

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**  
**The College of William and Mary**

**Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty**  
**May 19, 2006**

*Contents and Status:*

- Part I. Overall Procedures for Evaluation** (Approved May 17, 2006)
- Part II: Procedures for Annual Merit Review and Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty**  
(Approved Nov. 1, 2005 and May 17, 2006)
- Part III: Mid-Probationary Review of Tenure-Eligible Faculty** (Approved May 17, 2006)
- Part IV: Tenure and Promotion Procedures** (Approved May 17, 2006)
- Part V: Promotion to Full Professor Procedures (To be completed in Fall 08)**
- Part VI: Eligibility for Research Leave** (Approved January 16, 2007)
- Part VII: Post Tenure Review Policy and Procedures** (Unchanged)
- Part VIII: Policy on Joint Appointments** (Unchanged)

**Part I. Overall Procedures for Evaluation**

All personnel evaluations in the Sociology Department will follow the guidelines of the November 15, 1996 Faculty Handbook as amended. These evaluations involve participation of the Chair and Personnel Committee.

*The Personnel Committee consists of three members elected by a majority vote of the members of the department. The Personnel Committee will meet and elect a Chair. Committee members serve staggered three-year terms. Following a completed term, a member may not serve on the Personnel Committee for a period of three years. Members of the Personnel Committee for tenure and promotion reviews must be at a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. If a member of the Personnel Committee is untenured or is undergoing review, the member will be replaced by one of the most recent former members of the Committee who meets the tenure and rank standards, normally beginning with the most recent member. The Chair of the Department does not serve on the Personnel Committee, and may not serve on the Committee for a period of three years following his/her completed term in office.*

*The responsibilities of the Committee include personnel actions concerning members of the department and range from issues concerning recruitment and retention to the periodic evaluations of faculty members of the department. The Chair maintains an individual personnel folder for each faculty member of the department. The individual faculty member is responsible for providing the Chair with all relevant items of information for the folder. Each faculty member has the right of access to all information in his or her personnel file upon request, given reasonable notice.*

*The personnel folder contains the following information:*

1. A current curriculum vitae.
2. Annual merit reviews by the Chair and each member of the Personnel Committee.
3. A mid-probationary review, if applicable.
4. Tenure review, if applicable.
5. Promotion to Full review, if applicable.
6. Post-tenure review, if applicable.
7. Research Leave Eligibility reviews, if applicable.

8. Joint appointment memoranda and reviews from home and host departments/programs, if applicable.

These reviews will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines articulated by the Provost. Recommendations for annual merit, mid-probationary, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews are prepared independently by the Personnel Committee and the Chair and forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. As soon as the candidate's file is submitted, faculty members holding appropriate rank are invited to provide written commentary.

In the case of mid-probationary and tenure decisions, all tenured members of the department will participate in a confidential vote on whether to recommend a positive review. The majority identifies itself and decides who will write its report which will be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The Chair reports on how the process was organized and what criteria were applied to the review, and may submit an independent report. Criteria for evaluation for mid-probationary, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure are described in more detail in Part II.

## **Part II: Procedures for Annual Merit Review and Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty**

Annual merit reviews are normally conducted early in the spring semester and focus primarily on the activities of the preceding calendar year. Faculty members will be evaluated according to the following weighting system (15 total points possible): teaching (6 points), research and scholarly activities (6 points), and service (3 points). Under exceptional circumstances, a tenured faculty member who is not the Chair may negotiate with the Chair and the Personnel Committee to adjust the weighting of the areas of his/her evaluation for a single year. If the Chair wishes to engage in such an adjustment, he/she will negotiate with the Personnel Committee and the Dean. Such negotiations must be completed prior to the relevant year. All elected members of the Personnel Committee will provide to the Chair both narrative and numerical evaluations for all departmental faculty members, including continuing, fixed-term, and joint appointed faculty members, except for themselves and the Chair. The Personnel Committee's evaluations of the Chair will be sent directly to the Dean.

### **Procedures for Evaluation of Merit Reviews**

1. Faculty members are responsible for submitting their annual activities report and supporting documentation by December 15<sup>th</sup>. Faculty members will submit the departmental activities report forms with scholarly, teaching and service activities listed and short narratives describing accomplishments and planned activities in the area of scholarship and teaching. These forms will be available on the department website. In addition, supporting documentation for teaching activities must be submitted. These include course syllabi and student evaluations. Prior to evaluating the files, the Personnel Committee and the Chair will meet to check for completeness of the files. Faculty members who lack any materials will be so notified by the Chair. For faculty with Joint Appointments, one file should be submitted for the Department review, which would include our forms at the front and the additional documentation from programs behind.
2. Each committee member will individually review the files and bring their assessments to the Personnel Committee meeting. The committee will discuss these and develop a collective scores, which the chair of the committee will submit to the

Chair and the averages and ranges per category. The committee will generate and submit one narrative to the Chair for each section of each faculty member's review: teaching, scholarly activities, and service.

3. In the event that the Personnel Committee or the Chair requires more information to make their assessment, they may request additional supporting documentation.
4. The Personnel Committee and the Chair will use the criteria and score values enumerated later in this section to evaluate faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service.
5. Each category score by the Personnel committee and the Chair will be accompanied by a description of the reasoning on which the score is based. A summary score shall equal the sum of the three area scores. The scores of committee members are advisory to the Chair. If the Chair agrees with the PC average, then the score goes forward to the Dean. If the Chair disagrees with the PC average by one point or less, then the Chair may put forward a new score. If the Chair disagrees with the PC average by more than one point, then Chair must go to the PC and describe their beliefs on why the scores should be reconsidered. The PC discusses this and votes to support the Chair's new score, or does not grant permission to the Chair. At the end of the process, the Chair will report to the individual faculty member the narrative that went up, the range of PC scores, the average of the PC's scores, and any adjustments to their scores made by the Chair.
6. The Chair of the department is responsible for submitting the merit recommendation for each member of the department to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In the event the final evaluation scores of the Chair place a faculty member in jeopardy of an unscheduled post-tenure review in the next two years, the Chair will meet with the Personnel Committee to discuss his or her recommendation before it is sent to the Dean.
7. The Chair of the department will provide to each faculty member copies of all category scores and written evaluations from the Chair and Personnel Committee pertaining to him/her.
8. If the faculty member is on leave one semester, the Personnel Committee will use person's single semester score for evaluating their merit in teaching and service. If the faculty member is on leave for the entire calendar year, the committee shall use their average from the previous two years.
9. Avenue for appeal: Faculty members have the right to appeal their annual review ratings. Copies of a written appeal should be provided to all members of the Personnel Committee and the Chair. Faculty will have fourteen calendar days to file an appeal of their merit scores in writing, which goes to the PC and the Chair. Appeals will be adjudicated by the PC, with the score they put forward after the appeal being the final one which goes to the faculty member and the Chair, who will then report it to the Dean. In the case that the appealing faculty member is also a member of the PC, that person will recuses themselves, and the last previous person to have served on the PC will serve in their place.

## Forms of scholarly contribution and their relative merits

The Department of Sociology at the College of William and Mary views scholarship as encompassing any activity that advances our discipline by creating or extending sociological knowledge and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is the publication of original research, professional development also includes other activities that support research in the discipline, including reviewing articles and books, editing or refereeing journals and books, and presenting or participating in conferences.

The Department of Sociology recognizes that the variety of methods and forums used to develop and disseminate sociological knowledge is a fundamental strength of the discipline. The department views debates over the relative merits of basic vs. applied research, theoretical vs. empirical work, scholarship of discovery vs. scholarship of integration, qualitative vs. quantitative methods, and primary vs. secondary analyses as misguided struggles over false choices. Each research topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged on whether it produces a valuable product. Thus, scholarly achievement can occur in numerous ways and no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

For example, a person who mainly writes articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who publishes his/her work in books (provided that the publication process has comparable peer review scrutiny). Faculty who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, books, or book chapters) will be evaluated on the whole body of work as will faculty who specialize in one form of scholarly expression. Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give less credit to published work that is not refereed.

### 1. Publication in top journals

The Department of Sociology recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals exists within the field of sociology. This hierarchy is largely based on published journal rankings in which measures such as “impact,” “centrality,” and “core influence” scores are used to weight the value of sociology journals. Based on these rankings, it is generally recognized that the *American Sociological Review*, the *American Journal of Sociology* and *Social Forces* are the three most prestigious journals in the discipline. Articles published in these three outlets are often influential. Moreover, the acceptance rates of manuscripts submitted to these journals are low given the rigor of the review process. A handful of other journals may include (but are not limited to) examples such as *Sociological Forum*, *Sociological Perspectives*, *Social Problems*, and *Sociological Quarterly*. It is clear that publishing in the top journals in sociology has significant professional value given the prestige and attention that publishing in such outlets brings to the scholar and the department.

### 2. Publication in specialty journals

The trouble of ranking journals is most apparent in the case of specialty journals. It is difficult to compare or assess the relative value of works published in journals within one sub-field of sociology with those published in another sub-field. Moreover, it is often the case that very valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or unique empirical evidence that challenges existing knowledge may not be published in the best-known journals. Still, it is possible to rely upon “core influence” or “impact scores” when comparing a specialty journal with all journals in sociology (e.g., the *Journal of Marriage and the Family* can be considered a leading sociology journal) or the relative ranking of one specialty

journal with another specialty journal (e.g., the *Journal of Marriage and the Family* is more highly regarded than the *Journal of Family Issues*). Having recognized that such measures can be used as one method by which to rank journals, this should not be the only consideration in evaluating the quality of a scholarly contribution.

### **3. Publication in interdisciplinary journals**

Sociologists examine virtually every arena of social life. The department recognizes the value of publishing in scholarly social sciences journals in which sociologists and those from other disciplines (anthropology, demography, economics, education, environmental science, epidemiology, political science, etc.) also publish. Moreover, as a result of interdisciplinary collaboration, some of a scholar's publications may appear in journals that may be the exclusive terrain of other disciplines. The department recognizes that sociologists can and do regularly make sociological contributions to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work so long as it undergoes the peer-review process. Publication in interdisciplinary journals or journals within other disciplines brings prestige to the scholar, the department, and The College of William and Mary by reaching a wide audience of scholars within and external to the discipline.

### **4. Publication of books**

Publishing a book is a highly valued scholarly activity and much of the research that sociologists undertake is better suited to publication in the form of a book than in a refereed journal (and vice versa). Indeed, because of the rich diversity of sociological methods, perspectives, and subjects, refereed books and journal articles share equal status within the discipline and the Department of Sociology embraces both forms of publication. Still, it is possible to make distinctions between books and journal articles that are relevant for assigning merit scores. For example, books, given their length, often present multiple analyses whereas it is frequently the case that articles are narrower in scope. This has a bearing on the time it takes to produce a book. Also, the publication process for books often varies; for example, some book contracts are awarded based on a prospectus while some presses or editors require a finished manuscript that must undergo review. While the department emphasizes the importance of final publication, it also acknowledges that a book-length manuscript that has been accepted for publication should receive more merit (because it represents a tangible product) than a book contract awarded to a scholar based a prospectus.

Finally, the Sociology Department recognizes that there are a limited number of very prestigious presses in which to publish a book, particularly the University of California Press, Cambridge University Press, Chicago University Press, and Oxford University Press. These outlets maintain extremely high publication standards and a rigorous peer review process. Moreover, prestigious disciplinary awards such as the A.S.A.'s Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award or the S.S.S.P.'s C. Wright Mills Award, tend to be disproportionately given to works published with these presses. Still, there are numerous other high-quality presses that publish sociological work. While it is not possible to exhaustively or precisely rank academic presses the department recognizes that distinctions can be made among them based on acceptance rates and the rigor of the review process. Furthermore, many non-academic presses (e.g., Routledge, Russell Sage) can and do produce excellent and influential books. For these reasons, evaluating a book's quality must be based on multiple criteria in addition to the reputation of the press in which a book is

published. These criteria include the rigor of the review process, reviewers' assessments of the manuscript, published reviews of the final product and any awards that a book receives.

### **5. Co-authorship**

The Department of Sociology acknowledges the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of determining the relative contributions of co-authors. Modern sociological research is increasingly a team enterprise, and interdisciplinary research—which we strongly support—almost by definition results in publications with multiple authors. The Department does not therefore automatically assume that higher value should be given to single-authored than to co-authored works. We also know that the order of authorship does not necessarily convey information about the relative contribution a scholar makes to a given work. We will, however, accord proportional credit to a faculty member's contribution to a multiple-authored work if it can be established (preferably by the authors themselves). Finally, the department values publishing with undergraduate students and recognizes that, in most cases, co-authorship does not enhance the pace of publication. We therefore view co-authorship with students as largely a teaching exercise that should not be viewed as a diminution of scholarly work.

### **6. Publication of book chapters, editorial oversight of edited volumes, and monographs**

Chapters appearing in edited volumes and/or serving as the editor of and contributor to an edited book may be considered meritorious but, generally, this form of publication is accorded less status within the discipline. In many cases edited chapters and books do not have as much of a scholarly impact as refereed journal articles or books. Thus, while the department considers the publication of edited books and book chapters to be a viable and merit-worthy endeavor, publishing edited volumes will receive less weight than a book and book chapters will receive less weight than articles that appear in peer-reviewed journals.

### **7. Grant support**

Obtaining external grant support for research is a highly valued scholarly activity and success in obtaining grants weighs heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation and the quality of a scholar's ongoing research agenda. Nationally competitive grants (i.e., those funded by a national source in which the granting agency requires proposals to be scrutinized by scholarly peers) will be considered particularly meritorious. Still, grant support is a means to an end and is not a substitute for publication; thus, while grant support from highly competitive sources will be considered highly meritorious, it will not be conferred the same status as publication in peer-reviewed journals or books published with academic presses.

### **8. General Recognition within the Discipline of Sociology**

Invitations received for colloquium presentations or workshops at professional associations or other universities and reviews and citations of published work will be viewed as further evidence of scholarly reputation. A faculty member should provide a list of titles, locations, and dates for invited presentations and, for reviews and citations, a complete bibliographic citation of the work in which they appear.

### **9. Other forms of scholarly contributions**

The department's goal is to foster the production of high-quality scholarship in the form of publication and the department expects all of its members to meet these standards. Yet, there are a number of ways for a researcher to remain engaged in scholarly activities during years when he or she has not submitted research for publications. Such activities include presenting at conferences (in the form of paper presentations at regular session, roundtable discussions, or poster presentations) contributing to conference activities (i.e., serving as a conference or session organizer, a session discussant or moderator), serving as a referee for journals or book manuscripts, disseminating original data, designing software, publishing reference volume or other encyclopedic entries, book reviews, publishing working papers and white papers. Similarly, invited talks at other universities are a sign of scholarly productivity and the quality of ongoing research.

### **10. Evidence of ongoing research activity**

The Department of Sociology recognizes that a scholar's research outputs (i.e., their publications) may not manifest themselves on a yearly basis. There may be times of high productivity in which a book or several articles may be published in a single year and there may be several years between publications when a scholar is gathering data and/or preparing manuscripts for review. These research "inputs" are an inevitable part of the research process. Nevertheless, given the department's emphasis on the quality of one's scholarship, it is necessary for a scholar to publish in order for such scholarship to be evaluated appropriately. Therefore, collecting and collating data will be accorded much less weight than publication although such activities will be given moderate weight in the merit process.

In addition to research inputs (e.g., gathering and analyzing data) and research outputs (i.e., publication) there are intermediary stages in the research process that result in tangible evidence of probable publication. These intermediary stages include completing and submitting journal articles and book manuscripts and receiving positive feedback from journal editors and book reviewers. Such intermediary products will receive slightly more merit than research inputs and represent encouraging signs toward eventual publication.

### **Assigning Annual Merit Scores for Scholarly activity**

The Department of Sociology recognizes that active scholars typically will be engaged in multiple forms of research-related activities. Therefore, members of the personnel committee should consider the entirety of a faculty member's scholarly activities for a given year and then assign a merit score that reflects their assessment of overall research engagement. Delineating a scoring system for all forms of scholarly activity or combinations thereof would be difficult; however, the following rubric is offered as a heuristic device to assist the personnel committee in assigning faculty merit scores for scholarship. These guidelines express a general sense of the relative merit that may be assigned to common types of scholarship activities engaged in by sociologists.

**Scores ranging from 5.0 to 6.0** represent outstanding scholarly work. This range of scores may be warranted for published, peer-reviewed scholarly work in quality outlets. In the case of a publication of a book in a quality press a score of six may be warranted in two consecutive years (in the year of and the year following publication). In addition to publishing in

top outlets a scholar may be awarded a score in this range for receiving a prestigious grant or fellowship.

**Scores ranging from 4.00 to 4.75** represent good to very good level of scholarly activity. This range of scores may be warranted for submitting articles to peer-reviewed outlets, the publication of a book chapter, the submission of a grant proposal, the submission of a book prospectus or manuscript, or other significant activities that suggest publication within a reasonable time frame.

**Scores of 3.0 to 3.75** represent moderate levels of scholarly activity. This range of scores may be warranted for engaging in preliminary research inputs that are expected to result in publication. Research inputs consist of activities such as the collection of information that will be used in sociological analyses, the actual analyses of such information, or the development of a manuscript that will be submitted for publication within a reasonable time frame.

**Scores of 1.25 to 2.75** represent limited engagement in scholarly activity. This is evidenced by sporadic attempts to contribute to the discipline through the development of work that will be submitted to peer-reviewed outlets. This range of scores may be warranted for engagement in the same stages of preliminary research inputs (on the same research project) over several consecutive years without submitting the results of such research for peer review. While this range of scores may also be assigned for reviewing journal articles, grants, or books and for conference activities such as serving as a session discussant or organizer, these activities alone over the course of several consecutive years cannot sustain this range of scores indefinitely.

**Scores of 1.0 or below** represent unacceptably low levels of scholarly activity as evidenced by a lack of a concerted attempt to contribute to the field of sociology through scholarly activities that lead to publication in peer-reviewed outlets. The guiding principle of the department is that results of research be presented for scrutiny before one's scholarly peers and the lack of submission of original research for peer review over an extended duration may warrant scores in this range.

### **Forms of Teaching Activities and their Relative Merit**

The Department of Sociology at the College of William and Mary views teaching as encompassing any activity in which faculty thoughtfully contribute to a student's systematic exploration of the social world and their acquisition of tools that facilitate critical and analytical thought about society. The goals and activities involved in teaching sociology are varied. Sociology faculty expose students to new ideas, inspire them to think critically about commonly accepted social beliefs, and help them to appreciate the theoretical, methodological, and empirical contributions of the discipline. Faculty instruction also may focus on the wider goals of The College such as the development of research and writing skills, gaining exposure to interdisciplinary and cross-cultural ideas, acquiring leadership abilities, and becoming a thoughtful and productive citizen.

Faculty make contributions to the department's teaching mission by offering courses that: 1) are taught to a wide audience of students from across the college; 2) fulfill the requirements of the Sociology major; 3) present areas of specialization within sociology; and 4) count towards General Educational Requirements.

The Department recognizes that faculty may vary the content, format and organization of courses to suit their individual strengths, course objectives, and class size while also recognizing

that effective teaching likely involves a variety of classroom activities and assignments that help students to develop the diverse set of skills that characterize graduates of a rigorous liberal arts degree program. Course assignments and activities may include but aren't limited to: doing research papers, writing essays, completing "fact-based" assignments and exams, reading original materials, and making oral-presentations in class. Moreover, it is expected that assignments and course activities are graded conscientiously and with appropriate rigor.

Although the essential core of teaching within the Department involves developing and delivering materials in a classroom setting, there are many other out-of-class teaching activities that may enhance the intellectual experience of students (particularly majors). Such activities include, but are not limited to: supervising honors theses, independent studies, individual readings, and internships; providing research training and mentoring activities that lead to conference participation and research publication; and advising students on graduate school or career plans. Other non-classroom activities that signify effective teaching include developing new courses, transforming existing courses, developing new pedagogical approaches, contributing syllabi to an ASA teaching guide, publishing a teaching-related article (e.g., in *Teaching Sociology*) or participating in teaching development workshops of various types (e.g., Charles Center's Teaching Project, May Seminars, ASA teaching workshops). Completing a combination of the above activities in addition to high quality classroom teaching may make a faculty member eligible for an award or special honor (e.g., a state-wide, university-wide, or student group sponsored teaching award). Such formal praise brings recognition to the individual faculty member as well as the Department as a collective unit.

### **Evaluation of Teaching Quality**

Paralleling the variety of activities that faculty may employ in the process of teaching, the Department of Sociology recognizes that effective instruction is best evaluated on the basis of multiple sources of evidence, such as those discussed below.

1. **Quantitative Teaching Evaluations:** As a general rule, end-of-semester *quantitative* student evaluations of a course and an instructor are a pragmatic way to establish benchmarks of merit. The quantitative evaluation form contains multiple questions regarding course content and instructor performance. All of these items may be considered in evaluating a faculty member for merit. However, at a bare minimum, the two summary questions that ask students to assess the overall quality of the course and the overall quality of the instructor must be utilized. Responses to all items on the form are coded in a range from one to five, with one labeled as "poor," two as "below average," three as "average," four as "above average," and a five as "outstanding." The Department acknowledges that while scores on these items likely measure some aspects of "quality teaching," they also tap into other factors (e.g., difficulty of assignments/grading procedures, entertainment value of the course, physical appearance of instructor, pre-existing student interest in the topic; required vs. elective course) that at best are tangentially related to effective teaching. Such confounding factors cannot be easily parsed out of quantitative evaluations and therefore, while the College requires that these evaluations be used, the Department of Sociology considers them only one of several tools by which effective instruction will be assessed.
2. **Other Evidence of Effective Teaching:** In addition to the quantitative student evaluations, the Department of Sociology views several other factors as critical

evidence for evaluating effective instruction. These include (but may not be limited to):

- (a) **Student written comments on evaluation forms:** Teaching merit may be indicated by receiving written comments from students that indicate high quality instruction, thought-provoking material, and challenging assignments and exams.
- (b) **Syllabi of Courses Taught:** Faculty should submit the most recent syllabus for each course taught during the last year. Syllabi represent a “contract” with students as required in the faculty handbook and should generally be followed as closely as possible. Syllabi may demonstrate the degree to which faculty use up-to-date materials, a variety of assignments, and a level of difficulty/academic rigor that is appropriate for the course level and description as outlined in the course catalog.
- (c) **Number of students taught:** Sociology courses vary in size depending upon level, topic, and format (e.g., lower division courses tend to be larger, seminars and writing intensive upper-division courses are generally smaller). Against that backdrop, faculty are expected to teach courses at or near their capacity whenever it is possible to do so (i.e. when enough students register for a course). It should be considered meritorious when a faculty member is willing to over-enroll their courses in order to meet student demand.
- (d) **Difficulty of Courses:** Some courses are inherently difficult to teach. Consideration should be given to the type of course taught as a context for assigning merit points on the basis of quantitative student evaluations, since evaluation scores are likely to be lower for these difficult-to-teach courses.
- (e) **Development of New Courses & Major Transformation of Existing Courses:** Sociological knowledge is constantly advancing and changing. Vibrant teacher-scholars should stay up-to-date with the latest knowledge in their areas of specialization as well as within the core of Sociology. As a result, it is expected that periodically individual faculty will either create new courses that represent the latest developments in the discipline or substantially revise and update existing courses. Development of new courses and major updates to existing courses requires beyond the normal teaching effort on the part of faculty and therefore, may be considered meritorious teaching activity.
- (f) **Teaching interdisciplinary courses:** The College and the Department of Sociology clearly value interdisciplinary instructional efforts. Interdisciplinary teaching has its own set of unique challenges that should be acknowledged. Faculty who regularly contribute to interdisciplinary instructional activities may warrant consideration for additional merit for such activities.
- (g). **Supervision and Mentoring:** Faculty may provide information regarding teaching and mentoring activities that include, but aren’t limited to: supervision of honor theses; directed readings or independent study courses; supervision of internships; advisement of students; and the organizing or presenting of seminars on pedagogy. Evidence of success in these activities include, but aren’t limited to: honors and rewards received by one’s students; papers presented at

conferences or accepted for publication; and admittance into graduate or professional programs.

- (h) Peer review of teaching:** As additional evidence, faculty may opt to have a colleague review and provide written commentary on their course materials, lectures and other classroom activities.

The above activities may be highlighted in a brief teaching narrative that all faculty should provide as part of their annual merit review file. In addition, any teaching-related activities not mentioned above should be discussed in the narrative. The narrative is designed to provide faculty with a forum for “self evaluation” and a tool for drawing attention to teaching activities that are especially noteworthy or meritorious.

### **Assigning Annual Merit Scores for Teaching**

The Department of Sociology recognizes that faculty will ideally be engaged in *multiple* forms of teaching-related activities. Therefore, members of the personnel committee should consider the entirety of a faculty member’s teaching activities for a given year and then assign a merit score that reflects their assessment of overall teaching engagement. Delineating a scoring system for all forms of instructional activity or combinations thereof would be difficult; however, the following rubric is offered as a heuristic device to assist the personnel committee in assigning faculty merit scores for teaching.

**Scores ranging from 5.0 to 6.0** represent *outstanding* teaching. The baseline of this range of scores may be warranted for a teacher who earns quantitative student evaluations (for the course and for the instructor) that average more than one standard deviation above the department’s mean teaching score on student quantitative evaluations. Faculty may be moved above the baseline of this range of scores if they show other indications of “outstanding instructor effectiveness” such as qualitative student comments that consistently offer high praise and/or evidence of active engagement in teaching activities beyond the classroom (e.g., supervision of theses/projects; research training; teaching workshops; development of new courses, etc.). Faculty receiving state or college awards for outstanding teaching will be assigned scores in the upper range of this category.

**Scores ranging from 4.00 to 4.75** represent *good-to-very good* teaching. The bottom of this range of scores may be warranted for faculty who receive quantitative teaching scores that, on average, are within one ( $\pm 1.00$ ) standard deviation of the department’s mean teaching scores. This baseline merit score may be adjusted upward on the basis of qualitative student comments that indicate solid teaching, and/or based upon evidence of active engagement in teaching activities outside the classroom.

**Scores ranging from 3.00 to 3.75** represent *fair* performance in teaching. The base of this range of scores may be warranted for faculty who receive quantitative teaching evaluation scores that average between 1.01 to 1.5 standard deviations below the department’s mean. Merit scores may be raised above this baseline if the faculty member receives qualitative comments that indicate, overall, that an instructor is reasonably effective at teaching or if the faculty member shows evidence of engaging in teaching activities outside of the classroom.

**Scores ranging from 1.25 to 2.75** represent *needs improvement* in teaching. This range of scores may be warranted for faculty who receive quantitative teaching scores that average

between 1.51 to 2.0 standard deviations below the department's mean; receive teaching scores that on average are below the 3.0 or "average" on student teaching evaluations; receive qualitative student comments that suggest somewhat inadequate instructional effectiveness; and participate in few (if any) non-classroom teaching activities.

**Scores of 1.0 or below** represent *poor* teaching. This range of scores may be warranted for faculty who receive quantitative teaching scores that average more than 2 standard deviations below the department's mean; receive scores that, on average, fall below the 3.0 or "average" score on the student teaching evaluations; receive qualitative comments that suggest completely ineffective instruction; and are engaged in few, if any, teaching activities outside of the classroom.

### **Forms of Service and their relative merits**

Service to colleagues, the department, and to the University are essential elements of academic life and are therefore important in judging faculty members' contributions toward merit. Faculty members also owe service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee and board members. In addition, sociology faculty, who are extensively trained to analyze social issues and problems, can offer discipline-relevant forms of community service; thus, efforts to apply sociological knowledge and methods to address local, state, or national concerns are highly valued in the department.

Neither the College nor the Department of Sociology asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. As such, service will be evaluated differently for assistant, associate, and full professors.

The list provided below indicates what the Department of Sociology considers important forms of service for faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality.

1. **Collegial Support and Cooperation:** Faculty should list efforts in assisting colleagues. These include: a) conferring about educational/teaching issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, assistance with new teaching technology, obtaining or defining data sets, or finding information that can be presented to students); b) guest-lecturing in other courses (in the department and across the university); c) providing substantive feedback or editorial guidance on manuscripts or grant applications (either through the writing group or informally).
2. **Contributions to the Department of Sociology:** Faculty should list the ways they have contributed to the activities that are essential to the operation of the Department. These include memberships on or chairing the Department or its various committees. In rough order of descending importance, these activities include: a) chairing the department, the personnel committee, or a search committee; b) serving on the personnel committee; c) advising and supervising the sociology club and its related activities; d) writing the newsletter; e) hosting and/or organizing departmental events; f) serving as webmaster; g) managing or working in the Center for the Study of Inequality; h) serving as library liaison. The following activities are also essential but are considered less meritorious: chairing or serving on the awards, budget, or human subjects committee. This list is not meant to be exhaustive but represents some common types of service within the Department. Members of the personnel committee will consider the merits of less typical activities as they are presented.

3. **Contributions to the College or University:** Faculty should list their contributions to The College of William and Mary. These include memberships on or chairing committees or representing the College at outside functions. Particularly noteworthy is the long tradition of faculty governance within the College, and sociology faculty who participate in college-wide governance activities will be rewarded accordingly. In order of descending importance, some of the contributions to the College include: a) directing other programs; b) co-chairing the Dean's Advisory Committee; c) serving on elected college-wide committees (e.g., RPT/EPC/CASE); d) administering a study-abroad program; e) serving on the faculty affairs committee; f) serving on a College-wide search committee; g) being appointed to ad hoc college committees; h) inviting speakers to the college and organizing their visits; i) serving on the faculty assembly; j) representing the Department in College activities (e.g., for admissions); k) serving as faculty advisor to student committees; l) serving as a 'mentor' to new faculty to the college. This list is not meant to be exhaustive but does represent some of the more common types of University service that are considered in merit reviews. Members of the personnel committee will consider the merits of less typical activities as they are presented.
4. **Offices Held in Professional Associations and Service to the Discipline:** Faculty should list the positions they hold in professional associations. This includes serving as a board, council, or committee member or serving as an officer. (Note: These include administrative positions only; service as a member of an association's scholarly award committee, as an editor or referee for a journal, or as a program session organizer or discussant is considered along with other scholarly activities). Faculty should also list activities associated with evaluating colleagues (or their work) for tenure or promotion at other colleges or universities or serving as reviewer on grant applications to the NSF or similar granting organizations.
5. **Community Participation:** Faculty should list their service to the community. These include serving on a community organization's board of directors, delivering lectures, speeches, presentations, or workshops for community groups; media interviews and articles or editorial in newspapers; serving as a member, officer, or (unpaid) consultant for a nonprofit or business organization as a sociologist; creating organizations or organizing their activities; supervising student service to the community; and serving as a "public intellectual."
6. **Public Service or Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations:** Faculty should list their work for large-scale organizations or entities. This includes any assistance given to government agencies or public officials (e.g., serving on or consulting for task forces or advisory committees) and any help given to develop or enhance state, or national resources (e.g., assisting the development of resources for a worthy cause).

### **Assigning Annual Merit Scores for Service**

The Department of Sociology recognizes that colleagues who participate in the vitality of the Department, College, and wider community engage in multiple forms of service-related activities. Therefore, members of the personnel committee should consider the entirety of a faculty member's service activities for a given year and then assign a merit score that reflects their assessment of overall service-related engagement. Delineating a scoring system for all forms of service activities or their endless combinations would be nearly impossible; however, the following rubric is offered as a heuristic to assist the personnel committee in assigning merit

scores to faculty for their service. These guidelines express a general sense of the relative merit that may be assigned to common types of service in which sociologists engage.

**Scores ranging from 2.25 to 3.0** represent an outstanding level of service. This range of scores may be warranted for willingly and responsibly serving as chair of the department, or for willingly and responsibly serving as chair of one or more highly demanding committees in the Department, College, or discipline or for consistently undertaking significant leadership activities in the department, college, discipline, and wider public.

**Scores ranging from 1.25 to 2.0** represent a good level of service. This range of scores may be warranted for actively participating in important committees in the department, college, or discipline, making important contributions to the public at large, or being consistently available and willing to provide substantial assistance to colleagues.

**Scores ranging from .25 to 1.00** represent acceptable levels of service. This range of scores may be warranted for serving on some committees in the department or college that may be less demanding.

**A score of 0** represents an unacceptable level of service. This score may be warranted for a pattern of not serving or refusing to participate in service-related activities when called upon.

### **Part III: Mid-Probationary Review of Tenure-Eligible Faculty**

Mid-probationary reviews first and foremost represent an opportunity to provide guidance to tenure eligible faculty who may need to make adjustments in their efforts in scholarship, teaching, and service prior to the tenure assessment. But mid-probationary reviews also provide an opportunity for tenured faculty to critically assess a candidate's likely potential to make sufficiently significant contributions in teaching within the department, scholarship within the discipline, and service to the department, college, community and discipline. Tenured faculty will be especially concerned with the candidate's quality and pace of scholarship during their first years at the college.

The mid-probationary assessment is made by the entire tenured faculty of the department and reviews the total progress of the candidate to date. The process is independent of annual merit reviews; positive or negative annual merit reviews do not guarantee a positive or negative mid-probationary review.

For a faculty member scheduled to be reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of his/her appointment at the College, the mid-probationary review must be completed in the third year of his/her employment in a tenure-eligible position. The date of this mid-probationary review must be noted in the Dean's letter of intent to the candidate.

For a faculty member with a shorter probationary period as a result of credit for academic employment elsewhere, the Dean's letter of intent will schedule a mid-probationary period review, except in cases where a tenure review is scheduled during the first three years of service at William and Mary. Normally, a faculty member must have completed at least one full year of service in a tenure-eligible position at the College before being considered for tenure.

All materials for mid-probationary review must be submitted to the Personnel Committee by November 15. All mid-probationary reviews must be forwarded to the Dean by January 15 with a recommendation as to whether the employment should be continued or whether the

individual should be given notice of termination according to the schedule set out in the current Faculty Handbook.

Materials submitted to the Dean's Office should include evidence concerning teaching effectiveness (evaluations and syllabi), research and scholarly activities (published articles, materials under review, and work in progress), and service (a summary of service work for the department, college, discipline and community). These criteria are described in Part II. A self-evaluation by the candidate of his/her teaching philosophy, scholarship, service, and a statement of future plans in all three areas shall also be included, as indicated below:

1. **A current curriculum vitae which documents the candidate's earned doctorate, record of teaching, research and scholarly activities and service.**
2. **Evidence of teaching covering the applicable review period.**  
A teaching file must include documentation as enumerated in Part II.
3. **Evidence of research and scholarly activities covering the applicable review period.**  
Such activities are enumerated in Part II.
4. **Evidence of service covering the applicable review period.**  
Service criteria are enumerated in Part II.
5. **A narrative self-evaluation not to exceed five double-spaced pages on the candidate's philosophy regarding teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service, and a statement of future plans for each criterion of evaluation.**

Evidence relevant to joint appointments: in those cases where the candidate occupies a joint appointment with another department or program, a letter from the non-tenure granting department or program assessing the candidate's contributions to that department or program is required. Similarly, if a candidate is formally affiliated with another department or program, a letter from the non-tenure granting department or program assessing the candidate's contributions to that department or program is required. In both cases, this information must be considered. The department's Joint Appointment policy, below, provides guidance on these reviews.

The Personnel Committee will submit in writing its evaluation of the faculty member to the tenured members of the faculty. After discussion, all tenured faculty members will vote on the Committee's recommendation. These votes will be recorded. The Personnel Committee's evaluation and evaluation by the Chair and any majority or minority reports will be shared with the person under review, who will be given the opportunity to prepare a written response on these reports before the Department's and Chair's recommendations are forwarded to the Dean's Office. One representative of the majority in the departmental vote will prepare a Majority Report reflecting the procedure, discussion, and the outcome of the faculty vote. This report will be sent directly to the Dean, with a copy to the Chair. Letters from faculty who disagree with either the Chair's or the Majority Report shall be forwarded to the Dean's Office. The separate recommendation of the Department Chair will be forwarded to the Dean's Office.

If tenured faculty reach consensus that the candidate's pattern of achievement suggests the candidate will be able to make significant and positive contributions in research, teaching and service, they should vote in the affirmative, indicate the basis of their positive assessment and note any areas of mild or moderate concern that the candidate should address. If the tenured faculty hold collective reservations about a candidate's ability to make significant and positive

contributions in research, teaching and service, but the majority vote affirmatively, such reservations should be specified in writing in at least one of the documents (Personnel, Chair, or Majority Report) provided to the candidate and Dean. If some of the tenured faculty have serious reservations about a candidate's ability to make significant and positive contributions in research, teaching and service, but the majority vote affirmatively, such reservations should be specified in writing in at least one of the documents (Personnel, Chair, Majority or Minority Report) provided to the candidate and Dean. In this case if the candidate is reappointed, the candidate must select, in consultation with the Chair or another tenured faculty member, a faculty mentor who will attempt to guide the candidate in redirecting their efforts during the second half of their probationary period. If the majority of the tenured faculty hold serious reservations about a candidate's ability to make significant and positive contributions in research, teaching, and service sufficient to earn tenure within the Department of Sociology, they should consider not voting in favor of re-appointment.

Note: External letters are not required for mid-probationary reviews.

#### **Part IV: Tenure and Promotion Procedures**

Tenure and promotion procedures will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines articulated by the Provost (March 29, 1996) and through the use of criteria specified in the *Faculty Handbook*. Normally, as specified in the candidate's contract, the time for review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will occur during a candidate's sixth year. The appendix at the end of this document specifies all of the pertinent deadlines for the review. With the Provost's permission, the tenure review may occur before the sixth year. If a non-academic leave has occurred during the tenure probationary period and the Provost agreed at the time of the leave to an extension of the probationary period, the tenure review will be adjusted accordingly.

The time for review for promotion to Professor may occur as early as the candidate's sixth year of service at the rank of Associate Professor if the faculty member presents evidence of an excellent, long-term record in teaching, of excellence in research and scholarly activities, and service. On research and scholarly activities, tenured faculty will pay special attention in its assessments to the quality and consistency of research output, and making an impact on the field. Outsider reviewers will be asked to comment on the candidate's present or likely contribution to their sub-discipline. On teaching, faculty will assess the candidate's teaching courses which are required for the major, supervision of students, rigor and variety of courses. Some service is expected at multiple levels: to the department, the college, the community and the discipline. The table at the end of this section specifies all of the pertinent deadlines for the review.

Members of the Personnel Committee for tenure and promotion reviews must be at a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. If a member of the Personnel Committee is untenured or is undergoing review, the member will be replaced by the most recent former member of the Committee who meets the tenure and rank standards. If a review committee for a candidate for promotion to Professor cannot be formed from within the Department of Sociology, the Chair will consult with the candidate, the Personnel Committee, and the Dean in order to generate an appropriate committee.

This is a process which reviews the total progress of the candidate from their initial appointment, and is therefore independent of annual merit reviews. Further, the assessment is made by the entire tenured faculty of the department, and for both of these reasons positive annual merit reviews do not guarantee a positive tenure review.

Recommendations for tenure and promotion are prepared independently by the Personnel Committee and by the Chair. The personnel file for tenure and promotion reviews must contain the following information:

1. **A current curriculum vitae which documents the candidate's earned doctorate, record of teaching, research and scholarly activities and service.**

Curriculum Vitae should clearly distinguish between scholarship that is published, accepted for publication, and still under review. Under normal circumstances, only scholarship that is published or accepted for publication will be considered for tenure and promotion. Dates and page numbers for publications are mandatory.

2. **Evidence of teaching covering the applicable review period.**

A teaching file must include documentation as enumerated under "Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty." All student evaluations for all of the faculty member's courses and a statistical summary of the scores on the evaluations must be included in the file. The evaluations must be in a separate dossier, binder, or file box that is clearly marked with the faculty member's name and department. Candidates for promotion shall include all student evaluations since tenure or for the previous eight years, whichever is shorter. A summary of student comments, a description of the kinds of courses offered, such as survey or introductory, upper level, or seminar, and a comparison with other courses offered in the department must be included in the report of the chair, the department, or the departmental personnel committee. A second means of evaluating the faculty member's teaching must be included besides student evaluations.

3. **Evidence of research and scholarly activities covering the applicable review period.**

Such activities are enumerated under "Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty."

4. **Evidence of service covering the applicable review period.**

Service criteria are enumerated in Part II.

5. **A narrative self-evaluation.**

Candidates will provide a narrative not to exceed five double-spaced pages on the candidate's philosophy regarding teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service, and a statement of future plans for each criterion of evaluation.

6. **At least four letters from appropriate external reviewers must be received.**

The candidate will prepare a list of potential reviewers. The Chair and the Personnel Committee will also prepare a list of potential reviewers. External reviewers must be wholly disinterested, i.e., what has traditionally been known as "arms-length." The test for being wholly disinterested is that the potential reviewer should not have the appearance of a vested interest based on his or her own career in the career advancement of the faculty member under review. External reviewers should not have taught the faculty member during his or her graduate education or post-doctoral experience, be a former colleague or supervisor, or have collaborated closely with the faculty member on publications or grants. They may have been in contact with and/or served with the faculty member in editorial roles, review panels, participation in conferences, and professional organizations. If a department has a question as to

whether or not a reviewer is wholly disinterested, the Chair should contact the Dean of the Faculty who will discuss the case with the Chair of the RPT Committee and, if necessary, the Faculty Affairs Committee. The final decision rests with the Dean. After conferring with the candidate, the Chair and the Personnel Committee will select no fewer than four reviewers, at least one of whom must be selected from the candidate's list. Reviewers cannot all come from the candidate's list. External reviewers must be sent the candidate's curriculum vitae and copies of selected scholarly works that the candidate and the Chair have agreed upon. Identical cover letters to the reviewers will inform them that identifying information will be removed from their letters when they are shared with the candidate. External reviewers' C.V.'s, complete or abbreviated, must be included in the tenure or promotion file.

**7. Optional evidence may include letters from colleagues and students as they are relevant to the candidacies.**

All letters solicited are part of the file and must be forwarded. Faculty members are free to include any materials they wish in their files, including letters from William and Mary faculty colleagues and students. Such materials, however, must be clearly distinguished from external review letters.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor will receive copies of the letters from the external reviewers, the Personnel Committee's report, the department's decision, and the Chair's report. The candidate's response times are outlined in the appended timeline. Such responses will be included in the final tenure file. Grounds and procedures for appeal of a negative outcome are provided in the *Faculty Handbook* (amended April 1999), pp. 24-27. All eligible tenured faculty members and professors of appropriate rank will have the opportunity to review the candidates' files. The vote of these faculty members will be recorded and forwarded to the Dean with the final reviews by the Chair and the Personnel Committee.

Table 1: Timelines for Reviews\*\*

*Timeline for Tenure/Promotion Reviews*

Candidate's and Personnel Committee's lists of potential reviewers	March 1 <sup>st</sup>
Solicitation letters go to outside reviewers	April 1 <sup>st</sup>
Materials sent to outside reviewers	June 1 <sup>st</sup>
Letters from outside reviewers	September 1 <sup>st</sup>
Full tenure materials	September 1 <sup>st</sup>
Candidate's response to outside reviewers	September 8 <sup>th</sup>
Personnel Committee's report	September 15 <sup>th</sup>
*Candidate's response to Personnel Committee's report	September 22 <sup>nd</sup>
Department's decision	October 1 <sup>st</sup>
Chair's report	October 8 <sup>th</sup>
*Candidate's response to department's decision and Chair's report	October 15 <sup>th</sup>
Personnel Committee's Report, Department's decision, Chair's report, Candidate's response(s), and complete review materials go to Dean	October 15 <sup>th</sup>

Note:

If these dates fall on a Saturday, then the previous day (Friday) will be used as the due date.

If these dates fall on a Sunday, then the next day (Monday) will be used as the due date.

1. \*If joint appointment: home/host personnel committee report.

2. \*If joint appointment: home/host personnel committee report.

\*\* If the Dean or Provost should change any deadlines, our associated dates will shift accordingly.

### **Part V: Promotion to Full Professor**

During the period between tenure and promotion, faculty members are expected to have continued at least the same level of achievement in research and teaching, both in terms of quantity and quality, as for the period before tenure. For promotion, however, the faculty member's national or international standing should have grown in a fashion appropriate to 12 or more years of continued productivity.

Consideration for promotion will normally take place no less than six years after tenure. Promotion to full professor after less than six years may be possible, based on exceptionally strong performance in research, teaching, and service.

Departments may recommend for promotion faculty members with a modest research record if the faculty member has a sustained record of exemplary teaching and service over a long period, usually at least 15 years since award of tenure, and has the support of a commanding majority of the full professors in the department. The faculty member's research, even though it may be smaller in quantity than is normally the case, will also be considered as part of the case for promotion. The report of the department arguing that the faculty member's contributions in service and achievements in teaching are unusually strong will be crucial to obtaining a favorable decision from the RPT Committee and the Dean.

1. Each September 1st, the Chair of the Personnel Committee will ask (in writing) all members of the Department who have the rank of Associate Professor whether they wish to be considered for promotion to Professor in that academic year. Responses will be due on or about September 15.
2. If a faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion, the Chair of the Personnel Committee will so inform the Committee. If the candidate to be considered is a member of the Personnel Committee, the candidate will remove himself or herself from the Personnel Committee. Should the candidate be Chair of the Personnel Committee, the remaining members of the Committee will select from among themselves an acting chair, who will serve in the capacity of Chair of the Personnel Committee in all remaining deliberations of the case by the Committee, and who will write any reports on behalf of the Personnel Committee. All members of the Personnel Committee will be Full Professors; Associate or Assistant Professors who are members of the Personnel Committee will be replaced by the last Full Professor who served on the Personnel Committee in all cases for promotion to Full Professor. If a review committee for a candidate for promotion to Professor cannot be formed from within the Department of Sociology, the Chair will consult with the candidate, the Personnel Committee, and the Dean in order to generate an appropriate committee.
3. The Chair of the Personnel Committee will inform the Department of the case under consideration. Working with the candidate, the Personnel Committee will gather relevant information about the candidate's teaching, scholarship and service. All materials of evaluation in the member's file will be considered. The information gathered will include the following:

- (a) Letters from department members. The Chair of the Personnel Committee will invite department members to provide a written description of any information that they have that is relevant to the promotion consideration. Such letters should address the criteria for promotion listed above.
- (b) The Department's standard student course evaluation forms, and at least one other method of teaching evaluation, will be used. In accordance with College rules, a candidate's file must include all student evaluation forms from every course taught by the candidate during the last eight years or since tenure, whichever is shorter.
- (c) The curriculum vitae of the candidate shall be included in the file and its format shall be in a form required by the university as stated in the Dean's memo of September 19, 2006. In particular, refereed and non-refereed publications must be indicated clearly. Citations must be complete and include page numbers. A clear distinction must be made between work accepted for publication, work being considered for publication, and work in progress.
- (d) The candidate shall include a written narrative self-evaluation describing his or her teaching, scholarship and service, and a statement of future plans in all three areas. The length of this narrative shall not exceed five double spaced pages.
- (e) The candidate will prepare a list of potential reviewers. The Chair and the Personnel Committee will also prepare a list of potential reviewers. In accordance with the Provost's memo of September 7, 2006 and the Dean's memo of September 19, 2006, external reviewers must be wholly disinterested (i.e., what has traditionally been known as "arms-length"). The test for being wholly disinterested is that the potential reviewer should not have the appearance of a vested interest in the career advancement of the candidate under review. External reviewers should not have taught the candidate during his or her graduate education or post-doctoral experience, be a former colleague or supervisor, or have collaborated closely with the candidate on publications or grants. Reviewers may have been in contact with and/or served with the candidates in editorial roles, review panels, participation in conferences, and professional organizations. If a department has a question as to whether or not a reviewer is wholly disinterested, the Chair should contact the Dean of the Faculty who will discuss the case with the Chair of the RPT Committee and, if necessary, the Faculty Affairs Committee. The final decision rests with the Dean. After conferring with the candidate, the Chair and the Personnel Committee will select no fewer than four reviewers, at least one of whom must be selected from the candidate's list. Reviewers cannot all come from the candidate's list. External reviewers must be sent the candidate's curriculum vitae and copies of selected scholarly works that the candidate and the Chair of the Personnel Committee agree upon. Outside evaluators should come from programs, institutions or agencies of a quality commensurate with the reputation and standards of The College of William and Mary. The same letter of solicitation should be sent to all reviewers. In accordance with the Dean's memo of September 19, 2006, solicitation letters will inform reviewers that identifying information will be removed from their letters when they are shared with the candidate. External reviewers' Curriculum Vitae, complete or abbreviated, must be included in the

promotion file. External reviewers will be sent the candidate's Curriculum Vita and copies of the scholarly works which the member and the Department Chair have agreed should be sent. Copies of the Curriculum Vitas of external reviewers will be sent to the Dean along with the candidate's dossier.

4. The candidate under consideration for promotion will have an opportunity to meet with the Personnel Committee to present evidence or to make a statement in support of his or her case for promotion, and to discuss the substance of any relevant information gathered by the Personnel Committee.
5. The members of the Personnel Committee will attempt to reach a majority decision. Failing this, the Department Chair will break ties in the Personnel Committee vote. In cases in which the department chair is an associate professor or there are three or fewer Full Professors in the department, the following procedures will apply:
  - (a) If the Department Chair is an associate professor, he or she will be replaced by a Full Professor (who is not a member of the Personnel Committee). The acting chair will be elected by a vote of all Full Professors in the Department.
  - (b) If there are three or fewer Full Professors in the Department, the chair of the Personnel Committee will assume the administrative duties of the Department Chair in matters associated with the candidate's case for promotion (but he or she will not be permitted to have a tie-breaking vote).
6. The Personnel Committee will prepare a written report of its decision and the reasons for the decision. The report will be evaluative and not merely descriptive. This report will reflect only the majority decision. Any member of the Personnel Committee who opposes the majority decision may write a signed minority report.
7. The candidate will receive a copy of the Personnel Committee's report, including any attached supporting documents, and any signed minority reports. If the member so chooses, he or she may request in writing to the Chair of the Personnel Committee that the Personnel Committee reconsider a negative case, giving his or her reasons why reconsideration is appropriate. The member will have one week to request reconsideration after receiving the Personnel Committee's report. The candidate will again have the opportunity to meet with the Personnel Committee. If the candidate has requested reconsideration, a second decision by the Personnel Committee will be reached by majority vote.

The Personnel Committee will forward its (revised) written recommendation to the candidate and to all members of the Department who hold the rank of Full Professor. There will be a meeting of all Full Professors in the Department, and no others, to consider the Personnel Committee report. There will be a secret ballot of those department members, held at the meeting, to endorse, modify, or reject the Personnel Committee's report. Full Professors may vote in absentia, provided their written ballot is received by the Chair of the Personnel Committee prior to the meeting described in this paragraph. The Chair of the Personnel Committee will deliver all in-absentia votes to the meeting of Full Professors.

8. The candidate will be shown the final report and supporting documents. The final report, including all letters obtained in the review process, will be delivered by the Chair of the Personnel Committee to the Dean, along with an independent report written by the Department Chair, together with whatever response the candidate may wish to attach, and with whatever signed minority reports members of the Department may wish to add. The Department Chair will discuss his or her report with the candidate before it is delivered to the Dean. The Chair's report to the Dean will include vote totals from the final meeting held by the Department's Full Professors to consider the Committee's report.
9. If the candidate wishes further consideration of the case, he or she must invoke the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

### **Part VI: Eligibility for Research Leave**

Eligibility for 7<sup>th</sup> year Scheduled Semester Research Leaves requires faculty make a case to the Chair that they have been sufficiently research active to merit the leave. To receive a Scheduled Semester Research Leave (SSRL), a faculty member must have satisfied the criteria set forth under item one, two or three within the five years prior to the date of the anticipated SSRL:

- 1) Published three articles of original scholarship in peer-reviewed professional journals;  
**or**
- 2) Published a book of original scholarship with an academic press or reputable trade press;  
**or**
- 3) Completed a combination of three substantively distinct research activities set forth in lists "A" and "B" below. Of these three activities, at least two must come from the activities in list A.

#### List A

- A) Published an article of original scholarship in a peer-reviewed professional journal
- B) Published a book chapter of original scholarship in a peer-reviewed edited volume
- C) Received a contract for a book of original scholarship from an academic press or reputable trade press (Based upon peer review of a prospectus and at least 2 substantive chapters)

#### List B

- D) Received a research grant or research fellowship from an extramural agency on the basis of peer-review of a research proposal
- E) Served as the editor/co-editor of a volume of peer-reviewed chapters of original scholarship or as the editor/co-editor of a special issue of a peer-reviewed professional journal
- F) Presented original scholarship at a peer-reviewed professional research conference
- G) Published a textbook that synthesizes scholarship in sociology or a subfield thereof

Using the above criteria, the eligibility of a faculty member for an SSRL will be determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee. In the event that a faculty member engages in scholarly activities that are not listed above, that faculty member may request that said activity be included as part of List B. Decisions to grant or deny such requests also will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee. The criteria above set forth minimums to satisfy the definition of "research active" necessary to earn a SSRL but this designation should not be construed as sufficient to meet eligibility for tenure or promotion.

## **Part VII: Post Tenure Review Policy and Procedures [UNDER CONSTRUCTION]**

### **Initiation of a Post-Tenure Review**

The initial request for a Post Tenure Review may be initiated by the Dean, Department Chair, or, in the case of a faculty member with an appointment in an interdisciplinary program, by the Program Director.

The request for a Review must be based on a faculty member having merit evaluations that have been persistently lower than those of the large majority of other members of his or her department for several years and lower than what can be reasonably expected of a faculty member who is actively engaged in teaching, research, and service. Having the lowest merit evaluations in a department, especially in a small department, would not, by itself, be sufficient cause for a Review.

The Dean and the Chair, or the Dean, Chair, and Director in the case of a joint appointment in an interdisciplinary program, will discuss the case and determine if there are temporary, extenuating circumstances that account for the faculty member's low merit evaluations. The final decision on whether or not there should be a Post Tenure Review rests with the Dean.

The Post Tenure Review will be carried out by the Department, and the Chair will report the results of the Review to the Dean. In the case of a faculty member with an appointment in an interdisciplinary program, the Review would be jointly carried out by the Department and Program, and the Chair and the Director will report the results to the Dean.

### **Responsibility for Post-Tenure Review**

The post-tenure review will be performed by the tenured members of the Department's elected Personnel Committee at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed and by the Chair. The Personnel Committee will submit a single evaluation to the Department Chair. Post-tenure review will be conducted in accordance with the principle articulated by the Provost concerning rank and tenure status. Specifically, those who serve on the Personnel Committee and the Appeal Committee must hold tenure and must be at a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. The position of Department Chair is recognized as exempt from the restriction regarding eligibility because of rank as the result of administrative responsibilities. [ATTEMPTING TO REMOVE REDUNDANCY FROM OLD DOCUMENT]

### **Information for Post-Tenure Reviews**

The faculty member being reviewed will provide the Personnel Committee with a current curriculum vitae and all other relevant information regarding teaching, research, scholarly activities, and service (as specified in the Department's "Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty") for the preceding six years. In addition, the Department encourages faculty members to provide a brief career narrative (five double spaced pages maximum) for consideration.

### **Criteria for Post-Tenure Reviews**

1. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences Policies and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review (approved January 23, 1997) will provide the framework for reviews within the Sociology Department. A review will be based on the department's criteria for judging teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service. The Department's 15

-point scale used for purposes of annual merit evaluation will be used for post-tenure review (see above).

2. A rating of “unsatisfactory overall performance” will result from either (1) a “1” or lower rating in teaching or (2) the faculty member’s failure to make up for a “1” or lower in research or “0.5” or lower in service by superior performance in both other categories (defined as “5-6” in teaching and research and “2.5 - 3” in service). Merit evaluations for the purpose of annual salary adjustments will continue to reflect all the three areas according to the relative ranking the Department has adopted.
3. A conclusion of unsatisfactory teaching indicated by a merit rating of “0” or “1” must result in a conclusion of “unsatisfactory overall performance.” Unsatisfactory teaching or research and scholarly activities is indicated by a merit rating of “0” or “1” and unsatisfactory service by “0 or .5” An “unsatisfactory overall performance” is also indicated by the faculty member’s failure to make up for an unsatisfactory research and scholarly activities or service by superior performance in both other criteria (defined as “5-6” on teaching and research and scholarly activities and “2.5-3” on service).

### **Conclusions of the Post-Tenure Review**

The Personnel Committee will prepare a report of its findings for each faculty member under review and will rate each faculty member’s performance as superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in teaching, research, and service; appropriate justification will be included. The reports will be conveyed to the Chair by February 1. The Chair will review the reports and make his/her assessment of each faculty member’s record. A finding of “satisfactory or superior overall performance” by the Personnel Committee and the Chair ends the departmental post-tenure review. The Chair will inform each faculty member under review of the decisions of the Personnel Committee and Chair. A copy of the Personnel Committee’s report and the Chair’s report will be sent to the Dean by February 15. These reports are also included in the faculty member’s personnel file.

1. If the Personnel Committee and the Chair conclude “superior overall performance” the Chair will forward the report to the Dean with a recommendation that the Dean give appropriate recognition.
2. If there is a discrepancy in conclusions reached by the Personnel Committee and the Chair, the two parties will meet to attempt to resolve their differences. Failing that, both recommendations are to be forwarded to the Dean. ~~the Chair’s conclusion prevails.~~ If the Chair concludes “satisfactory,” the departmental process ends. If the Chair concludes “unsatisfactory,” the faculty member is so informed.

### **Performance Plans and Other Actions**

1. Should a finding of “unsatisfactory performance” be upheld subsequent to the above reviews and appeals, the faculty member in consultation with the Chair and the Dean will develop the requisite “performance plan” to address the identified areas of deficiency. The resulting plan must be approved by the Chair and the Dean. The plan must contain specific goals that can be used to evaluate performance within the specified time-frame.

- 2 If the assessment of unsatisfactory performance is upheld, the faculty member, in consultation with the Chair and the Dean, will develop a performance plan to address the identified areas of deficiency as specified in Section V. The plan must be approved by the Chair and the Dean by the date of May commencement and it must contain specific goals that can be used to evaluate performance within a specified time-frame. For unscheduled reviews, the following-up review will occur in September after the performance plan has been in place for one academic year. If the overall performance continues to be unsatisfactory, disciplinary action may be taken as referred in Section 5.

2. Follow-up reviews will occur in September after the performance plan has been in place for one academic year. The required “follow-up” reviews will be conducted by the Personnel Committee, the Chair and the Dean.
  - (a) Disciplinary action may be taken if, as a result of the follow-up reviews, the Personnel Committee, the Chair and the Dean determine that overall performance continues to be unsatisfactory.
  - (b) In all cases involving overall unsatisfactory performance the Chair will inform the Dean of the nature of deficiencies, proposed remedial actions, and the results of the ongoing monitoring.

### **Unscheduled Post-Tenure Review**

1. If the Chair’s annual merit evaluation for a tenured faculty member is “unsatisfactory overall performance” for two years in any three –year period, an unscheduled post-tenure review is triggered. The evaluation criteria are those specified in Part II. In such cases, the Chair will initiate the review procedure immediately following the annual merit review evaluation that mandates it (no later than the last business day in January) and inform the person undergoing review. The faculty member being reviewed will submit the information specified in Section II to the Personnel Committee by February 15<sup>th</sup>. The Personnel Committee will be reconstituted, if necessary and will review the materials and submit its reports to the Chair by February 22<sup>nd</sup>.
2. If the Personnel Committee and the Chair conclude “unsatisfactory overall performance”, the faculty member is informed by February 24<sup>th</sup> and has the right to appeal the decision.

Note: If any dates fall on a weekend the due date is the next business day.

### **Special Reviews**

#### **1. The Chair**

- (a) When the Chair of the Department is considered for post-tenure review, the review will be conducted by the Personnel Committee in accordance with already established principles. If the finding is “unsatisfactory overall performance,” the Chair is informed and he/she may appeal the decision, as stated above.
- (b) If it is necessary to conduct an unscheduled post-tenure review for the Chair, the Dean will initiate the review process in accordance with the guidelines established for other faculty who must undergo such a review.

#### **2. Joint Appointments**

In the case where a faculty member holds a joint appointment in Sociology and a second department or program, post-tenure review will be the joint responsibility of the home and host units. However, because a faculty member who holds a joint appointment serves two units, the review must incorporate the conditions for evaluation and other relevant information from both departments or programs as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding at the time of appointment and the

procedure for evaluation of faculty and the department's Policy on Joint Appointments (below).

## **Part VIII: Policy on Joint Appointments**

### **1. Mission/Statement of Vision**

Sociology is by its nature interdisciplinary, combining different epistemological traditions and methodologies. The history of sociology is one of crossing disciplines, and today its subfields have significant overlaps in theory and methods with many diverse fields. Much of the exciting work in our field is occurring along these borders: we expect interdisciplinarity to be increasingly important in the future.

We are committed to supporting interdisciplinary teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service. This document establishes our department's procedures on joint appointments so as to avoid misunderstandings in the future and to regularize joint appointments at the College. Joint appointments need special consideration at all times, and special procedures are needed at times of hire and review: mid-probationary, promotion and tenure, annual review, and post-tenure review. Fairness requires that Joint Appointments should not bear a double burden, and that is the central principle guiding this policy.

Memoranda of Understanding will be developed before and during one's appointment at the College. These should specify teaching expectations, how decisions about teaching assignments will be made, and outline realistic demands for service and research. These Joint Appointment Memoranda of Understanding (JAMOU) should be renegotiable periodically at the faculty member's request. Especially governance expectations need to be clearly laid out, and followed. We expect some host programs and departments to have heavier needs for committee work from their limited number of joint appointments than will home departments. Reviews must be conducted cooperatively, with the department playing a proactive role in creating *holistic* evaluations of the performance of our jointly appointed faculty.

### **2. Definitions and Principles**

The Department of Sociology complies with the provisions stated in the 1998 Policy on Joint Appointments, in which case Sociology is understood either as the home department and the other department or program as the host department, or vice versa. Joint appointment becomes formal only when it is supported with a JAMOU. Faculty appointed are expected to meet teaching, research and scholarly activities and service needs of an interdisciplinary program. The department recognizes both the "joint appointments" formed at the time of hiring and those that may evolve after a faculty member's initial appointment.

- (a) A *continuing joint appointment* between the Department of Sociology and another department or program will normally be conceived at the time of hiring as a consequence of teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service needs of an interdisciplinary program or a department. The joint appointee is expected to maintain sustained involvement in all the units described in the letter of intent. Continuing joint appointments are restricted to tenure-eligible and tenured faculty.

- (b) A *fixed-term joint appointment* may be initiated either by the Department of Sociology or other affiliated departments or programs or by an individual faculty member to enhance teaching, research and scholarly activities and service. Such appointments have a fixed, renewable term and can be held by nontenure-eligible faculty, formalized with a JAMOU. A fixed-term joint appointment will normally be initiated at the time of hire of a new or replacement faculty member. With just cause, a fixed-term joint appointment may be initiated after the initial appointment with the College. Just cause in this case means continuing demand for courses that serve potential host and home units, advising concentrators for the department or interdisciplinary program, and serving on committees in both units.
- i. The home and host units of faculty with fixed-term joint appointments will be specified in the JAMOU. Faculty members with joint appointments will have full rights and privileges consistent with their rank in the home unit unless otherwise specified in the JAMOU.
  - ii. Faculty members who hold joint appointments in the Department of Sociology but whose home departments, programs, or schools are elsewhere will be treated as members of the host department and be so specified in the JAMOU.
- (c) When Sociology is the home department, the needs of its curriculum and personnel must be considered when requests for joint appointment are made. The department or its representative must approve requests for creating a fixed term joint appointment.

### **3. Home Unit and Host Unit Relationship**

In merit, mid-probationary, tenure, promotion and post-tenure evaluations of jointly appointed faculty, the Sociology Department will work with the other unit(s) in developing mutually agreeable guidelines for incorporating the host's recommendations into the home unit's evaluation. These guidelines shall be consistent with the faculty member's JAMOU and the Joint Appointment Policy of the College.

- (a) Such guidelines may include, but are not limited to discussions between the personnel committees of the home and host unit and/or discussions between the Chair of the Sociology Department and the Chair/Director of the other unit. Differences in definitions of duties and workload expectations and standards for evaluations in the personnel policies of the home and host units may occur on occasion. Concerns about how these differences will be bridged and how a joint appointee is to fulfill these varying sets of expectations will be explicitly addressed and clarified during the negotiation of each JAMOU (in accordance with A&S Policy on Joint Appointments, III.A).
- (b) In evaluations of jointly appointed faculty the preferred approach is a holistic report prepared collaboratively by the two units. The Chair/Director of the home and host unit shall exchange their recommendations on merit, mid-probationary, tenure and post-tenure no later than fifteen calendar days prior to when such materials must be submitted to the Dean. The personnel committee and the Chair of the home unit will consider the host unit's report in crafting their recommendation. (See Calendar of Dates Relevant to All Reviews)

- (c) When there is disagreement or inconsistency between the evaluations of the home and host units, the Chair and Chair/Director shall meet to attempt to reach agreement.
  - i. The faculty member shall be notified in writing by the Chair of the home unit and by the host unit Chair/Director of the disagreement and steps each unit will take to resolve the disagreement or inconsistency.
  - ii. If agreement is reached, the home unit's recommendation submitted to the Dean will reflect such agreement. A copy of this revised recommendation will be made available to the faculty member and the faculty member will have three days for response.
  - iii. If no agreement is reached the home and host units will submit separate evaluations or recommendations to the Dean. The Dean will then make the final decision on the evaluation or recommendation.

Revised April 24, 2008