

**SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION and MULTIMEDIA STUDIES
DOROTHY SCHMIDT COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS**

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Adopted February 1985)

(Revised Fall 1998, Spring 2000, Spring 2008, Spring 2010, Spring 2012, Fall 2018)

(Approved by Provost – March 2019)

(Approved by Provost, Spring 2021)

This document will be reviewed by the School every four years or on an as needed basis.

For purposes of promotion and tenure, faculty members in the School of Communication and Multimedia Studies accept the following criteria and the guidelines for their interpretation adopted on February 1, 1985, and amended Fall 1998, Spring 2000, Spring 2008, Spring 2010 and Spring 2012.

Recommendation for promotion or tenure is not automatic upon fulfillment of these criteria. Although annual report ratings are a key basis for promotion and tenure decisions, all achievements contributing to these ratings will be examined and reassessed at the time of candidacy for promotion and/or tenure. The School's evaluations of individuals for promotion and/or tenure shall be made after a meeting that includes discussion of the case and consideration of the appropriate criteria and a secret ballot polling all faculty members eligible to vote on the case. Only tenured Associate and Full Professors are eligible to vote on promotion to Associate Professor and tenure decisions. Only Full Professors may vote on promotion to Full Professor.

A list of potential referees, of the rank (or higher) aspired to by the candidate, from nationally recognized, four year, graduate degree granting academic institutions, should be compiled by the Director and tenured faculty in consultation with the candidate. The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the list for conflicts of interest. Letters from co-authors, dissertation advisors and personal friends are not appropriate. The Director will solicit five letters from the selected referees using the letter template provided by the provost's office. These letters will evaluate the candidate's research and/or creative activity according to the criteria of the School and disciplinary norms at similar institutions.

Minimum Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

I. Promotion

A. Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Research and Creative Activity

Candidates must demonstrate a coherent research/creative agenda in addition to national visibility or impact in the field, which are typically established by attainments described hereafter. These cumulative achievements must indicate the candidate's likelihood and potential to exercise the security and academic freedom that come with tenure as the means to further develop their research/creative trajectory. Candidates are expected to have a minimum of five articles accepted and in press or in print in peer

differently than print publications. Multiple authorship will count the same as single authorship when the faculty member's contribution is demonstrably substantial.

2. Instruction
Candidates annual report ratings in instruction must average "Good" or better. Faculty should be well established in their ta7 (.7 (y)-13a

materials that do not fall into this category may not always count as the equivalent of a work of original research. In order to count such books/materials no differently than works of original research, arguments can be made using appropriate peer review criteria for traditional and pedagogical works included below.

Peer review criteria for research and other creative works can include the following:

- A. Acceptance to a highly competitive venue with a high ratio of submission to acceptance.
- B. Acceptance based on external review by academic peers.
- C. Acceptance based on blind review by academic peers.
- D. Acceptance based on editorial and curatorial review by academic peers.
- E. Acceptance to a regional, national, or international venue with a rigorous academic reputation.
- F. Acceptance to a smaller venue for which the work is specifically appropriate.
- G. Favorable critique, citation, and/or reprint by academic peers following publication.
- H. Selection by invitation based on the reputation of the venue, committee decision, curator selection, or

when it results

CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REPORT
(Adopted February 1985)
(Revised Fall 1998, Spring 2000, Spring 2008, Spring 2010)

The criteria will be reviewed by the School every four years or as needed.

them in writing.

CRITERIA

For purposes of annual report of faculty at the School level members of the School accept the following criteria and guidelines for their interpretation. The criteria and guidelines assume assignment of all faculty to all three aspects of the School's mission. This mission includes quality instruction, research, and professional service. **All evaluation of faculty must be based on assignment.** It

- C. Acceptance based on blind review by academic peers.
- D. Acceptance based on review by more than one academic peer.
- E. Acceptance to a regional, national and/or international venue with a rigorous academic reputation.
- F. Acceptance to a smaller, local venue for which the work is specifically appropriate.
- G. Favorable critique, citation, and/or reprint by academic peers following publication or exhibition.
- H. Acceptance as a work of original research/ creative work.
- I. Selection by invitation when it results from the established significance of a work or body of works.

Performance Criteria for Annual Report of Research

The designated rating will be awarded for achievements including, but not limited to, the following:

I. Rating: 5 – Exceptional

- a. Acceptance of a completed book manuscript by a publisher.
- b. Publication of a peer-reviewed book.¹
- c. Publication of a textbook or other instructional material.
- d. Acceptance and/or exhibition of a production by selection at an appropriate venue.
- e. Distribution of a production by selection from an appropriate distribution company.²
- f. Acceptance and/or exhibition of a production by invitation at an appropriate venue.
- g. Purchase of a production by an appropriate venue or distributor.
- h. Award of a competitive external research fellowship or research grant.
- i. Editing of a book accepted by contract for publication.
- j. ETw 29.732 0 Td e/001 Tcl (e)2.7 (n)2.1 (n)2.4 (at)-1.135-169 -1.6 (o)-9atoi-4 (r (u)-0.6 (c)ad2.6 (o)-9)]TJ0 Tw 6o0i6 (o)s4.1 [-4 n)

- member will receive one "Exceptional" rating.
- D. Multiple authorship will count the same as single authorship when the faculty member's contribution is substantial. A book to which a faculty member has contributed only an isolated segment will count as an article in a national publication, not as a book.

II.

Candidates must explain the significance of each instance of exhibition to assist the evaluation process.

B. Assessing the quantity and timing of creative work

Unlike scholarly publications, a single creative production may be evaluated numerous times in different contexts. Each showing makes the work available to a new audience and represents a unique process of selection and peer review, deserving individual recognition.

A completed work of any length may move through several distinct phases of production before completion. Work on a production in progress may be evaluated by one or more of the following:

1. Pre-production documents, including script or pre-production paperwork.
2. Raw footage or a rough cut of the production.
3. Other documentation of pre-production or production work.

INSTRUCTION

Faculty instruction includes, but is not necessarily limited to the following: performance in teaching regularly scheduled classes, instructional performance in coordinating the internship and teaching assistant programs, performance in serving as a chair or a member on a graduate thesis or dissertation committee, and performance in academic advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students. Faculty instruction also

1. Considerations in regard to data from Student Perception of Teaching Surveys.
 - a. Number of courses taught; faculty teaching full loads will be given more consideration than those with other assignments.
 - b. Number of course preparations required; faculty preparing more courses will be given more consideration than those teaching multiple sections of the same course.
 - c. Range of courses taught (that is, introductory courses to graduate seminars; required or elective courses; theory, performance, or analytics courses); recognition will be given to the fact that different kinds of courses present different instructional challenges.
 - d. Grading load of courses taught; faculty teaching courses with heavy grading loads will be given more consideration than those teaching courses with light grading loads.
 - e. Number of courses taught; faculty teaching full loads will be given more consideration than those with other assignments.

I. Rating: 5 – Exceptional

a. Evidence of consistently outstanding instruction in at least two (2) of the three (3) main categories listed under II, Instructional Portfolios: Peer Review Process: A. Evidence of Quality Instructional

V. Rating: 1 – Unsatisfactory

- a. Failure to demonstrate any significant achievement in instruction.
- b. A performance improvement plan will be developed to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.
- c. Failure to meet performance improvement plan benchmarks may result in sanctions.

SERVICE

Service consists of those activities not clearly defined under instruction and research which nevertheless contribute to the furtherance of the University's role and functioning as an academic institution. Service can consist of activities on behalf of or contributing to the School, College, or University; to the professional field, and/or to the community. In addition, under the category of service, assigned administrative activities, including School Director, Program Director or Coordinator, Assistant Dean or any other administrative position which accounts for 50 percent or less of an individual's annual assignment shall be included as administrative service.

Because administrative service assignments vary greatly, they shall be evaluated individually on the basis of information supplied to the Personnel Committee.

Criteria for Annual Report of Service

The designated ratings and the levels of achievement for service activities listed under each rating represent only the minimum required. In themselves they do not guarantee the respective rating. Criteria used in the assigning of a rating are (1) the amount of time spent on the specific service, (2) the kind of role played by the faculty member, with leadership positions evaluated more highly, and (3) the outcome or result of the service.

I. Rating: 5 – Exceptional

An "Exceptional" rating will be awarded to any faculty member who, in addition to serving the School satisfactorily, has served the academic or civic community in at least one of the following ways:

- a. Membership on a major College or University committee or governance body.
- b. Significant service to a professional association, editorial board, or other professional or scholarly entity.
- c. Significant service to the School.
- d. Significant service to the community.
- e. Cumulative equivalent to any of the above.

II. Rating: 4 – Outstanding

An "Outstanding" rating will be given to any faculty member who, in addition to serving the School satisfactorily, has served the academic or civic community in at least one of the following ways:

- a. Membership on a minor College or University committee.
- b. Service to the public schools.
- c. Service to the School, University, community, professional association, or other professional or scholarly entity.
- d. Cumulative equivalent of any of the above.

III. Rating: 3 – Good

- Promoting a scholarly environment
- Implementing and maintaining School policies
- Effectively representing the School and its faculty to the Dean and other University administrators
- Making personnel and evaluation decisions in a professional, unbiased n