

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Policy Title: | Department of Communication Promotion and Tenure Guidelines |
| Version: | 4 |
| Department Approval: | 09/23/2013 |
| College Approval: | Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 02/05/2014 |

Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.

**Department of Communication
College of Arts & Sciences
Georgia State University
PROMOTION & TENURE GUIDELINES**

Contents:

- I. Introduction.....3
- II. Policies on Promotion and Tenure5
 - A. Eligibility (Time-in-Rank) Policies5
 - B. General Policies.....5
- III. Promotion and Tenure Process6
- IV. Criteria for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and Tenure10
 - A. Tenure10
 - B. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure10
 - C. Areas of Evaluation.....12
 - D. Metrics/Measures of Quality.....16
- APPENDIX ONE: Pre-Tenure Review22
 - A. Areas of Evaluation.....22
 - B. Metrics/Measures of Quality.....22
- APPENDIX TWO: Post-Tenure Review.....27
 - A. Areas of Evaluation.....27
 - B. Metrics/Measures of Quality.....27

Effective Date: February 5, 2014

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

As defined in the GSU College of Arts & Sciences Bylaws a candidate for promotion and/or tenure is bound by the College and Department promotion and tenure manuals in effect on January 31 of the calendar year in which the reviews of the candidate occur.

Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are first made at the level of the Department of Communication by the Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee and then by the chair of the Department. The recommendations are then forwarded to the College’s Area Committee on Promotion & Tenure.

The promotion & tenure processes and other faculty review processes described in these departmental guideline documents conform to the policies and procedures detailed in the Georgia State University Promotion & Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and the GSU College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual. College policies and forms are available online.

These Promotion & Tenure Guidelines of the Department of Communication have also been formulated in conformity with the requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

The process of granting promotion and tenure is an essential mechanism for ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the University. It is intended to be both rigorous and fair. Promotions are awarded in recognition of high levels of accomplishment in the academic work of the University. The decision to award tenure is particularly important because it represents a reciprocal commitment between the University and the recipient, which can last decades. The University thus shines in the reflection of the achievements of its faculty. In view of the multi-disciplinary nature of the Department of Communication, these guidelines seek to augment and clarify, wherever advisable and appropriate, distinctive criteria for the activities of the faculty of the Department of Communication as they relate to the policies of the College.

The academic discipline of Communication encompasses multiple professional, creative, and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making meaning. The Department of Communication exists at the juncture of these traditions and embraces perspectives from the social sciences, humanities, and the performing and media arts. Such a configuration re-affirms the importance of candidates for promotion and/or tenure assuming the responsibility for educating colleagues regarding the quality and importance of their own scholarly or creative work and also, through the inclusion of contextual information from peers and other sources, helping the Department identify and understand the trajectory of their efforts, as well as the national/international reputation they are working to establish.

The Department’s multi-disciplinary nature necessitates that the professional development of faculty members takes diverse forms. While crediting a broad spectrum of scholarly and creative activities, these guidelines assess the range of faculty work in terms of the positive and unique

47 contributions made to the advancement of the individual discipline, as well as to departmental
48 and institutional goals.

49

50 These departmental guidelines are designed to provide information concerning expectations for
51 performance and achievement at the departmental level for promotion and tenure as well as the
52 manner in which departmental expectations intersect with the expectations set forth in the
53 College manual.

54 **II. POLICIES ON PROMOTION & TENURE**

55

56

57 **A. Eligibility (Time-in-Rank) Policies**

58

59 Candidates should refer to the College Promotion & Tenure Manual for information about
60 “Eligibility (Time-in-Rank) Policies”.

61

62 **B. General Policies**

63

64 Promotion and tenure review in the Department follows the rules, procedures, and calendar set
65 forth in the College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual, and on the College
66 website. University and College promotion and tenure calendars supersede any dates in these
67 departmental guidelines, which are offered for the purpose of illustration and to provide
68 information about the typical promotion and tenure cycle.

69

70 Every faculty member in the Department of Communication has a responsibility to be aware of
71 the contents of the College of Arts & Sciences and Georgia State University promotion and
72 tenure manuals, including all deadlines.

73

74 It is the Department’s conviction that there is no more important type of faculty evaluation than
75 the promotion and tenure review process. Because of this, the Department’s Promotion & Tenure
76 Committee commits itself to the highest standards of professionalism and confidentiality with the
77 continuing goal of always producing the fairest and fullest promotion and tenure
78 recommendations of the highest quality that respects both the process as a whole and the faculty
79 colleague being evaluated. To this end, the Department agrees that e-mail should not be used for
80 this confidential personnel process (with the exception of non-substantive matters such as
81 scheduling meetings). Promotion and/or tenure deliberations at all levels are confidential.

82

83

84 III. PROMOTION & TENURE PROCESS IN THE DEPARTMENT

85

86

87 The promotion and tenure process begins in the Department of Communication, where the
88 Department's Promotion & Tenure Committee and the departmental Chair evaluate the
89 credentials of those faculty members who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure and who
90 request consideration. The qualifications of each eligible faculty member being considered must
91 be evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth in the College Promotion &
92 Tenure Manual and in these departmental guidelines on promotion and tenure.

93

94

95 The Department of Communication has a Promotion & Tenure Committee that reviews and
96 evaluates the credentials of all faculty members being considered for promotion to associate
97 professor with tenure. This Committee consists of all tenured associate professors and professors
98 in the Department, except the chair of the Department and any members of the Department
99 serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion/tenure application at the College
100 or University level. This Committee also reviews and evaluates the credentials of faculty
101 members who already hold the rank of associate professor and who are candidates only for
102 tenure. A subcommittee of the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee, made up of all
103 faculty who hold the rank of professor (except the chair of the Department and any members of
104 the Department serving in a position that will review the candidate's promotion/tenure
105 application at the College or University level) will review and evaluate the credentials of faculty
106 members who are being considered for promotion to professor or who already hold the rank of
107 professor and are being considered only for tenure.

108

109 The Promotion & Tenure Committee is chaired by a tenured faculty member appointed by the
110 Department Chair. The Committee's evaluations are based on information derived from
111 information submitted by the candidate, the departmental Committee, outside evaluators, and the
112 Department Chair.

113

114 The Department of Communication's Promotion & Tenure Committee operates through a system
115 of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate's credentials. Subcommittees
116 are typically appointed to evaluate the candidate's Professional Development, Teaching, and
117 Service

118

119 Though the candidate is required to provide a dossier documenting his or her case, organized
120 according to the structure of the guidelines of the Department and manual of the College, the
121 Committee has the option of requesting additional information from the candidate or the
122 Department Chair to help it assess the candidate's portfolio.

123

124 All final recommendations must be made by the appropriate departmental committee. The
125 Committee must meet to discuss and vote on its final recommendation.

126

127 The report of the Promotion & Tenure Committee should summarize the strengths and/or
128 weaknesses of the faculty member in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service in light
129 of the criteria included in these guidelines and the report should clearly indicate

130 recommendations concerning promotion and/or tenure. All conclusions and recommendations
131 should be substantiated by summaries and/or selected inclusions of written data gathered by the
132 Promotion & Tenure Committee. These may be included within the report itself or attached as an
133 appendix. If there is not unanimity, separate minority report(s) shall also be included.
134

135 After reaching its decision, the departmental Committee sends the chair of the Department a
136 written statement of its recommendation, along with a detailed justification of it. The letter from
137 the departmental Committee must be signed by the Committee chair and all Committee members
138 who agree with the recommendation and justification. Committee members who do not sign the
139 letter shall provide separate letters indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these
140 recommendations.
141

142 The Committee shall present the report to the Chair of the Department of Communication, who
143 shall write a separate report which includes his/her assessment. After reaching his/her decision,
144 the Department chair will prepare a statement indicating his/her recommendation along with the
145 reasons for it. If either the majority report of the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee or
146 the Department chair recommends in favor of promotion or tenure, then this action generates a
147 departmental nomination of the candidate. In this circumstance, no self-nomination by the
148 candidate is needed or permitted.
149

150 A candidate for promotion and tenure shall receive from the Department chair, in a timely
151 fashion, copies of the recommendations of the Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee
152 and the Department chair. A candidate shall also receive copies of any minority reports from the
153 Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee. The Chair of the department will remove the
154 faculty signatures from both the majority and minority reports before providing them to the
155 candidate.
156

157 A candidate has a right to respond to any of these recommendations or reports by writing to the
158 Area Committee on Promotion & Tenure. This statement becomes part of the candidate's
159 promotion and tenure file.
160

161 The candidate also has the right to respond in writing to the letters and reports of the
162 Departmental Chair and the Departmental Committee and to send his/her response to the Office
163 of the Dean.

164 **IV. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE**

165

166 The Department's Promotion & Tenure Committee shall use these departmental guidelines that
167 have been approved by the College Promotion & Tenure Review Board as its standard for
168 evaluation.

169

170 **A. Tenure**

171

172 Tenure is established and governed by the policies and regulations of the Board of Regents of the
173 University System of Georgia. These policies state that tenure resides at the institutional level;
174 thus, the criteria and guidelines for recommending the granting of tenure to members of the
175 faculty of the Department of Communication are those provided in these guidelines and in the
176 Promotion & Tenure Manual of the GSU College of Arts & Sciences.

177

178 Only Associate Professors and Professors employed full-time are eligible for tenure. Individuals
179 with the title of Instructor, Lecturer, Academic Professional, Assistant Professor, or Adjunct
180 Professor are not eligible for tenure.

181

182 Tenure may be awarded upon completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-
183 time service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. The five-year period should be
184 continuous, although a limited interruption because of leave of absence or part-time service may
185 be permitted. This interruption may not exceed two years. However, no probationary credit for
186 the period of interruption will be allowed. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum
187 probationary period may be allowed for service at other institutions or for full-time service at the
188 rank of Instructor at Georgia State University. Such credit shall be specified in writing and
189 approved by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences.

190

191 **B. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

192

193 Candidates will be evaluated as either having **met** or having **not met** the standards for promotion
194 and/or tenure in each of the following three areas: Professional Development, Teaching, and
195 Service. The evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under
196 consideration, the standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and resources of the
197 department. Departmental and discipline-specific standards are defined in these Promotion &
198 Tenure Guidelines.

199

200 **1. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor:**

201

202 To be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor by the Department, a
203 candidate must be evaluated as *excellent* in both Professional Development and Teaching. In
204 keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have
205 developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her
206 discipline, as determined by peers within and outside of the University, while establishing a
207 national reputation in his/her field. The candidate will also be evaluated on evidence of his/her
208 current trajectory in Professional Development, which if successfully continued, will result in
209 timely progress towards the rank of Professor after promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

210 The candidate must also be evaluated as having provided effective Service to merit promotion to
 211 the level of Associate Professor. The rank of Associate Professor also presumes a demonstrated
 212 ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and graduate students
 213 and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The candidate must
 214 also be judged as contributing significantly to the instructional and service activities of the
 215 Department.

216

217 **2. Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor:**

218

219 For faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor
 220 with tenure, the criteria for tenure are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to
 221 Associate Professor.

222

223 Faculty members already at the rank of associate professor seeking tenure must also be
 224 evaluated as *excellent* in professional development and teaching and as having provided *good*
 225 service.

226

227 **3. Promotion to the Rank of Professor:**

228

229 Such promotion is a recognition awarded to candidates who have distinguished records of
 230 achievement and standing in their professions and also at Georgia State University. Both the
 231 quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor
 232 must substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. In keeping
 233 with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have established a
 234 national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high
 235 quality and productive research, scholarship, and creative activities.

236

237 **4. Tenure at the Rank of Professor:**

238

239 The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor.

240

241 **C. Areas of Evaluation**

242

243 The Department of Communication will evaluate all candidates based on evidence in three areas
 244 of their academic life: Professional Development, Teaching, and Service. Each candidate for
 245 promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Communication should specify what is distinct,
 246 unique, original, and individual about his/her contributions to his/her area of specialization
 247 within his/her academic discipline and instructional area. Distinct aspects and features of
 248 specialization within each discipline and within the areas of Professional Development,
 249 Teaching, and Service should be clarified and documented for the departmental and college
 250 promotion and tenure committees.

251

252

253

254

255 **1. Professional Development**

256
257 Professional Development is a major concern in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure.
258 In order to ensure quality instruction, it is essential that faculty members in the Department of
259 Communication maintain a high level of scholarly and/or creative activities that advance the
260 field of Communication and the candidate's specialization within his/her particular discipline by
261 creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. Specifically, these activities should
262 evidence demonstrable professional growth by the faculty member.

263
264 In the disciplines represented in the Department of Communication, Professional Development
265 can involve a range of professional activities from scholarly research and publication to creative
266 activities. It is appropriate, therefore, that the criteria and methods for demonstrating and
267 measuring Professional Development are relevant to the various disciplines of Communication.
268 The evaluation standard for Professional Development for both scholarly and artistic works is
269 that the quality of any submitted materials must be assessed by outside reviewers. Letters from
270 outside reviewers who are authorities in the candidate's field (solicited in accordance with the
271 procedures described in the College manual) play an influential role in providing a
272 supplementary perspective on the candidate's achievements and stature in the area of
273 Professional Development.

274
275 The Department of Communication recognizes that Professional Development can take many
276 forms and employ a variety of methods. It may encompass basic and applied research, theoretical
277 and empirical work, scholarship of discovery and integration, qualitative and quantitative
278 methods, and creative endeavors. Each topic, method, approach and technique shall be judged
279 only on whether it is appropriate to the stated Professional Development goal and whether it
280 produces a valuable societal or disciplinary product. We believe, therefore, that success in
281 Professional Development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique
282 is inherently superior to another.

283
284 For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could
285 be seen as equally successful with another who published his/her work in books but whose work
286 undergoes comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication
287 media (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books) and/or creative activity
288 will be evaluated on the whole body of work, just as will those who specialize in one form of
289 scholarly or creative expression. Likewise, candidates who pursue creative activities will also be
290 evaluated through peer review. This review may involve formal outside adjudication at the time
291 of the performance, exhibition, or presentation of a creative work.

292
293 Obtaining external funding for one's research or creative works is a highly valued Professional
294 Development activity and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources,
295 will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in those disciplines. The Department of
296 Communication recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in some departmental
297 sub-disciplines. Grant support, however, is not a substitute for the peer-reviewed products of
298 quality research and creative activity.

299
300 Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing,
301 refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar.

302 Although no particular type of activity is specified for promotion and tenure, successful
 303 candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

304
 305 The Department also recognizes that there is a rough hierarchy of scholarly journals,
 306 conferences, publishers, film festivals, production companies, distribution companies, and other
 307 channels of dissemination that exists within the Communication disciplines. Some valuable work
 308 that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge
 309 may not be published in the best known journals or exhibited in the best-known venues. The
 310 Committee may consider these distinct criteria to discern the quality of the candidate's work and
 311 the character of the venues where the work is disseminated, which collectively may be referred
 312 to as channels of dissemination: (a) geographic scope of the channel's reputation, ranging from
 313 on-campus, local, state, regional, national, and international – in some cases, there may be
 314 special value to on-campus exhibitions and performances, but that value must be demonstrated
 315 and judged by the criteria below; (b) competitiveness of the channel; (c) reputation or prestige of
 316 the channel as evidenced in the academic, popular, or industry press; (d) size of the audience of
 317 the channel as determined by number of persons who attended, tuned in, downloaded or
 318 streamed the exhibition or transmission; (e) distinguished awards given by the channel from
 319 either peer, curator, or audience review; and (f) scholarly or artistic impact, as evidenced by
 320 citations, press response, and academic research about the candidate's work.

321
 322 For those projects that fall outside of conventional creative categories – such as, experimental,
 323 new and emerging media – it will be necessary for the candidate to establish the status of his/her
 324 work in relation to generally understood standards of the candidate's discipline and medium.

325
 326 While the Department of Communication recognizes the value of both individual and
 327 cooperative scholarship and creative works, we acknowledge the importance and occasional
 328 difficulty of determining the relative contributions of co-authors or co-creators; communication
 329 research and creative activity are often a team enterprise. We strongly support interdisciplinary
 330 research, which by definition results in publications and creative project exhibitions with
 331 multiple authors and creators. We cannot therefore assign higher intrinsic value to single-author,
 332 jointly-authored, or collaboratively created works. Additionally, we know that order of
 333 authorship or credit does not necessarily convey accurate information about one's relative
 334 contribution to the work. We will thus accord appropriate credit if the candidate's contribution to
 335 a co-authored or collaboratively created work is empirically established within the conventions
 336 of the candidate's discipline.

337
 338 It is incumbent upon the candidate to document objectively his/her specific contribution to the
 339 collaborative creative or research project and describe how that contribution resulted in its
 340 recognition within the candidate's discipline.

341
 342 As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate's publications or creative
 343 projects may appear in the scholarly or artistic outlets of other disciplines. We recognize that
 344 work in the general academic field of Communication can and does regularly make contributions
 345 to the knowledge base of a broad range of disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work
 346 appearing in related professional publications, insofar as its quality is appropriately
 347 demonstrated. Likewise, a candidate's creative collaborations with other artists outside and

348 within the discipline of Communication will be given consideration. While interdisciplinary
 349 work is highly valued and encouraged, it is still expected that a candidate will be able to make the
 350 case that his/her core program of work maintains a strong connection to and is within the
 351 discipline of Communication.

352
 353 Many of the most innovative projects in the field of Communication combine theory and
 354 practice. The Department encourages such work and recognizes there may be overlaps in the
 355 categories of scholarly works and creative projects. Those achievements which fall into the two
 356 categories will be evaluated using criteria drawn from both.

357
 358 Criteria for evaluating creative projects will include consideration of the length and complexity
 359 of the project, the means of disseminating the work to an audience, and the evaluation of the
 360 completed work by outside peer review. While the length of a work may be significant, it should
 361 be considered in conjunction with its influence, scholarly and artistic quality, and complexity.

362
 363 Supporting materials for creative projects and their dissemination venues might include reports
 364 invited by the Department from outside peer reviewers in the professional and/or academic
 365 sphere, evidence of the size and significance of an award competition, the approximate purchase
 366 price of scripts (where appropriate) or the price of a script option, and/or published reviews of
 367 articles, films, plays, or books authored by the candidate, if available. Peer evaluation of a
 368 written screen or stage play may be more difficult to obtain than that of a live production or
 369 media work. Certain creative works – i.e., scripts, plays, or new media and web or digital
 370 productions – may win awards but not be publicly disseminated, published, or produced. Scripts
 371 that win awards but are not published or produced or which are optioned or purchased outright
 372 may be submitted as part of a dossier. The production of a conference paper and/or published
 373 article based on a creative production could lend additional merit to the dossier. For example, a
 374 new media work might be submitted to a conference and thereby become a part of the normal
 375 conference reputation and refereeing procedure.

376
 377 The Department of Communication appreciates the increasingly prominent role that online
 378 publication, new media work, and web-based resources play in the production and dissemination
 379 of knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are often difficult to
 380 apply to these new forms of scholarship. Therefore, candidates must make their own case for the
 381 quality and breadth of an intellectual project.

382
 383 The Department of Communication resists the idea that qualitative evaluations can be defined
 384 solely by number of publications, performances, or other scholarly and creative activities. We
 385 expect that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly and/or creative productivity through both
 386 the quantity and quality of their professional record organized according to the categories of
 387 professional development listed in the college manual and as detailed below. Evaluation of an
 388 individual faculty member's Professional Development will focus on the entire profile of that
 389 individual's contribution.

390
 391 a. Presentations at Professional Meetings: These include participation in programs
 392 at local, regional, national or international meetings of professional associations, including
 393 presentation of papers, organization of panels or programs, serving as panel leader or

394 commentator, organization of and participation in workshops, symposiums and juried
 395 competitions. The presentation of academic research or creative works will typically receive
 396 greater weight in the review process than more administrative tasks.

397

398 b. Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews: These
 399 include published articles, chapters in books, books, monographs, and book and performance
 400 reviews, and those accepted for publication, broadcast and electronic distribution. Book reviews
 401 typically receive less weight than the other publications listed here.

402

403 c. Achievements in the Visual & Performing Arts: These include creative projects
 404 in film/video, broadcasting, digital media, and live performance.

405

406 d. Awards & Grants: These include grants, contracts, scholarships, fellowships,
 407 travel awards, personal development awards funded internally and by external local, regional,
 408 national or international agencies that have supported the candidate's scholarly research or
 409 creative activities. International and national external awards and grants will generally weigh
 410 more heavily than those from regional or local competitions.

411

412 e. Significant Professional Services: These include memberships on editorial
 413 boards, editorships for professional journals, referee for professional journals, referee for
 414 granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, consultant for artistic projects, and critic
 415 or juror for professional organizations.

416

417 f. Recognition by National, Scholarly, and Professional Associations: This
 418 includes honors, awards, fellowships, and internships.

419

420 g. General Recognition Within One's Discipline: This includes citation of works
 421 or contributions by other scholars, requests for colloquium presentations or workshops, reviews
 422 of publications or performances, invitations to juried screenings and performances, or exhibitions
 423 of media art, guest performances and lectureships. International and national recognition will
 424 generally weigh more heavily than regional or local recognition.

425

426 h. Specialized Professional Activities Appropriate to the Discipline: Included here
 427 are materials for which descriptions are not presented in any of the other categories above (e.g.,
 428 significant writing in the mass media). These materials may not include work in progress or work
 429 submitted but not yet accepted for publication.

430

431 i. Other

432

433 2. Teaching

434

435 The Department of Communication regards quality Instruction to be of foremost importance to
 436 the Department and the University, as it is at the heart of what we do. It is a major responsibility
 437 of the faculty and, as such, it recognizes teaching excellence and student-related achievements as
 438 central in the evaluation of faculty members. Faculty have a responsibility to provide strong
 439 undergraduate and graduate programs for our majors and for the students throughout the

440 University who have programmatic need for Communication courses. Included in the evaluation
 441 process will be written documentation of evidence organized according to the categories of
 442 teaching listed in the college manual. Examples include:

443

444 a. Courses Taught During the Last Eight Semesters

445

446 b. Perceptions of Students, including official student evaluation instruments for
 447 the past eight semesters.

448

449 c. Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction

450

451 d. Evidence of Instructional Service Beyond the Classroom (i.e., independent
 452 studies, practica, honors theses, theses, and dissertations)

453

454 e. Published Materials (e.g., textbooks, published articles, manuals and/or
 455 monographs on pedagogy)

456

457 f. Student Publications & Creative Accomplishments (e.g., published articles,
 458 books, conference papers, attendance at conferences, performances, film screenings, theatrical
 459 productions and readings, media presentations, awards, and other recognition of student
 460 accomplishments at GSU and elsewhere)

461

462 g. Instructional Portfolio: This category includes selected materials the candidate
 463 has compiled as required in the College's Teaching Assessment Policy.

464

465 h. Other Materials. This category might include: (1) the development of effective
 466 evaluation and assessment methods relative to student performance and the acquisition of
 467 knowledge and skills (to be reflected in examinations, teaching methods and pedagogical
 468 philosophy); (2) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the appropriate
 469 levels and the continued improvement and updating of established courses (to be reflected in
 470 course syllabi and other curricular materials); (3) the maintenance of high standards for the
 471 material taught and expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions,
 472 syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other examples); (4) the advisement
 473 of students on various levels and in various degree programs seniors, majors, Honors students, or
 474 graduate students – this responsibility entails knowledge of and attention to departmental,
 475 college and university programs, policies and procedures; (5) evidence of effective student
 476 mentoring activities; and (6) a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching
 477 methodology.

478

479 When reviewing student evaluations, the Committee will not take the student evaluation
 480 percentages at face value alone without also taking into consideration the candidate's total
 481 number of students during the period of evaluation; the numbers of his/her undergraduate vs.
 482 graduate students, as well as the student evaluation numbers and ranges of each group; the
 483 numbers of required vs. elective, graduate vs. undergraduate, and core vs. special topics courses
 484 he/she has taught during the last eight semesters; and the numbers of large (75 students or more)
 485 vs. small-sized classes (25 or fewer students) he/she has taught during the period of evaluation.

486
 487 In making the case for his/her promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may also address other
 488 variables, such as: (1) the extent to which the courses taught by the candidate during the last
 489 eight semesters included any new preparations or other courses which the candidate has taught
 490 repeatedly in the past; (2) the clock time of the different classes taught by the candidate, whether
 491 they were mid-day (or at times most preferred by students) or late night or early morning during
 492 the last eight semesters; (3) the extent to which the candidate taught courses with a lecture format
 493 or others which included collaborative/group learning, or which had a particular focus on active
 494 class participation required of students, during the last eight semesters; (4) students' perceived
 495 rigor of a candidate's courses by students, as well as their grade expectations, during the last
 496 eight semesters; (5) the grade averages and grade distributions of the courses the candidate
 497 taught during the last eight semesters; (6) whether there have been any peer, institutional, or
 498 other evaluation of the candidate's teaching abilities and methods; and (7) whether the candidate
 499 participated in any pedagogical workshops or meetings during the last eight semesters, where the
 500 focus was on developing instructional excellence.

501 502 **3. Service**

503
 504 The Department of Communication has inherently and by definition a special responsibility to
 505 provide discipline-oriented service activities. These include service to the University community,
 506 the local community, and relevant local, national and international professional communities.
 507 The professional/academic interface is a distinguishing characteristic of the disciplines in the
 508 Department of Communication and requires that consideration be accorded the service function
 509 in all faculty evaluations, including the evaluation for tenure and/or promotion. For example,
 510 interaction with the press, electronic media, and the performing arts communities is essential to
 511 the development of the Department and to the academic performance of faculty members.

512
 513 Only those service activities, however, which are related to the candidate's area of professional
 514 competence will be included in an evaluation of Service.

515
 516 Collegiality, in the broadest sense, is a necessary and highly valued aspect of all candidates
 517 seeking promotion and tenure in the Department of Communication.

518
 519 Appropriate service activities should be documented and organized according to the categories of
 520 services listed in the college manual (section V.G.). Complete descriptions and dates for any
 521 service category must be provided along with explanatory documentation. Examples include:

522
 523 a. Assistance to Colleagues: Consultation about educational problems, review of
 524 manuscripts, collaboration on research projects, assistance with film, video, or dramatic
 525 productions, artistic exhibitions, or musical performances, and contributions to programs in other
 526 concentrations, areas, or schools.

527
 528 b. Contributions to the Department of Communication: Chairing departmental
 529 committees, memberships on committees, development of programs and activities other than
 530 teaching and those related to professional development, participation in Department-sponsored

531 activities, and holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload
532 assessment.

533

534 c. Contributions to the College, University, or University System

535

536 d. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations:

537 Consultancies, memberships on advisory boards, and offices held.

538

539 e. Significant Discipline-Related Community Service: Speeches, presentations,
540 performances, short courses, hosting a conference, on-going contacts.

541

542 f. Meritorious Public Service: Assistance to governmental agencies, and
543 development of community, state, or national resources.

544

545 g. Offices Held in Professional Associations

546

547 h. Other

548

549 **D. Metrics/Measures of Quality**

550

551 **1. Evaluation of Professional Development**

552

553 Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate as
554 **having met** or **not having met** the required standards in Professional Development.

555

556 **a. Associate Professor**

557

558 Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank Associate Professor is available only to those candidates
559 who are judged to be *excellent* in Professional Development.

560

561 The candidate will be evaluated on evidence of his/her current trajectory in Professional
562 Development. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be
563 deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the
564 advancement of his/her discipline, as determined by peers within and outside of the University,
565 while establishing a national reputation in his/her field.

566

567 The candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Professional Development if the Committee's
568 assessment is that the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work is highly accomplished. Such a
569 candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-8) of influential refereed
570 articles and/or refereed book chapters of distinguished quality; or a larger number of refereed
571 articles and/or refereed chapters of very good quality; or a refereed book and at least 4 refereed
572 articles and/or chapters, all of very good quality. A candidate also should have been very active
573 in other research and/or creative roles, such as an intramural or external research or creative
574 grant recipient, a conference session organizer or participant, a creative event producer, a journal
575 editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

576

577 For a candidate whose discipline is creative and is a principal author or producer of works of
 578 single channel media art such as film, television, video, radio, interactive media or Internet
 579 webcast, the candidate will be judged as having met the required standards in Professional
 580 Development, if the Committee's assessment is that the candidate's creative work is highly
 581 accomplished with a body of work that demonstrates characteristics of scale in terms of length or
 582 size, and quality, and complexity as recognized by the discipline. Such a candidate, for example,
 583 might have disseminated through peer reviewed or competitive venues, a significant number (6-
 584 8) of influential refereed short films/videos written, produced and/or directed under 20 minutes;
 585 or a larger number of refereed short films written, produced and directed of very good quality; or
 586 a refereed medium length film or television pilot or episode of 20 to 60 minutes written,
 587 produced and/or directed and at least 4 refereed short films written, produced and/or directed
 588 under 20 minutes, all of very good quality. A candidate, who creates and disseminates a feature
 589 length film of greater than 60 minutes as writer, producer and/or director might also have
 590 written, produced and/or directed two short films or one medium length film of high quality and
 591 significant recognition. A candidate also might have been very active in other research and/or
 592 creative roles, such as collaborating as a crew member with other directors and producers, as an
 593 intramural or external creative grant recipient of an award of a competitively offered residency,
 594 private fund or investment, an organizer of a conference or festival session/panel, a curator of a
 595 media exhibition, a film festival organizer or jury member, a creative event producer, a journal
 596 editor or referee, a grant reviewer or a filmmaker/artist-in-residence designee or jury member.
 597

598 For a candidate whose discipline is creative and is primarily a writer of dramatic works of
 599 performance for live theater or recorded media such as film, television, radio, interactive media
 600 or Internet webcast, the candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Professional Development if the
 601 Committee's assessment is that the candidate's creative work is highly accomplished. Such a
 602 candidate, for example, might have disseminated through competitive peer reviewed venues such
 603 as recognized film festivals, stage and screen script competitions, production company options or
 604 acquisitions, a significant number (3-4) feature or full length scripts for films/videos, made-for-
 605 television pilot or episodic screenplays, electronic media games or live stage plays. The
 606 screenwriter candidate might also submit a combination of feature or full length screen or stage
 607 plays and a larger number of refereed short film/video screenplays or short plays where four
 608 short scripts of up to 20 pages roughly equals one long script of 90 to 120 pages. Where the work
 609 is judged of very good quality, a larger number of finished works would also qualify the
 610 candidate as highly accomplished. A candidate also might have been very active in other
 611 research and/or creative roles, such as an intramural or external creative grant recipient, an award
 612 of a prestigious screenwriting fellowship, a conference or festival session/panel, an invited
 613 screen or stage play reading, a screen play competition organizer or jury member, a journal
 614 editor or referee, or a writer-in-residence designee or jury member.
 615

616 The Committee recognizes that new and emerging media provide artists and scholars unique
 617 channels of dissemination where the candidate's medium of authorship is intrinsic to the
 618 message that medium transmits. For a candidate whose discipline is creative and is a producer of
 619 new and emerging media work such as electronic media games or interactive media for Internet-
 620 based, set-top, digital media installation or other electronic distribution means, the candidate
 621 must establish three principal frameworks for evaluation.
 622

623 First, the candidate submitting new and emerging media in his/her dossier must provide a means
624 to measure the complexity and scale of the work that roughly associates the total time of the
625 audience's engagement with the work to the audience's depth of experience with the subject that
626 the work presents. A work of new media should describe how many minutes it would take for the
627 audience to engage in the work intended for each session or episode, and the number of sessions
628 or episodes the audience would be expected to engage the work to complete its viewing. The
629 increments of time engagement should parallel the equivalent increments of scale applied to the
630 linear media forms where a short film is recognized with a length of up to 20 minutes, a medium
631 length film is approximately 20 to 60 minutes, and a feature length film is approximately 60 or
632 more minutes.

633
634 Second, the candidate submitting new and emerging media in his/her dossier must provide a
635 means to referee the work by which his/her distinguished peers can judge the candidate's work in
636 competition with other works vying for similar dissemination opportunities and recognition.
637 Here too, the candidate should consider (a) geographic scope (b) competitiveness, (c) reputation
638 or prestige, (d) size of the audience in describing the channel of dissemination and judgment of
639 the work.

640
641 Third, the candidate submitting new and emerging media in his/her dossier must establish and
642 rank evidence of impact within the discipline arising from exhibition and/or dissemination of the
643 work. The candidate should provide evidence, as described above for linear media, with (e)
644 distinguished awards and (f) scholarly or artistic impact. These three frameworks
645 (complexity/scale, means to referee the work and evidence of impact) will be considered by the
646 Committee for establishing the quality of each of the candidate's work.

647
648 For the candidate who elects to submit all or part of a dossier of work that consists of
649 collaborative contributions, as defined previously, where the candidate performs the role of
650 cinematographer, editor or sound design, a leading role as an actor, a rough ratio of two works of
651 collaborative contribution to one work of principal authorship will be considered as described
652 above for candidates submitting work as directors and producers of films/videos and television
653 programs.

654
655 For the candidate who elects to submit all or a part of a dossier of work that consists of creative
656 contributions, as defined previously, where the candidate performs the role of all other practicing
657 crew or cast member, such as an audio mixer, Foley artist, art director or production designer,
658 lighting director, supporting actor/actress, or other collaborative contributor, a rough ratio of
659 three works of collaborative contribution to one work of principal authorship will be considered
660 as described above for candidates submitting work as directors and producers of films/videos and
661 television programs.

662
663 The impact of the candidate's contribution to any work in the dossier should be explained as
664 described above for creative collaborators, and will be considered by all reviewers of the dossier.
665 Some collaborative contributions might rise to the status of co-authorship, with the candidate
666 needing to make this case. The candidate must explain the precise nature of the collaboration so
667 that reviewers can accurately determine the expected quantity and quality of the candidate's
668 work, and the impact of the candidate's contribution to the work's recognition.

669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714

b. Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available only to those candidates whose Professional Development is judged as *excellent*.

Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor must substantially surpass those required for recommendation of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As part of both the College and Department reviews, the candidate will be evaluated on evidence of his/her current trajectory in Professional Development. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline, as determined by peers within and outside of the University, while having established a national and/or international reputation in his/her field.

The candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Professional Development if the Committee's assessment is that the candidate's scholarship or creative activities are highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a large number of influential refereed articles and/or refereed book chapters of excellent quality; or a larger number of refereed articles and/or refereed chapters of very good quality; or a larger number of recognized films/video/television pilots or episodes, screen or state plays, or works of new and emerging media of excellent quality; or a refereed book and a significant number of refereed articles and chapters, all of very good quality. A candidate also should have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as an external research grant recipient, conference or festival session/panel organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, exhibition curator, programmer or jury member, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The quality of a faculty actor's creative/collaborative work will be judged based on available external professional peer review. The hiring process for professional productions is one form of peer review, as such positions are often highly competitive, and applicants are usually screened diligently. Other forms of peer review could include winning a prestigious award or honor, reviews by nationally recognized theatre critics or in professional journals, a commission to collaborate on the production of a new play or the review of a production by an independent professional peer.

2. Evaluation of Teaching

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate's instruction as **having met** or **not having met** the required standards in Teaching.

a. Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank Associate Professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be *excellent* in Teaching.

The candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Teaching if, from Section IV(C)(2) above, the overall assessment of the Committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate's performance is highly accomplished. For example, the dossier provides evidence that student learning outcomes have been achieved; the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; evidence is presented documenting the pedagogically effective use of learning technologies; the course material presented might show impressive preparation; a significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

b. Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and even exceed the sort of involvement and accomplishment required for an Associate Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in Teaching are expected to surpass those required for recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank Professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be *excellent* in Teaching.

The candidate will be judged as *excellent* in Instruction if, from Section IV(C)(2) above, the overall assessment of the Committee from the evidence available is that the candidate's performance is superb. For example, the dossier provides evidence that student learning outcomes have been achieved; the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; evidence is presented documenting the pedagogically effective use of learning technologies; the course material presented might show impressive preparation and a continuing devotion to improving and updating course content and syllabi, as well as overall curricular reform; the candidate might participate in college, university-wide, or national committees that focus on instructional improvements and issues; a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

NOTE: It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate by appropriate metrics the quality of his/her Teaching in the Department of Communication.

761 **3. Evaluation of Service**

762
763 Based on the evidence available, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate's
764 service according to whether the candidate **has met** or **has not met** the standards required.

765
766 **a. Associate Professor**

767
768 For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be
769 evaluated as at least *good* in service.

770
771 A candidate will be judged as *good* in service if the candidate has effectively performed
772 departmental service tasks that have been assigned to him/her and has been active in assistance
773 to colleagues.

774
775 **b. Professor**

776
777 Candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and
778 even exceed the sort of Service involvement and accomplishments required for an Associate
779 Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in the Service area are
780 expected to surpass those required for recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate
781 Professor. For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, the candidate must be
782 evaluated as at least *very good* in service.

783
784 A candidate at this level will be judged as *very good* in service if the candidate effectively has
785 taken a significant leadership role in departmental service. Examples might include (but are not
786 limited to): graduate director, Executive Committee member, chair of at least one significant
787 departmental standing committee, assessment coordinator, or service in some other substantial
788 capacity (such as, University senator, self-study committee member, etc.), and has been very
789 active in assistance to colleagues. In addition, the candidate must have significant service on
790 College or University committees, and have significant administrative service in his/her principal
791 national/international professional associational organization(s) or to governmental entities

792
793 NOTE: It is the candidate's duty to demonstrate by appropriate metrics the quality of his/her
794 Service to the Department of Communication, the College of Arts & Sciences, Georgia State
795 University, and also to the larger national and international community.

**APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835

A1. Professional Development (Research)

Poor: The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, or the faculty member has produced a body of research that casts doubt on his/her commitment to the field and likelihood of further progress.

Fair: The faculty member makes limited contributions to the field, with no substantial plans to improve his or her activity.

Good: The faculty member's scholarly work is competent but limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member maintains an active program of professional development, but he or she has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; however, there are clear indications that he or she has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has produced a significant body of original scholarship that is highly accomplished. This body of scholarship, which normally would include a book, but may be a comparable body of articles and book chapters based on national models of sub-fields. Collaborative projects with other scholars in conventional or digital media are also significant based on the high level and quality of the contribution. Peer-reviewed work published in highly regarded digital media (including, e.g., multimedia productions and computer software) is valued equally to print publications in sub-fields in which scholarship adopting emerging technologies is essential. Further evidence for a rating of *excellent* includes documentation directly demonstrating one's emerging national reputation and the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from external agencies. The faculty member may also be active in other research roles, such as a conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty member's current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when he or she comes up for tenure, should the faculty member's upward trajectory continue.

Outstanding: The faculty member's scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, winning prestigious fellowships or grants, and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required for a rating of *excellent*.

836 **A2. Professional Development (Creative Work)**

837

838 **Poor:** The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, or
 839 the faculty member has produced a body of creative work that casts doubt on his/her
 840 commitment to the field and likelihood of further progress.

841

842 **Fair:** The faculty member makes limited contributions to the field, and his or her creative work
 843 is of modest significance, with no substantial plans to improve his or her activity.

844

845 **Good:** The faculty member's creative work is of moderate quality but limited in scope and
 846 impact.

847

848 **Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional
 849 development, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field;
 850 however, there are clear indications that he or she has projects underway that are likely to result
 851 in a more prominent creative profile in the near future.

852

853 **Excellent:** The faculty member's creative work is highly accomplished, and he or she has
 854 produced a body of work that shows national recognition and strong achievement in the field,
 855 indicating that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as in the near
 856 future. The faculty member's body of work has been disseminated in competitive, peer-reviewed
 857 venues (e.g., film festivals, script competitions, production company options, screenplays, etc.)
 858 to documented high acclaim. An evaluation of *excellent* indicates that the faculty member's
 859 current and imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level
 860 when he or she comes up for tenure, should the faculty member's upward trajectory continue.

861

862 **Outstanding:** The faculty member's creative work is of rare quality and unquestioned
 863 importance, as evidenced by national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major
 864 publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and/or a volume of high-quality work
 865 significantly greater than that required for a rating of *excellent*.

866 **B. Teaching**

867

868 **Poor:** The faculty member demonstrates an unacceptable record of competence as a teacher,
 869 including little evidence of mastery of teaching techniques and/or subject content. For example,
 870 the student evaluation scores suggest a weak performance in the classroom; and/or the candidate
 871 might demonstrate little or no involvement in mentoring students.

872

873 **Fair:** The faculty member demonstrates minimal competence as a teacher. For example, the
 874 student evaluation scores suggest minimally proficient performance in the classroom; the course
 875 material presented might show minimal preparation, an acceptable degree of knowledge of the
 876 subject matter might be indicated; and/or the faculty member might demonstrate a minimal level
 877 of involvement in mentoring students.

878 **Good:** The faculty member's instructional performance is adequate but not distinctly positive.
 879 For example, the student evaluation scores might suggest adequate or, perhaps, uneven
 880 performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show conscientious
 881 preparation; a competent degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or
 882 the faculty member might demonstrate a modest level of involvement in mentoring students.

883
 884 **Very Good:** The faculty member's performance is highly competent. For example, the student
 885 evaluation scores suggest effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is very
 886 good, in the 4-out-of-5 range); the course material presented might show diligent preparation; a
 887 better-than-average degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the
 888 faculty member might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

889
 890 **Excellent:** The faculty member's performance is highly accomplished. For example, the student
 891 evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (often in the mid 4-out-
 892 of-5 range); the course material presented shows impressive preparation; course materials and
 893 assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate; a
 894 significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter is indicated; the faculty member
 895 demonstrates a high level of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students; and the
 896 overall teaching record demonstrates a commitment to the instructional mission of the
 897 department.

898
 899 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's student
 900 evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member may have published a
 901 textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or will have received one or more teaching awards.

902 C. Service

903
 904 **Poor:** The faculty member's service responsibilities have not been acceptably undertaken.

905
 906 **Fair:** The faculty member has participated nominally in assigned committee and service duties.

907
 908 **Good:** The faculty member effectively performs departmental service tasks that have been
 909 assigned to him/her and has been active in assistance to colleagues.

910
 911 **Very Good:** The faculty member effectively performs assigned departmental service tasks or
 912 performs effective service at the college, university, or university system level. The faculty
 913 member may be actively involved in service to community, governmental, or professional
 914 organizations or has significant contact with media representatives (e.g., talks, workshops,
 915 interviews), and has been very active in assistance to colleagues.

916
 917 **Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that
 918 has involved significant departmental or other college, university, or university system
 919 administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above
 920 as *very good*.

921 ***Outstanding:*** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
922 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department
923 and throughout the college and university. The faculty member may also have served effectively
924 as a leader of a state, regional, or national professional association.

**APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964

A1. Professional Development (Research)

Poor: The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, or the faculty member has produced a body of research that casts doubt on his/her commitment to the field and likelihood of further progress.

Fair: The faculty member makes limited contributions to the field, with no substantial plans to improve his or her activity.

Good: The faculty member's scholarly work is competent but limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects. Included here is the circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed, positively reviewed, and/or accepted/contracted for publishing. Normally, the faculty member is involved in additional research roles, such as a conference session organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, or book reviewer.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member has produced a significant body of original research since her or his last promotion, which may include a book-length project, a number of book chapters or peer-reviewed articles, co-authored or co-edited projects, or some combination of these. The faculty member's books, book chapters, digital publications, and/or articles are published by presses and in journals and digital media that are held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member's work attest to this reputation. Other important evidence includes the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies. Normally, the faculty member has been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as a conference session organizer or participant, creative event producer, journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

Outstanding: The faculty member's scholarly work is of rare quality and unquestioned importance, and he or she has achieved eminence in the field. Evidence may include national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues and winning prestigious fellowships or grants, and/or a volume of work significantly greater than that required for a rating of *excellent*.

965 **A2. Professional Development (Creative Work)**

966

967 **Poor:** The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, or
 968 the faculty member has produced a body of creative work that casts doubt on his/her
 969 commitment to the field and likelihood of further progress.

970

971 **Fair:** The faculty member makes limited contributions to the field, and his or her creative work
 972 is of modest significance, with no substantial plans to improve his or her activity.

973

974 **Good:** The faculty member's creative work is of moderate quality but limited in scope and
 975 impact.

976

977 **Very Good:** The faculty member's professional development record indicates steady creative
 978 development that falls short of completion of a major body of work. Included here is the
 979 circumstance in which work on a major project is progressing well but has not been completed in
 980 the period under review.

981

982 **Excellent:** The faculty member's creative work is highly accomplished, and he or she has
 983 produced a body of work that has led to national or international recognition and shows strong
 984 achievement in the field, indicating that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future
 985 as well as the long term. The faculty member's body of work has been disseminated in
 986 competitive, peer-reviewed venues (e.g., film festivals, script competitions, production company
 987 options, screenplays, etc.) to documented high acclaim. Additional evidence for a rating of
 988 *excellent* might include the following: external creative grant recipient; an award of a prestigious
 989 screenwriting fellowship; a conference or festival session/panel; an invited screen or stage play
 990 reading; a screen play competition organizer or jury member; a journal editor or referee; a writer-
 991 in-residence designee or jury member.

992

993 **Outstanding:** The faculty member's creative work is of rare quality and unquestioned
 994 importance, and he or she has achieved eminence in the field. Evidence includes national or
 995 international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in
 996 prestigious venues and/or a volume of high-quality work significantly greater than that required
 997 for a rating of *excellent*.

998 **B. Teaching**

999

1000 **Poor:** The faculty member demonstrates an unacceptable record of competence as a teacher,
 1001 including little evidence of mastery of teaching techniques and/or subject content. For example,
 1002 the student evaluation scores suggest a weak performance in the classroom; and/or the candidate
 1003 might demonstrate little or no involvement in mentoring students.

1004

1005 **Fair:** The faculty member demonstrates minimal competence as a teacher. For example, the
 1006 student evaluation scores suggest minimally proficient performance in the classroom; the course
 1007 material presented might show minimal preparation; an acceptable degree of knowledge of the

1008 subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a minimal level of
 1009 involvement in mentoring students.

1010

1011 **Good:** The faculty member's performance is adequate but not distinctly positive. For example,
 1012 the student evaluation scores might suggest adequate or, perhaps, uneven performance in the
 1013 classroom; the course material presented might show conscientious preparation and updated
 1014 syllabi; some level of participation in curricular reform might be manifested; a moderate breadth
 1015 and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might
 1016 demonstrate a modest level of involvement in mentoring students.

1017

1018 **Very Good:** The faculty member's performance is highly competent. For example, the student
 1019 evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom (the overall average is
 1020 very good, in the 4-out-of-5 range); the course material presented might show diligent
 1021 preparation; a better-than-average degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated;
 1022 and/or the faculty member might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring
 1023 students.

1024

1025 **Excellent:** The faculty member's performance is highly accomplished. For example, the student
 1026 evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom (often in the mid 4-out-
 1027 of-5 range); the course material presented shows impressive preparation; course materials and
 1028 assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate; a
 1029 significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter is indicated; the faculty member
 1030 demonstrates an extensive level of involvement and success in mentoring and directing students;
 1031 and the overall teaching record demonstrates a commitment to the instructional mission of the
 1032 department.

1033

1034 **Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of *excellent*, the faculty member's student
 1035 evaluations will be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. The faculty member may have published a
 1036 textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or will have received one or more teaching awards.

1037 C. Service

1038

1039 **Poor:** The faculty member's service responsibilities have not been acceptably undertaken.

1040

1041 **Fair:** The faculty member has participated nominally in assigned committee and service duties.

1042

1043 **Good:** The faculty member effectively performs departmental service tasks that have been
 1044 assigned to him/her and has been active in assistance to colleagues.

1045

1046 **Very Good:** The faculty member effectively performs assigned departmental service tasks and
 1047 performs service at the college, university, or university system level. The faculty member is
 1048 actively involved in service to community governmental, or professional organizations or has
 1049 significant contact with media representatives (e.g., talks, workshops, interviews), and has been
 1050 very active in assistance to colleagues.

1051 ***Excellent:*** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that
1052 has involved significant departmental or other college, university, or university system
1053 administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above
1054 as *very good*.

1055
1056 ***Outstanding:*** In addition to the level of service described above as *excellent*, the faculty member
1057 demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department
1058 and throughout the college and university. The faculty member has served frequently and
1059 effectively as a leader of a state, regional, or national professional association.