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The Department of Communication & Journalism Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The Communication & Journalism department’s faculty evaluation process is intended to: guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member’s assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member’s progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to “Tenure track” faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL: https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track, Clinical track, and Non-Tenure track faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Instructors and Lecturers will normally participate in this process.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member’s workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member’s assignment for the
following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean’s Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA’s faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)
The “typical” annual teaching assignment for “research active” TTF is 5 courses¹ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach² workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for “highly productive” research TTF is 4 courses³ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does becomes productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)
CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines⁴ the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university's academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)
NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Instructors/Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the Faculty Handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Appendix 1 outlines the university’s expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

¹ A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.
² “In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition.” - Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.
³ Ibid.
⁴ http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment
Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member’s regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member’s third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's
progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate’s submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Policies.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf
Teaching
The AU Faculty Handbook states:
Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work
The AU Faculty Handbook states:
A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.
Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach
The AU Faculty Handbook states:
Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the
program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under “Outreach Publications” on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

**Service**

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.
Appendix 2

Department of Communication & Journalism Workload Guidelines
For Tenure-Track Faculty

(Accepted 12/4/2009)

A. The initial workload assignment for tenure-track faculty is negotiated upon hire. The workload will be distributed across all assigned areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may be included as a percentage of the faculty member’s workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member’s assignment for the following year. The department chair meets with each faculty member annually to conduct a review. During that meeting the faculty member and chair will discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. Any changes will be incorporated into the written annual review. The faculty member will sign the annual review. The original will be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies will be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean’s office, one copy will be placed in the CLA faculty personnel file and one copy will be forwarded to the Provost’s office).

B. Types of Faculty Positions:

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF). The “typical” annual teaching assignment for a research active TTF is 5 courses (or the equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF will be assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for a “highly productive” research TTF is 4 courses (or the equivalent) equaling 50% per year. Dean’s office permission is required for the status of highly productive research. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor fails to fulfill a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In such cases, the faculty member will be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. The faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, the teaching load will increase proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she becomes productive the teaching load will be reduced accordingly.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF): NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Instructors/Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the Faculty Handbook, teaching in CLA includes holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

C. Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves:

Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave will be evaluated based on the purpose of the leave. For example, if a faculty member is on a research leave that person will be evaluated as a temporary 100% research. In the case of a part-time leave, evaluation metrics must add up to 100%. The time not covered by the leave will be evaluated using the faculty member’s regular appointment
Appendix 3

Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Workload %</td>
<td>Performance Score</td>
<td>Workload %</td>
<td>Performance Score</td>
<td>Workload %</td>
<td>Performance Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. X</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Score/Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Departmental of Communication & Journalism Annual Review Guidelines

(accepted 12/4/2009)

A. All faculty members are evaluated annually in the areas of teaching, research, outreach and service in accordance with their percentages and assigned duties. The annual review meeting process will follow the guidelines established in the Faculty Handbook. During the faculty annual review the faculty member and department chair will establish tentative percentages. Prior to tenure, faculty members must maintain a 25% research assignment. Teaching loads will be determined in accordance with individual program and enrollment needs as well as funding. After tenure, if a faculty member does not foresee an extensive research program or service component, the faculty member may select a load with a higher number of courses so that teaching will be weighted more heavily. Percentage assignments are determined on a yearly basis and may be changed based on the faculty member’s projected activities.

In addition, a third-year tenure review will be conducted for non-tenured, tenure-track faculty. The chair or faculty member may also request annual tenure review if so desired. The following system is to be used for annual performance evaluation. Tenure and promotion guidelines are provided in the Faculty Handbook and in the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

B. Following is a typical assignment of percentages that represents expectations for full-time faculty. Assignments may vary for individual faculty and may be revised at the request of the chair or faculty member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>62.5 (five courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Creative Work</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Scholarship</td>
<td>0 to 10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other assignments reduced accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage assignments for research and creative work and service and outreach are departmental baselines and may vary significantly. For example, faculty who engage in substantial outreach activities may be better served with a higher percentage for outreach and lower percentage for research/creative activity.

Each area of performance will be rated as follows:

4 Exemplary
3 Exceeds expectations
2 Meets expectations
1 Marginal
0 Unacceptable

C. Essential expectations for instruction include class meetings, preparation, grading, holding office hours, academic advising, course revisions, and contributing to other departmental teaching responsibilities, such as participating in theses and independent studies. Percentage for instruction for the year is typically allocated according to the following:
Factors that will contribute to a faculty member’s overall evaluation for instruction include:

1. Peer evaluation
2. Courses and curricula developed
3. Teaching materials of courses evaluated
4. Teaching philosophy and self-evaluation of courses taught
5. Teaching publications and pedagogical presentations
6. Theses directed
7. Service on graduate committees, including chairing nonthesis committees
8. Receipt of teaching effectiveness grants and awards
9. Teaching evaluations
10. Additional instructional activities: independent studies directed, supervising internships, participation in the Honors College, participation in the Human Odyssey program, participation in professional development activities related to pedagogy (e.g., Biggio Center, CLA technology seminars, and so on) etc.

In general, the following are the standard expectations for tenure track faculty. Expectations will be negotiated and adjusted according to differing assignments.

4 Exemplary: The individual being evaluated has achieved a minimum of 6 of the following items: Exceptional peer evaluation; exceptional course development (development of a new courses and a new course preparations (or a significant revisions of a course previously taught)); exceptional teaching materials; thorough and honest self-evaluation of teaching with evidence of responsiveness; at least one publication related to teaching; directing at least one thesis; participation on 3 or more graduate committees; receipt of a teaching grant or award; excellent teaching evaluations (based on the average of the first four items on the standard teaching evaluation); extensive participation in other instructional activities.

3 Exceeds expectations: The individual being evaluated has achieved a minimum of 5 of the following items: Positive peer evaluations; thorough teaching materials; comprehensive and honest self-evaluation of teaching; development of a new course or a new course preparation (or a significant revision of a course); participation on 3 or more graduate committees or directing at least one thesis committee; receipt of a teaching grant or award; presentation related to pedagogy; good teaching evaluations (based on the average of the first four items on the standard teaching evaluation); active participation in additional instructional activities.

2 Meets expectations: The individual being evaluated has achieved the following items: Acceptable peer evaluations; acceptable teaching materials; honest self-evaluation of teaching; additional instructional responsibilities, such as independent studies, course development, theses, undergraduate and graduate committees; acceptable teaching evaluations.

1 Marginal: The individual being evaluated has any of the following: Below average peer evaluations; below average teaching materials, incomplete self-evaluation of teaching, little additional instructional responsibilities, such as independent studies, theses,
undergraduate and graduate committees or course development; poor teaching evaluations.

Unacceptable: The individual being evaluated has any of the following: Unacceptable peer evaluations; unacceptable teaching materials, little or no self-evaluation of teaching, very little or no additional instructional responsibilities, such as independent studies, theses, undergraduate and graduate committees or course development; unacceptable teaching evaluations.

D. Performance evaluation of research and creative work is specific to each individual’s particular role as an academic. It is incumbent on the faculty member to present clear arguments regarding the academic value of activities in the year-end report. Goals will be set during the annual review to establish standards of progress for long-term (multiple year) projects in subsequent annual reviews. Research and creative work should draw on the individual’s area(s) of expertise as an academic. Such activities may include, but are not limited to, scholarly publications, nontraditional research befitting of academics, multimedia development and/or publication, publications that are journalistic or historical in nature, and other creative activities appropriate to an individual’s expertise. Faculty members may emphasize some research or creative work over others. Evaluation will be based on three tracks: research, creative, and professional publications. Activities from different tracks can be combined.

D1. Research Track: The research track focuses on traditional scholarly research. Generally, two competitive convention papers or professional presentations will be considered equivalent to one research article, a research grant equivalent to one research article, and a book chapter equivalent to one research article. Conference papers alone will not lead to either meeting expectations or exceeding expectations. The performance evaluation for research must take into account articles and other works that are under review or revision and resubmission. It is incumbent on faculty members to detail these activities in the year-end report.

The following factors dealing with the nature and quality of each publication will be considered in the overall research evaluation:

1. The quality of the journal or the press (e.g. state journal vs. national journal) and acceptance rate.
2. Whether the article or book is the result of new research or the reworking of already published material.
3. Whether the paper is read or a presentation is given at a regional, national or international conference.
4. In the case of joint authorship, the individual faculty member’s contribution will be taken into account.
5. Methodological demands and constraints, context, and parameters of the research.
6. Whether the research has received an award or recognition for its contribution.

In general, the following are the standard expectations for tenure track research faculty. Expectations will be negotiated and adjusted according to differing research assignments.

4 Exemplary: The individual being evaluated has made major contributions to research. Examples of such contributions include the acceptance or publication of a scholarly book, the acceptance or publication or an average of three or more articles per year plus at least two convention papers or professional presentations, or the equivalent.

3 Exceeds expectations: The individual being evaluated has made significant contribution
to research. Such contributions may include the acceptance or publication of an average of two articles per year and at least two convention papers or professional presentations.

2 Meets expectations: The individual being evaluated has made average contributions to research. Such contributions may include the acceptance or publication of one article per year plus at least one convention paper or professional presentation or demonstrable evidence of work in progress.

1 Marginal: The individual being evaluated has little scholarly activities or demonstrable results from such activity or evidence of work in progress.

0 Unacceptable: The individual being evaluated has no scholarly activities or evidence of work in progress.

D2. Creative Track: An evaluation of creative works focuses primarily on works newly produced, works-in-progress, and works exhibited. The evaluation may also take into account other factors, including: invited lectures/presentations, honors, awards, grants, commissions, freelance activities, published reviews, collections and acquisitions, and gallery affiliations. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to specify goals and address how progress is being made toward achieving goals within a long-term project.

The following factors dealing with the nature and quality of creative activities will be considered in the overall evaluation.

1. The type and scope of a faculty member’s creative work.
2. The number of exhibitions and the caliber of the exhibition venue.
3. The selection criteria employed (e.g., juried, invited, etc.).
4. The length of time it typically takes to complete the project in question.
5. Production costs.
6. Distribution costs (the costs involved in submitting works to festivals, competitions, exhibitions, etc.).
7. Fund raising: Because grants in the arts have become increasingly scarce over the past several years, raising the money necessary to produce and distribute a creative work can itself take a significant amount of time.
8. Whether the creative work has received an award and/or recognition for its contribution.

In general, the following are standard expectations for tenure track faculty focusing on creative activities. Expectations will be negotiated and adjusted according to differing assignments.

4 Exemplary: The individual being evaluated has engaged in extraordinary creative activity resulting in multiple exhibitions and has completed an extraordinary amount of exhibition-quality work, such as the completion of a large-scale project.

3 Exceeds expectations: The individual being evaluated has engaged in significant creative activity and has had multiple exhibitions, or has completed a significant amount of exhibition-quality work, or shows exceptional progress toward the completion of large-scale work.

2 Meets expectations: The individual being evaluated has engaged in an acceptable degree of creative activity, and has had work exhibited or shows significant progress toward producing exhibition-quality work.
Marginal: The individual being evaluated has engaged in little creative activity and shows little progress toward producing work of exhibition-quality.

Unacceptable: The individual being evaluated has no creative work or evidence of work in progress.

D3. Professional Publication Track: The professional publication track acknowledges that good journalism can advance public discourse and knowledge. An evaluation of the professional publication track takes into account the nature and quality of the published works. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information reflecting the value of the professional publication. Submission of a portfolio of published material outside of standard research journals should be made at the time of the annual review. Individual faculty members should also provide details to reflect the overall value of the professional publication.

Examples of professional publications include: (1) Professional journals such as American Journalism Review, Columbia Journalism Review, and Editor and Publisher; (2) Newspapers could range from editorial columns published in major dailies (New York Times/Wall Street Journal/USA Today) to in-depth feature/news series or articles in major state or regional newspapers (Mobile Register/Shreveport Times); multimedia distribution will also be considered; (3) Magazines such as Alabama Heritage, Time, and Sports Illustrated; (4) Books related to professional publications.

The following factors dealing with the nature and quality of professional publications will be considered in the overall evaluation.

1. The type and scope of a faculty member's work.
2. The number and caliber of professional publications.
3. The selection criteria employed (acceptance rates, editorial feedback, etc.)
4. The length of time and amount of research required to complete a project.
5. The extent to which a publication advances knowledge or contributes to the public discourse.
6. The nature of the publication outlet (national, regional, state, local), including its audience.
7. Whether a publication has received an award and/or recognition for its contribution.

In general, the following are standard expectations for tenure track faculty focusing on professional publications. Expectations will be negotiated and adjusted according to differing assignments.

4 Exemplary: The individual being evaluated has made major contributions to the field such as acceptance or publication of a book related to professional publications or publication of several articles and convention or professional presentations. National and regional recognition of professional publication as well as the quality of the publication will be considered.

3 Exceeds expectations: The individual being evaluated has made significant contributions to professional journals and/or other media outlets. Additional evaluation of significance of publication record in newspapers and magazines will be based on overall criteria on the nature and quality of professional publications.

2 Meets expectations: The individual being evaluated has made average contributions to professional publications by having an acceptable degree of publishing activity and/or professional presentations related to publishing or demonstrable evidence of work in progress.
1 Marginal: The individual being evaluated has few professional publications or demonstrable results from such activity or evidence of work in progress.

0 Unacceptable: The individual being evaluated has no professional publications or evidence of work in progress.
E. Service encompasses a range of activities that may or may not draw on a faculty member’s academic expertise. For example, service to academic organizations may include reviewing articles for journals, which requires expertise. It may also include planning a convention or serving as an academic association officer or committee member. All such activities are considered service regardless of whether they rely on expertise.

In general, the following are standard service based expectations for tenure track faculty. Expectations will be negotiated and adjusted according to differing assignments.

4  Exemplary: The individual being evaluated has made major contributions to the profession, state, university or department as evidenced by quality and effort invested.

3  Exceeds expectation: The individual being evaluated has made significant contributions to the profession, state, university or department as evidenced by quality and effort invested.

2  Meets expectations: The individual being evaluated has made average contributions to the profession, state, university or department as evidenced by quality and effort invested.

1  Marginal: The individual being evaluated has little service activity or inability to carry through service assignment in a responsible manner.

0  Unacceptable: The individual being evaluated has very little or no service activity.

F. Outreach relies profoundly on expertise and represents focused and coordinated efforts toward planning and achieving a specific outreach program. Generally, outreach serves some aspect of “community” as opposed to an academic association or creative outlet. “Community” may refer to a geographic region, such as a city, county or state and may also refer to a social or professional community, such as “high school teachers” or “media professionals.” For the purpose of outreach, a specific “community” must be served, but what constitutes a “community” should be viewed broadly.

Outreach is a form of scholarship and may involve applied research. A broad and successful program of outreach may also encompass some aspect of scholarly research, community and civic engagement, and/or creative activity. Therefore, cross-listings of outreach publications in both “research” and “outreach” are quite possible. Outreach, however, is not limited to publication. Outreach activities may encompass any activities that would match the College of Liberal Arts standard for outreach: “to apply instruction and research to the needs and benefits of the public, so that the public can improve and enrich their lives.

The following factors dealing with the nature and quality of outreach will be considered in the overall evaluation.

1. The scope of the project and its impact on the public good.
2. The fit among theory; skills; university, college, and department mission.
3. Whether the outreach activity utilizes and/or results in best practices.
4. The methods employed.
5. An assessment and critique of the outcomes of the outreach effort.
6. The communication mode(s) employed to disseminate the information.
7. Whether the outreach activity has received an award and/or recognition for its contribution.

In general, the following are standard service based expectations for tenure track faculty. Expectations will be negotiated and adjusted according to differing assignments. Moreover, an outreach assignment is not automatic and as such, the percentage assignment, if applicable, should be negotiated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exemplary: The individual being evaluated has made major contribution to the profession, state, or community as evidenced by quality and effort invested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations: The individual being evaluated has made significant contributions to the profession, state, or community as evidenced by quality and effort invested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meets expectations: The individual being evaluated has made average contributions to the profession, state, or community as evidenced by quality and effort invested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marginal: The individual being evaluated has little outreach activity or inability to carry through assignment in a responsible manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unacceptable: The individual being evaluated has no activity in assigned outreach or civic engagement responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

Department of Communication & Journalism Third-Year Review Guidelines

The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of Communication and Journalism follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the Faculty Handbook.

An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.
Appendix 6

Departmental Of Communication & Journalism Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
Approved 12/4/2010

The Department of Communication and Journalism (CMJN) endeavors to excel in the four basic food groups for higher education: research, teaching, service and outreach. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate a commitment to communication and its multifaceted processes, journalism and education. The department combines a strong tradition of research, scholarship and creative work with instruction of undergraduate and graduate students and professional activity.

The CMJN faculty engage in a uniquely wide range of scholarly, creative and professional pursuits. This array of activities and agendas includes, but is not limited to: 1) traditional and non-traditional research and publication in the humanities and social sciences; 2) artistic or creative endeavors such as film, photography, graphic design and multimedia production that are presented in publications, festivals, public exhibitions and other venues; and 3) professional applications and opportunities in outlets associated with and exclusive to specific fields such as journalism.

Whatever the individual focus or field, the primary standards and criteria for establishing distinction are:

1) the **totality** of individual achievement and activity—research/creative work, teaching, service, outreach.

2) combined **quality**, **quantity** and **consistency** of the candidate’s research/creative/professional activities, and

3) the **impact or significance** of that work within their discipline.

General Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion are encouraged as complementary. The standards for tenure are more stringent than those for promotion. Promotion to associate professor rests on evidence of an emerging regional or national reputation and demonstrations of excellence in all assigned areas whether they be teaching, research/creative endeavors, service or outreach. Associate professor rank is generally regarded as a rank of transition on the path to professor. Those who hold associate professor rank are expected to use their time in the rank to develop at least one area of excellence, an area which will distinguish that faculty member on a national or international level. Even if that faculty member never attains full rank, the department views attempts at attaining excellence in at least one area of endeavor to have inherent merit.

General Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor is based primarily on the attainment of national or international recognition in the person’s academic field, as determined by peers within the person’s discipline. The successful candidate for promotion must demonstrate steady attention to scholarship, with continued professional development, distinguished achievement and an outstanding body of works, scholarly or creative, since the previous promotion. Distinguished achievement in research or creative activity consists of significant advancement beyond the credentials submitted for promotion to Associate Professor, and usually includes a book or monograph, or equivalent series of publications in major refereed journals, or exhibition record. The individual is expected to also continue to maintain an excellent record of teaching and service to the department, university and/or profession.
RESEARCH and CREATIVE WORKS

General Guidelines

The following guidelines are for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion as well as the committee members evaluating the candidate.

- The candidate will clearly define their individual area of expertise and intellectual/creative/professional realm, detailing its standards, venues, quirks and nuances, and document their productivity within that context.

- No absolute quantity of works (publications, public exhibitions, etc) will be specified, rather a range of works appropriate to the candidates specific area and proportional to their assignment.

- The candidate will produce a record of continuous work—published, presented and in progress—in selective, high quality outlets and venues with rigorous standards of acceptance.

- The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

- Collaborative research, both among departmental colleagues and with faculty in other parts of the University and at other institutions is valued and of growing importance in certain fields as it fosters innovation and cross-disciplinary work. First-authored publications that provide evidence that the faculty member is a driving force in a portion of the collaborative work are important for providing evidence of excellence. It is important to specify the level of contribution of each author.

- Solo authorship, or intellectual independence, must be demonstrated even if the individual’s research is predominantly collaborative in nature. The candidate’s ability to engage in independent scholarship and publication as evidence by solo and first-authored publications and presentations is essential. Collaborative research is valued and important, but solo/first-authored work is weighted more heavily in as much as it exemplifies the ability to think and publish independently.

- Evidence of continuous scholarly productivity. A gap in a candidate’s research/creative record—one year or more during which little or no work is published or presented at academic conferences—requires explanation and justification (e.g., the faculty member was working on a book or time consuming project; had undertaken a major administrative or service responsibility; personal issues etc.)

- In evaluating a candidate’s research/creative work, it is expected that the work will be subject to peer and juried review at appropriate levels—regional, national, international—and will demonstrate high standards of relevance, continuity, accomplishment and significance.

  a) Relevance in research means that the work should be related to the college curriculum and the candidate’s academic training, teaching area, creative or professional activities.

  b) Continuity in research is based upon the faculty member’s identification of intellectual focus and clear agenda for research or creative activity, as well as evidence of growth, consistency of effort and a common thread of emphasis that is identifiable.

  c) Accomplishment in research refers to the overall productivity, with an emphasis on both quality and quantity, and consistent output during the
time period being assessed. Effort associated with the research/creative effort/publication should also be considered (i.e., complex studies, time-consuming techniques, collection of large amounts of data, etc.)

d) Significance reflects the advancement of knowledge or art and the actual or potential influence/impact of individual research/creative/professional output and activity in the relevant field during the period assessed. This may include a variety of considerations, among them: originality, contribution to theory and practice, complexity of the subject matter and research methodology and its demands, constraints and context; reputation/selectivity of the presentation/publication outlet (i.e., impact statements, acceptance rate, etc.).

****

The following are among considerations in the overall research evaluation of the candidate’s body of works and productivity:

- Book publication / creative exhibition of work
- Publication/presentation of research/work in refereed journals, chapters in collected volumes, exhibitions, festivals, etc.
- Publication of book reviews, essays or lectures
- Presentation of research papers at scholarly conferences, including invited presentations or presentations at refereed conferences.
- Publication in edited collections of scholarly works
- Publication in professional, popular and specialized outlets
- Research awards and honors (i.e. from academic, professional societies, government entities, relevant industries, etc.)
- External funding (as a measure of research skill/competency)

Measuring significance:

- National publication or exhibition is typically weighted more heavily than regional/local publication/exhibition.
- Acceptance rates and journal or venue quality/ status in field;
- Citations and recognition such as awards or reviews
- Solo or percentage of contribution in joint authorship
- Juried or peer review weigh more significantly than invited works. However, invited works may suggest an established reputation a specific field.
- National awards are viewed as more prestigious than regional/local awards
• Peer recognition (i.e., the extent to which a candidate’s work has achieved a national/international reputation).

• Grants, fellowships, research contracts as provide indications of peer interest in the candidate’s research. The prestige of the granting agency, degree of competition and scarcity/availability of grants may also be considerations.

• Books: The reputation of the publishing house; type of audience, quality of reviews, awards, etc. Whether the book is the result of new research or the reworking of already published material.

• Creative works: The reputation of the venue (festival, exhibition, publication etc.), acceptance standards, audience, reviews, awards, collections, acquisitions, competitions, gallery affiliations et al. Other factors of creative context include: 1) type and scope of creative activity 2) length of time and labour involved in creative/production process, 3) production and distribution costs.

• Textbooks: Does it provide a new approach to the field? Helps to establish a new field, or is considered “seminal” in some way.

• Book chapters: Are judged similarly to books/textbooks. Also considered are length, substance, independent credit for the chapter.

• Refereed journal articles: Among the many considerations: standing of the journal; national/international/regional journal; type of article (original vs. review article); acceptance rate; reputation in the field.

There is a growing acceptance of the following:

• Publishing in journals in other academic fields and in interdisciplinary journals, as they are appropriate to the candidate’s area of research/expertise.

• Non-refereed journal articles: Does the publication (journal, magazine, newspaper etc) have a process of acceptance similar to that of peer review (e.g., board of peer editors, special issue editor, etc.).

• Book reviews. Generally carry less weight than original research. However, they may be weighted more heavily based on the importance of the publishing outlet and the quality of the review. They accent an active research agenda and can demonstrate standing in the field.

• Paper presentations: Refereed/invited or competitive papers carry greater weight than those that are not. Also considered will be the quality/importance of the conference and any recognition of the paper (awards, later publication, citation, conference proceedings, etc.). Thus, national or international conferences by recognized professional or academic associations are weighted more heavily than regional conferences, followed by state/local conferences.

Candidates should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research/creative work to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

TEACHING

Candidates at any level--tenure, associate or full--are expected to maintain a solid record of teaching. Criteria that are useful for determining effective teaching include, but are not limited to: 1) the scope and nature of courses, 2) individual teaching load, 3) course preparations 4) course syllabi 5 ) class size 6)
grade distribution 7) evidence of keeping materials current (readings, texts, screenings etc) 8) links to research agenda 9) assignments, projects, field trips, 10) teaching awards, 11) advising. Annual departmental, peer, student reviews should help provide a composite of classroom performance and overall instruction.

Candidates should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

SERVICE

Candidates are expected to establish good record of service within the department and beyond at college, university, and regional levels, and through professional organizational affiliations. Such service may include various committee assignments, advisory boards, journal editorialships, etc. In addition, candidates should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of service to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

OUTREACH

Outreach involves academic citizenship activities relevant to an individual’s assignment, discipline, rank and length of service. Outreach activities are those which extend the influence and expertise of the faculty to areas and populations external to the University. Consult the Faculty Handbook for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of outreach to advance the mission of the department, college and university.