

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

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**DRAFT**

Proposal Pending SCMS Faculty Approval, Nov. 30, 2017

(Adopted February 1985)

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

(Approved by Provost – March 2011)

**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 are expected to have a minimum of five articles accepted and in press or in print in peer reviewed journals or edited volumes (a minimum of three should be in print); or a peer reviewed book of original research accepted and in press or in print; or a minimum of five juried or peer reviewed creative productions/performances accepted or exhibited/performed. . Candidates must demonstrate a coherent research/creative trajectory and national visibility or impact in the field.

**2. Instruction**

Candidates' annual report rating in instruction must average "Above Satisfactory" or better.

**3. Service**

Candidates' annual report ratings in service must average "Above Satisfactory" or better.

**B. Promotion to Professor**

1.       **Research and Creative Activity**  
Candidates will have held the rank of Associate for at least five years and have published peer reviewed scholarly or creative work beyond that submitted for promotion and tenure. While the candidate's entire body of work will be considered, five articles in peer reviewed journals or edited volumes; or a peer reviewed book of original research accepted and in press or in print; or a minimum of five juried or peer reviewed creative productions or performances accepted, exhibited, or performed since promotion to Associate Professor are recommended. Candidates must demonstrate a coherent research/creative trajectory and international visibility or impact in the field.
2.       **Instruction**  
Candidates annual report ratings in instruction must average "Above Satisfactory" or better.
3.       **Service**  
Candidates annual report ratings in service must average "Above Satisfactory" or better.

Note: The editing of an accepted or published, peer reviewed book of previously published works does not always count as the equivalent of an edited book of original research unless editorial contributions are substantial and establish a new and original way of understanding the previously published works.

Electronic publications are considered no differently than print publications.

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

## **II.       Tenure**

In order to qualify for tenure, candidates must exhibit a pattern of research, instruction, and service activities that clearly demonstrate professional autonomy, initiative, and the promise of continued contribution to the School, the University, and the discipline. Candidates at the Associate Professor level or those who are being promoted to the Associate Professor level must have engaged in a program of research, comprising scholarly writing and/or creative production/performance that is coherent, continuing. The candidate must have already made a substantial start in this program and be able to demonstrate that he/she has already achieved successful outcomes appropriate to the nature of the research activity, such as the acceptance and publication of scholarly writing and screenings or awards at film or video festivals, etc. Moreover, the program of research must reflect a coherent set of issues, problems, concerns, or subjects. Candidates must demonstrate the coherence of their research program and both the relevance and significance of the recognition it has earned in their self-evaluation.

## **III.       Peer Review**

The primary basis for evaluation for all research and creative work is peer review. Peer review refers to various processes of selection and critique appropriate to each candidate's discipline, with more rigorous forms evaluated more highly than less rigorous forms. While blind, external peer review and other forms of external peer review are universally recognized for the evaluation of traditional research, and jurying or curatorial selection are the most universally recognized forms for selection of creative works, candidates are encouraged to make peer review arguments based on the appropriateness and availability of venues in their disciplines and according to one or more criteria on the list(s) below in relation to a particular publication or exhibition/performance.

Original, data-based and/or theoretical publications pertaining to pedagogy will be evaluated no differently than other forms of traditional research using the peer review criteria included below. Textbooks and other substantial teaching 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 from the established significance of a work or body of works.

Additional peer review criteria for pedagogical research and creative work can include the following:

- A. A significant number of adoptions of the work at four year institutions.
- B. Favorable critique of the work by academic peers.
- C. Content which demonstrably establishes an innovative and effective way of organizing and/or understanding knowledge in the discipline.
- D. External Funding Grant awards and/or applications for external support for research/scholarly and creative activities, if applicable.

#### **IV. Procedures**

A: Third Year Review. A meeting will be held in the Spring of an Assistant Professor's third year in rank for the purpose of reviewing this faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Assistant Professor will prepare a portfolio with all the items required in the Provost's P&T Memorandum for the current year except outside referee letters. This portfolio should be available to the tenured faculty for review at least two weeks before the meeting. At the meeting, the tenured faculty will discuss the Assistant Professor's progress. A summary of the discussion will be provided by the Director to the Assistant Professor for inclusion in the portfolio. There is no vote on Third Year Review. The portfolio will be passed on to the College Committee for similar discussion and report (see College P&T Guidelines).

B: Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor. In cases of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, the tenured, full-time members of the School shall review the application material of the candidate. These members shall meet as a group to deliberate and vote. Tenure-line faculty in the School (besides the candidate) may attend this meeting in order to observe the promotion and tenure process if all the candidates considered at the meeting agree to this in writing.

C: Promotion to Full Professor. In cases of promotion to Full Professor, the Full Professors in the School shall review the application material of the candidate. These Full Professors shall meet as a group to deliberate and vote. Tenured Associate Professors in the School (besides the candidate) may attend this meeting to observe the promotion and tenure process if all the candidates considered at the meeting agree to this in writing. If there are fewer than three Full Professors available to vote, any Full Professors tenured in the School but serving as faculty in other programs will be asked to vote on the case up to the minimum of three. If not, the tenured Full Professors in consultation with the Director and the candidate will select, up to the minimum of three, Full Professors from cognate disciplines at the meeting used to select external peer reviewers.

D. Confidentiality. All participants and observers at these meetings shall observe strict confidentiality concerning the deliberations that occur.

E. Voting Procedures and Letters for Tenure and/or Promotion. After the discussion at the meeting, members all vote by secret ballot. After the qualified members of the school have voted, a memorandum with a report of the numerical vote and the reasons for votes supporting and not supporting the candidate's application is written by the promotion and tenure representative for submission to the Director and inclusion in the candidate's portfolio. The Director then writes a letter for inclusion in the portfolio reporting the vote and the reasons for support and/or non-support of the candidate's application, and also provides a detailed analysis and evaluation of the candidate's work

in teaching, research and service and adds a statement of either support or non-support of the candidate. In cases of third year review, the Director shall report the faculty deliberation in a written narrative. There is no vote for third year review. All faculty discussions on these matters shall be strictly confidential and the reports of Director and P&T Representative shall summarize them without any attribution.

In all instances where the Director's recommendation is not consistent with the guidelines and criteria, the Director's letter shall explain the reason for the difference. The applicant has the right to file a response to the promotion and tenure representative's letter and/or to the Director's letter within five days of receipt. Any such letters will become part of the tenure application file.

Following the UFF/BOR Agreement, these criteria and guidelines and guidelines will not go into effect until the year after their approval by the Provost. Faculty members may choose to be evaluated under the new criteria immediately on their approval by the Provost.