- Participates in service activities that enhance the functioning, effectiveness, or reputation of the university
- Demonstrates leadership in service activities that enhance the functioning or reputation of the Department of Nursing
- Participates in the orientation and development of junior faculty in service and practice
- Contributes to the profession through leadership and advocacy in professional, clinical, or health-related activities

- Provides consultation, group work, or continuing education in professional organizations or community groups at the state or regional level
- Contributes substantively to activities that support the mission and goals of the department

**Creative Scholarship (as defined by the AACN Position Statement, March 1999):**

- Takes a leadership role in the planning, implementation, critique and completion of creative scholarship projects (For examples of scholarship activities, see Performance Criteria and Standards for Annual Review\ Scholarship).
- Seeks funding for creative scholarship (research demonstration grant, or special project)
- Demonstrates ability to secure funding for creative scholarship studies (ex. CISAT summer research grants).
- Disseminates scholarly work for a variety of local, state, regional, or national audiences.
- Contributes to the nursing literature through the development of book chapters and/or articles for peer-reviewed journals.
- Publishes creative scholarship articles in peer reviewed literature (minimum of 3 publications within past 5 years)

**Promotion to Professor:** Promotion to professor is contingent upon outstanding professional accomplishment and significant achievement among one's peers on a regional, state, or national level. Faculty members demonstrate consistent exemplary achievement in at least two of three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; and evidence of substantial accomplishment in each of the other two categories. Expectations for promotion include:

**Teaching:**

- Shows evidence of an established and consistent record of excellence in teaching
- Teaching demonstrates current and in-depth knowledge in area of nursing specialization
- Demonstrates knowledge and skill in evidence-based teaching
- Serves as a consultant and/or guest lecturer in areas of clinical expertise
- Participates effectively in indirect teaching activities
- Provides leadership in creating an environment supportive of effective faculty/student relationships
- Assumes leadership role in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation

- Creates an environment supportive of effective faculty/student relationships
- Demonstrates evidence of effective collegial relationship with clinical practicum sites.
- Assists students in the design and implementation of independent study, honors thesis and/or creative scholarship related to clinical practice (ex. Directed Studies)

### **Service:**

- Demonstrates leadership in service activities that enhance the functioning, effectiveness, or reputation of the university
- Develops innovative service strategies to enhance the function or reputation of the Department of Nursing
- Serves as a mentor to faculty in teaching, service, and practice roles
- Contributes to the profession through leadership and advocacy in professional, clinical, or health-related activities
- Provides consultation, group work, or continuing education in professional organizations or community groups at the regional or national level

### **Creative Scholarship:**

- Maintains an ongoing and productive program of creative scholarship (For examples of scholarship activities, see Performance Criteria and Standards for Annual Review\ Scholarship)
- Generates concepts and conducts multiple independent and original creative scholarship studies and projects
- Receives and documents external support on multiple creative scholarship studies and/or demonstration grants
- Generates special projects (or their equivalent) through successful competition from a peer-reviewed process
- Publishes at least 3 publications in past 5 years in peer-reviewed journals

### **I. Roles and Responsibilities:**

The roles and responsibilities of the individuals and groups involved in the review process are outlined below.

- A. The University: The University sets overall policy regarding the review process. The policy is found in the University Faculty Handbook.
- B. Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC): The Nursing Department PAC is composed of three (3) elected faculty representatives and 1 alternate. The committee serves in an advisory capacity to individual faculty members and to the department head in applying the review criteria and making recommendations for first year evaluations, third year evaluations (strongly encouraged) and comprehensive evaluations for promotion or tenure. The UPAC

also serves as an appeal body for the appeal of an annual evaluation. While in Nursing the UPAC generally consists of senior faculty members, the committee may contain tenured and non-tenured members, as well as members from other departments.

## **Department Of Nursing Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines**

### **II. Overview:**

The review process provides an opportunity for the faculty to present accomplishments and to make a statement regarding their present and future worth to the department and institution in relation to **merit based pay increases, promotion, tenure/post tenure, and rotating term appointment considerations**. The review is based on criteria and standards for Teaching, Scholarly Achievement & Professional Development, and Service. The evaluation procedures and criteria are designed to implement the faculty review policy established by the University and Board of Visitors, as outlined in the University Faculty Handbook. Data for evaluation come from multiple data sources, including self, peers, students, and the department head.

The annual evaluation process covers the academic year from **October 1 through October 1**. Each faculty member presents a self-evaluation and evidence of performance for evaluation that also can be used in applications for university promotion or tenure. The evaluation process includes both mutual evaluation and performance goal setting between the individual faculty member and the department head. The goal of the evaluation is to encourage growth and success in the faculty role.

### **III. Roles and Responsibilities:**

The roles and responsibilities of the individuals and groups involved in the review process are outlined below.

- A. The University: The University sets overall policy regarding the review process. The policy is found in the University Faculty Handbook.
- B. Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC): The Nursing Department PAC is composed of three (3) elected faculty representatives and 1 alternate. The committee serves in an advisory capacity to individual faculty members and to the department head in applying the review criteria and making recommendations for first year evaluations, third year evaluations (strongly encouraged) and comprehensive evaluations for promotion or tenure. The UPAC

also serves as an appeal body for the appeal of an annual evaluation. While in Nursing the UPAC generally consists of senior faculty members, the committee may contain tenured and non-tenured members, as well as members from other departments.

- C. **Department Head**: The department head advises faculty on the time line for the review process, submits annual written evaluations based on the evaluation criteria and the faculty members' goals, and writes an evaluation as part of the first year and comprehensive evaluations (tenure and promotion). All of these documents become part of the faculty member's personnel file within the department.
  - D. **Faculty Member**: Each faculty member submits yearly goals and a self-evaluation based on evaluation criteria. Faculty must notify the department head and the PAC chair of their intent to seek promotion or tenure according to the scheduled time.
  - E. **Students**: Student evaluations and examples of student work linked to innovative teaching/learning activities provide important evidence for faculty evaluation. Student evaluations for courses and for the faculty member each semester are submitted with the evaluation package and include summaries of student comments, as well as numeric ratings.
  - F. **Faculty Peers**: Faculty are encouraged to seek formative peer evaluation of teaching on an annual basis – particularly during the first three years of appointment – and to include this in the evaluation package. (A form is available for this purpose on the Common L drive). The use of different peers in different years is suggested to provide a range of perspectives. In addition, each year the department head solicits data from faculty peers using the form, *Peer Evaluation of Faculty Departmental Service* (on the L drive under Forms). This peer review is intended to provide open, honest, and constructive feedback.
- IV. **Types of Review**: (see university faculty handbook for additional specific information):

- A. **First Year Evaluation**: New faculty members are evaluated during the second semester of their first year. The purposes are to assess fit within the department, to provide feedback, and to familiarize the faculty member with the review process. The faculty member provides a self-evaluation and a comprehensive summary of achievements to the PAC no later than the end of the first week of the spring semester. PAC forwards its evaluation and recommendations to the Department Head no later than the end of the third week of the spring semester. The Department Head meets with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation no later than the end of the fifth week of the spring semester. Data are limited to the Fall semester, but materials should include:

(See detailed ***Format For Faculty Review Portfolio*** described in the following pages)

1. A current resume
2. Completed Faculty Activities Report (Nursing Common Drive: Faculty

Documents: Forms & Guidelines: Annual Faculty Evaluation.

3. Any supporting documents

- B. **Third Year Evaluation (Strongly Encouraged)**: Faculty completing their third year in a tenure track appointment can submit a comprehensive evaluation portfolio for review by the PAC and the department head. Purposes are to provide feedback and to assess performance in relation to goals and progress toward promotion or tenure. The review is to be completed prior to the beginning of the next academic year. To assist in this evaluation Faculty members provide portfolio data relative to their performance to PAC no later than **June 1**. PAC forwards its evaluation and recommendations to the faculty member and to the Department Head no later than **June 30**. The Department Head meets with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation no later than **July 30**.
- C. **Comprehensive Evaluation (Promotion or Tenure)**: Faculty approaching eligibility for promotion or tenure are involved in a Comprehensive Evaluation. Recommendation for promotion or tenure may originate with the Department Head, the PAC, or the faculty member.

Faculty in both Rotating Term and Tenure Track appointments may be considered for promotion. The faculty member can apply for promotion, or the department head or the AUPAC can nominate the faculty member for promotion. Faculty members should discuss intentions with the department head and submit a written nomination for promotion by **September 1**. Before being considered for promotion, faculty members must demonstrate competence in all performance expectations and meet the criteria for promotion of the specific rank as outlined later in this document. For faculty in tenure track positions, the review is held in the penultimate year and the probationary period does not exceed seven years. Faculty must normally hold a doctorate to receive tenure.

Faculty members provide a comprehensive summary of activities and accomplishments relative to all years of performance to PAC no later than **October 1** of the review year. PAC and the department head will make independent evaluations and will submit independent recommendations on promotion directly to the Dean of the College of Integrated Science and Technology by November 15. The Dean will make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by **December 15**. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will make recommendations to the President by **February 1**. The president submits recommendations to the JMU Board of Visitors and faculty will be notified by **April 1**. If a faculty member is seeking both promotion and tenure in the same year, the two are considered together. A faculty member who is denied promotion or tenure is notified by **February 15**.

- D. **Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation**: An evaluation is conducted annually for all full-time faculty, whether in tenure track or rotating term appointments, and both prior to and following tenure. The review provides an opportunity for

reflection, evaluation, and planning for the future. The performance evaluation is used to guide decisions regarding merit-based pay increases. Following are the components and time line for this process:

By May 15 of each year, faculty submit to the department head:

- A current resume
- Completed FAR (Faculty Activities Report) - Nursing Common Drive: Faculty Documents: Forms & Guidelines: Annual Faculty Evaluation.
- Any supporting documents organized in sections: Teaching, Scholarship/Prof Development, Service
- A completed *Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP)* – located in same document as the FAR. This document lists faculty goals for the coming year. These goals should be as specific as possible. The FAAP should include the relative weights the faculty wishes to allocate to the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. Unless otherwise negotiated with the Department Head, the usual weight within the department is 60 – 70% Teaching, 15-20% Scholarship and professional development, and 15-20% Service.

Evaluation Process: The program directors and the Department Head work together to review the FAAP (goals for the academic year) and the FAR (report of how goals were met) and prepare a written evaluation summary.

The faculty member schedules an evaluation meeting with the department head to be held prior to **September 20** and at least 2 weeks after materials are submitted. At least 24 hours prior to this meeting the department head gives the faculty member a preliminary written evaluation. The evaluation meeting is an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance. Following the evaluation meeting, and by **October 1**, the Department Head will provide a final written evaluation to the faculty member. This evaluation includes a rating of Exemplary, Standard Performance, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory for each performance category. In addition, overall performance is evaluated as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. For RTA faculty the evaluation includes a recommendation on extending the faculty member's appointment. Within a week of receiving the evaluation, the faculty member reviews, signs, and returns the statement to the department head indicating that the statement has been read and understood. If there is not mutual agreement with the written evaluation, the faculty member may express any concerns in writing within one week of the evaluation, to be filed along with the evaluation the conference. The faculty member may appeal in writing the evaluation within one week. The evaluation process, including an appeal process, must be finished by **October 21**.

Evaluation Ratings: Each performance area will be rated using the **Standards based faculty evaluation scale**. *Standard Professional Performance* is expected of

each individual for each performance area. If a performance area is rated *Improvement Required*, the department head will give specific feedback and suggestions for improvement and a faculty development plan for the coming year. Along with the department head the faculty member will formulate a development plan for the coming year. A rating of *Unsatisfactory* may result in non-renewal of the faculty appointment.

Additional Evidence for Evaluation:

Faculty are encouraged to seek formative peer evaluation of:

- Classroom Teaching (NSG COMMON\Faculty Documents\Forms and Guidelines\Faculty and Course Evaluations\Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching)
- Departmental Service (NSG COMMON\Faculty Documents\Forms and Guidelines\Faculty and Course Evaluations\Peer Review of Faculty Departmental Service) may be sought by the faculty member or by the UPAC or Department Head.
- The Department Head will request written evaluation of Program Directors annually from faculty teaching in those programs. Responses are compiled anonymously and shared with the Program Director

**E. Appeal of Annual Evaluations:**

See JMU Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4.g: “Before the academic unit head 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.”

See JMU Faculty Handbook Section III.E.4.h.: “In considering an appeal, the crucial questions for the reviewing body are whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the academic unit head (AUH), and whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment. The appeal process must be completed by **October 21**. The evaluation process is not final until any appeal has been completed.”

After the AUH provides the faculty member with the official written evaluation, but before the official written evaluation is sent to the dean, the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal the evaluation.

A faculty member may appeal an annual evaluation by the AUH on any of the following bases:

- (1) that his or her annual evaluation did not take into account all relevant information, or
- (2) that the information was not objectively reviewed by the AUH, or
- (3) that the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using a different standard of judgment.

The written appeal must be filed with the PAC by **October 7** of the year in which the evaluation is received. A copy of the appeal must be provided by the appealing faculty member to the AUH.

The appeal must include a copy of the three most recent annual evaluations (if applicable), the faculty member's most recent annual report of professional activities, and a detailed explanation of the basis for the appeal. The appealing faculty member is expected to supply any other information or documentation that the UPAC deems relevant, upon request by the UPAC.

The UPAC will review the appeal and issue a written recommendation to the AUH, with a copy to the appealing faculty member and the dean, by **October 21**. The UPAC may decide:

- a. that the appeal was filed on an inappropriate basis, in which case the appeal will be dismissed; or
- b. that the appeal was filed on an appropriate basis, in which case the PAC will consider the documents presented and decide that the documents do not support the allegations; or
- c. that the appeal was filed on an appropriate basis, in which case the PAC will consider the documents presented and decide that the documents support the allegations.

If the UPAC determines that the documents support the allegations in the appeal, the UPAC may recommend to the AUH that the evaluation be changed.

The recommendation will be considered by the AUH, who has until October 28 to finalize the evaluation and present it to the faculty member as his final decision. The AUH will request the faculty member's signature on the final evaluation, but the faculty member's failure to sign the final evaluation will result in the AUH sending the final evaluation to the dean without the faculty member's signature on the form, with a notation of the faculty member's failure to sign.

## **Department of Nursing**

### **Criteria and Standards for Faculty Evaluation**

Faculty performance evaluations are based on the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) and any additional data gathered by the faculty member, the UPAC, or the department head. A standards-based scale is the basis for rating full-time faculty in each performance area: teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service.

#### **Standards Based Faculty Evaluation Scale** (Adapted from Raoul, A., 1999)

##### **EX = Exemplary Professional Performance**

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently and substantively exceeded the department's standards of performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the department.

##### **SP = Standard Professional Performance**

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the department's standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful operation of the department rests.

##### **IR = Improvement Required (Inconsistent Performance)**

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not consistently meet the department's standards for performance. This rating is given with specific feedback as to which standards were not met, as well as suggestions for improvement and a faculty development plan for the performance area. Improvement in performance is required within the next rating period.

##### **UN = Unsatisfactory**

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the department's standards for performance in one of the following ways: 1) received an IR rating the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required, or 2) consistently violated one or more of the standards of performance. This rating represents performance that is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for employment with the department.

## **Rating Process**

Performance evaluations are based on all evidence in the Faculty Activity Report and performance portfolio. For this reason, it is important for the faculty member to provide clear and adequate evidence of achievement in each area. Some evidence, such as student ratings of teaching, can be quantified. However, it is recognized that interpretation of evidence in other areas is qualitative and subjective. Such areas include evidence of initiative and self-direction, degree of consistency in performance, supporting the group as a team player, going the “extra mile”, creativity and innovation, etc. To assist in evaluating performance in these areas, the persons conducting the review (Department Head, Director, or UPAC) may seek additional data from the faculty member or from peers. Performance evaluation ratings are based on the UPAC’s and/or the department head’s best judgment of all existing evidence.

## **Merit Pay**

Merit pay is designed to acknowledge the contributions faculty make to the mission and goals of the department and the institution. The Department Head and college Dean determine merit from the available pool of merit dollars, based on the annual performance ratings in the areas of teaching, scholarship/ professional development, and service. Faculty members who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory (UN) in any performance category are not eligible to receive a merit-based increase.

During the past several years all units in CISAT have agreed to award a pay percentage increase (equal to 75% of the merit pool allocation) to all faculty who are rated as Satisfactory (Standard Professional Performance) or better during their prior year’s evaluation. The remaining 25% merit pool has been available to award to meritorious faculty. The University insists that merit allocations must discriminate among faculty and be awarded to faculty whose performance is truly exceptional in one or more of the three domains.

To allocate merit, each Exemplary rating is a point and the remaining 25% of the pool is shared as an identical fixed dollar increase awarded for each point. The Department Head reserve 6-8 points to award at her discretion for truly exceptional performance that is highly beneficial to the department. The goal is a process that recognizes truly exceptional performance while also celebrating faculty who meet standard performance expectations.