

Department of Communication Governance Document

I. Introductory Materials

- A. *Preamble:* The Department of Communication is not currently a multi-campus unit. If departmental faculty are hired at branch campuses, Department faculty will modify governance and Tenure & Promotion documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of faculty governance and to ensure they have voice in departmental issues. The Department recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university. The Department of Communication at the University of South Florida has established the following bylaws, based upon the principle of faculty governance, to ensure order, clarity, fairness, and collegiality in the structure and operation of the Department. It is recognized that this document may not contravene US Federal and Florida State law, the University Constitution, the rules and regulations of the Florida Board of Governors (BOG) and the University of South Florida Board of Trustees (BOT), the USF Senate, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between USF and the USF chapter of the United Faculty of Florida and the USF College of Arts and Sciences Governance Document. The foregoing authorities will govern in the event that any provision of this governance document is inconsistent with or in conflict with them.
- B. *Mission Statement:* The Department of Communication embraces innovative humanistic and social scientific approaches to inquiry and engagement in health, media, organizational and relational communication, with emphases on culture, performance, and social justice.
- C. *How to amend this document:* Any three voting members of the department may propose an amendment. A proposed amendment must be made at least two weeks prior to the date of the meeting at which a vote on adoption is to be taken. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote, after full deliberation, by a two-thirds majority of the full membership of the department (not simply two-thirds of the attendees at the meeting). Amendments to the Faculty Evaluation Committee guidelines will go into effect one year following ratification while those to the rest of the document take effect immediately. All voting on proposed amendments will be conducted by secret ballot.

II. The department

- A. Membership
 1. Voting membership in the Department of Communication will include the following full-time, permanent academic ranks: Distinguished University Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, Instructor III. Non-voting membership is extended to those holding emeritus, temporary, post-doctoral, visiting, or affiliated positions.
 2. Those who have joint appointments will be considered voting members of the department if (i) 50% or more of their budgeted salary is administered through the department and/or (ii) their tenure home is in the department.

3. Faculty from other departments may be designated as affiliated faculty if they receive a 2/3 vote of acceptance by members of the department. Affiliated faculty are non-voting members of the department.
4. Members on leave from the Department will retain voting privileges pursuant to requisite department policies regarding participation, presence, or fulfilling other responsibilities. Members on leave will be provided timely information about department affairs and when possible will be provided opportunities to respond and make recommendations regarding them.
5. Under the guidance of the chair, committee service will be divided among the voting faculty. In some instances, as stipulated below (in section IV), students may hold voting roles on committees.
6. Graduate students, for instance, Graduate Communication Association (GCA) representatives, may be invited to contribute to discussions, but they do not vote.

B. Meetings

1. The parliamentary authority for meetings will be the most current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*. All voting members are expected to attend regular monthly meetings of the department. Arrangements can be made to attend remotely (via Skype, phone or other means), but physical presence is preferred. A quorum shall consist of 50% +1 of the members of the department.
2. Regular monthly meetings of the department will be set before the beginning of each semester. The schedule may be amended by the Chair, as deemed necessary.
3. Special meetings may be called at other times by any member of the Executive Committee or by any two voting members of the department.
4. Timely electronic notification of all meetings, regular and special, shall be made to all members of the department, and shall include the agenda for the meeting.
5. Voting members can attend meetings remotely (via Skype, phone, or other means) when necessary. Physical presence is preferred whenever possible.
6. Electronic minutes of each departmental meeting will be distributed in a timely manner.

C. Voting

1. Voting on questions during meetings shall be conducted *viva voce* (including voices of members attending remotely—via Skype, phone or other means) unless any member present (including members attending remotely) requests a vote by secret ballot (however, questions of faculty hires, amendments to this document, and of tenure and promotion shall always be by secret ballot). A simple majority of the votes cast, ignoring blanks, is sufficient for the adoption of any motion that is in order, except those which require a two-thirds vote (e.g., amending this document, suspending rules in this document, limiting the names to be voted for, among others listed in *Robert's Rules*). On a tie vote the motion is lost. The Chair typically does not vote unless the vote is by ballot. In other cases, the Chair may vote to make a tie (equating a failed motion) or to break a tie (to pass a

- motion). The chair cannot, however, vote twice, first to make a tie and then give the casting vote.
2. When voting on a question or ballot with more than two options, a majority is required to decide the question (not a simple plurality). If there is no majority, a run-off vote is held between the top two options to determine a majority winner. Ranking and rating systems of voting will not be employed unless the faculty agree by a 2/3 majority to use alternative voting procedures.
 - a) Electronic voting can be used for all matters, including ones conducted by secret ballot (such as tenure votes, faculty hires, for example) as long as confidentiality is maintained. At a meeting when some faculty members are present, and others are attending remotely (via Skype, phone, or other means), it may be necessary for everyone to vote electronically.
 - b) For minor matters that arise between faculty meetings, for expediency sake, the Chair may request confidential electronic votes.
 - c) In extenuating and exceptional circumstances, for time sensitive matters (for instance, votes on a faculty hire or Chair during the summer or winter breaks), electronic votes can be conducted without a meeting. This is not the preferred course of action.
 3. Proxy voting and absentee voting during faculty meetings is forbidden.

III. Administration

A. Chair

1. *The position:* The Chair is the chief administrative and academic officer of the Department and is responsible for executing the policies of the Department. In principle, major policy is determined by the Chair and the faculty; in practice, the Chair has final authority for policy and is answerable to the College and University. Thus, on occasion, the Chair may not follow the vote of the majority; in those cases, however, he or she must explain in writing or at a faculty meeting the reasons for his or her decision. It is important that the Chair see himself or herself as an interpreter and administrator of the will of the faculty; it is important that the faculty realize the Chair must have considerable discretionary authority since he or she is held responsible by the College and University for all Departmental activities. The chair typically serves a four-year term and is eligible for re-election.
2. *Charge:* The Chair is the representative of the Department to the administration, and is responsible for operating the business of the Department efficiently, fairly, and with transparency. The duties of the department chair will include representing the department within and outside the university, proposing and overseeing the budget, allocating resources including travel funds and office space, nominating the associate department chair and directors of academic programs, appointing members for department committees, scheduling classes, recruiting adjuncts, setting the agenda and presiding over department meetings, and making salary recommendations. The chair is also responsible for making annual faculty assignments and evaluating faculty in accordance with the procedures of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Perhaps most significantly, the Chair will,

in consultation with the Faculty, evaluate and improve instructional and administrative processes, see that all faculty have Departmental privileges and responsibilities appropriate to their rank, encourage research and scholarship, and foster collegiality within the Department.

3. *Selection procedures:* Upon a vacancy in the chair position or at the end of a term of an incumbent chair, department members will consider candidates for the position of chair in an election to be held at which at least two-thirds of the full-time faculty is present. All Associate Professors and Professors are eligible for nomination and self-nomination for the Chair position. All internal candidates will have an opportunity to discuss with the department the advantages of their candidacies. The Department will deliberate about internal candidates, about delaying and having an acting chair, and about hiring externally—arriving at a decision by majority vote before proceeding. Election of a chair-designate or acting chair will occur upon simple majority vote of all full-time faculty, for one candidate (see section II, B, 7 for voting procedures with more than two candidates). The outgoing chair or a member of the Executive Committee not running for the chair position will distribute and count the ballots and report a summary of the results and process to the Dean. If the faculty wish to pursue an external chair, and the Dean approves a search, a search committee shall be appointed (see section IV, F). This search committee may wish to include members from outside the department. Upon selection, the Chair must be approved by the Dean.

B. Associate Chair

1. The Associate Chair position shall be filled when requested by the Chair and approved by the Dean.
2. *Charge:* The Associate Chair assists in the administration of the Department, in implementing University and College policies and procedures, and in initiating and implementing internal policies and procedures. The Associate Chair works closely with the Chair on department business. The Associate Chair will have primary responsibility for all course scheduling, including considering curricular needs of students and all programs. The tasks will include working with the Chair to determine curricular needs, coordinating the scheduling of classes; working with the graduate director to coordinate graduate course scheduling; working with the undergraduate director, undergraduate advisor, and course directors to coordinate the scheduling of undergraduate classes; serving as liaison with faculty and graduate students to schedule classes; and working with the office manager to input classes. The Associate Chair will represent the Chair and Department at meetings and functions the Chair is unable to attend. Additional duties may be negotiated between the Chair and Associate Chair. The Associate Chair will be a non-voting (ex-officio) member of the Executive Committee and expected to attend all meetings.
3. *Appointment:* All tenured faculty are eligible for nomination for Associate Chair of the Department of Communication. The Associate Chair is appointed by the Dean upon nomination by the Chair, consent of the appointee, approval by the standing Executive Committee and a majority

of the faculty in a secret ballot. The chair will solicit self-nominations from faculty, select a candidate from those nominations, and seek approval first from the Executive Committee, and then the faculty (by majority vote). The Associate Chair's term is fully, or in part, concurrent with that of the Chair, but the period of appointment cannot exceed that of the serving chair. A person can be reappointed for multiple terms, and during a Chair's term of service, different Associate Chairs may be appointed through the process described above.

C. Director of the Graduate Program

1. *Charge:* The Director of the Graduate Program (DGP) serves as liaison with and representative to the School of Humanities, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School, and other entities in and out of the university on matters appropriate to the graduate program. The DGP manages graduate application, admissions, assistantship, and fellowship procedures; coordinates orientation programs and graduate student evaluations; manages recruitment of new graduate students and promotion of the program; approves all graduate student plans of study and committees; meets with and chairs the Graduate Committee; coordinates and analyzes graduate SACS data, and writes and submits the SACS evaluation report; and reports to the faculty on the state of the graduate program. The DGP serves a three-year term, and is eligible for multiple terms.
2. *Selection:* All tenured faculty are eligible for nomination and self-nomination when an opening for Director of the Graduate Program is announced. The Chair will discuss nominations with the Executive Committee, and with the Committee's consent will submit at least one nominee to the faculty for majority approval on a written ballot.

D. Director of the Undergraduate Program

1. *Charge:* The Director of the Undergraduate Program (DUP) serves as liaison with and representative to the School of Humanities, the College of Arts and Sciences, the office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and other entities in and out of the university on matters appropriate to the undergraduate program. The DUP supervises and coordinates the undergraduate honors program and the undergraduate honor society (Lambda Pi Eta); works with the undergraduate advisor to certify undergraduate students for graduation and to certify transfer courses; meets with and chairs the Undergraduate Committee; coordinates and analyzes undergraduate SACS data, and writes and submits the SACS evaluation report; manages recruitment of new undergraduate students and promotion of the undergraduate program; reviews policies and makes recommendations to the faculty regarding policy changes; works with the Associate Chair on curriculum needs and issues; and reports to the faculty on the state of the undergraduate program. The DUP serves a three-year term, and is eligible for multiple terms.
2. *Selection:* All voting members of the department are eligible for nomination and self-nomination when an opening for Director of the Undergraduate

Program is announced. The Chair will discuss nominations with the Executive Committee, and with the Committee's consent will submit at least one nominee to the faculty for majority approval on a written ballot.

IV. Committees

- A. Unless otherwise noted, voting procedures for committees follow those outlined in sections II-B-6, 7, and 8.
- B. Executive Committee
 1. *Membership:* The department Chair serves as chair of this committee. Other members include the Directors of the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs and at least two elected members (one tenured and one tenure-earning), who will serve one-year terms.
 2. *Duties:* The Executive Committee should meet at least once per semester. The Executive Committee serves an advisory and consultative function to the Department Chair on matters of department governance.
- C. Graduate Committee
 1. *Membership:* This committee will be chaired by the Director of the Graduate Program (DGP) and include at least two other members of the department assigned to one-year terms.
 2. *Duties:* The Graduate Committee will review graduate applications and direct the DGP to make offers for admissions to and funding in the graduate program. The Committee will also review, propose, and implement planning and policy formation regarding the graduate academic program and curriculum; review and recommend regarding new course proposals, oversee policies in recruitment, admissions, and advising of graduate students; and recommend policies regarding graduate comprehensive examinations.
 3. *Student Voice:* The committee will seek graduate student input when appropriate, and in a manner of the committee's choosing
- D. Undergraduate Committee
 1. *Membership:* This committee will be chaired by the Director of the Undergraduate Program (DUP) and include the Department's Undergraduate Academic Advisor and at least two other members of the department assigned to one-year terms.
 2. *Duties:* The Undergraduate Committee will review, propose, and implement planning and policy formation regarding the undergraduate academic program and the curriculum of the department; review and recommend regarding new course proposals; and oversee policies in admission and advising of students.
 3. *Student Voice:* The committee will seek undergraduate student input when appropriate, and in a manner of the committee's choosing
- E. Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)
 1. *Membership:* This committee will consist of 3-4 tenured faculty members and 1-2 non-tenured tenure-track faculty members (for a total of 5 members), appointed by the Chair. One of the tenured members will be appointed to a two-year term as Chair-elect, serving as a regular member the first year and as Chair in the second year. The other four members serve one-year terms.

2. *Duties:* The FEC has two principal tasks: in the fall, to prepare tenure and promotion files and mid-tenure review files, and, in the spring, to conduct the annual review of faculty for the department. The Committee may also be asked to participate in the Dean's annual evaluation of the Department Chair as an administrator. The Committee should also annually review its own guidelines and take the lead in updating and proposing revisions.
 3. *Responsibilities of the Committee Chair:* The chair should apprise members of their duties and establish a timetable for completing them. The chair is to set agendas for meetings and see that materials appropriate to the task of evaluation are made available. Upon completion of the committee's work, the chair is responsible for the preparation and signing of all final reports, such as tenure and promotion forms, committee letters of evaluations, and the online Annual Faculty Review Summary forms. As final orders of business, the chair should update the records of the committee and see that the FRC/FEC Guidelines are passed on to the next committee with an opportunity to discuss them at the committee's first meeting of the year.
- F. Equity, Social Justice, and Accountability Committee
1. *Membership:* The committee will consist of, minimally, 2 faculty members appointed by the department chair, and 2 graduate students. Department staff membership is optional, at the discretion of the staff, in consultation with the department chair. Graduate students will apply to a selection committee comprised of the committee's faculty members and staff member if one has been appointed. Committee membership should reflect a cross-section of interests and identities in the department community. One of the faculty members will serve as Chair of the Committee, and each student will serve as Co-chair, assisting the Chair, for one semester of the academic year term.
 2. *Duties:* The USF Department of Communication Committee on Equity, Social Justice, and Accountability is committed to developing conscious practices that create and sustain an institutional climate of respect, equity, accountability, and inclusion for all members of the department community. The committee strives to provide leadership, dialogue, space, and resources for department staff, students, and faculty colleagues with regard to issues of differences, equity, social justice, and accountability.
- G. *Ad Hoc* Committees will be created and appointed by the Chair, and approved by the Executive Committee, as need arises.

V. Tenure and Promotion

- A. For purposes of Tenure and Promotion, the Department of Communication will follow the procedures and conform to the standards of CAS and University guidelines. For the purposes of tenure decisions, the faculty Tenure and Promotion committee will consist of only tenured faculty in the department who meet CAS and USF criteria for service on tenure and promotion committees, and no separate vote and recommendation for the T & P committee will be taken or recorded as distinct from the faculty vote. In the case of promotion to full professor, the department committee will consist of tenured faculty in the department who meet CAS and USF criteria for service on tenure and promotion committees, and who have themselves attained the rank of Professor, and no separate

vote and recommendation for the T & P committee will be taken or recorded as distinct from the faculty vote.

VI. Other Policies

- A. The Department of Communication will compile a set of policies that guide recurring business (e.g., faculty search procedures, faculty attendance at graduation ceremonies, allocation of summer teaching assignments, etc.) in a separate document.

Approved by faculty vote on May 12, 2020.

Approved by Dean's Office on May 14, 2020.

Revised by the faculty 11/30/2018

Approved by the Dean's Office 10/07/2013

Revised by the faculty 09/20/2013

Revised by the faculty 10/06/1993

Revised by the faculty 10/07/1992

Revised by the faculty 08/28/1991

Revised by the faculty 09/12/1990

Revised by the faculty 05/01/1986

Adopted by the faculty 06/06/1977

Department of Communication: Faculty Annual Evaluation Criteria

A. General

In alignment with college and university guidelines and CBA, the department conducts an annual review of faculty activity. Although the annual review of activity over the preceding calendar year plays an important role in institutional processes such as determining raises and merit pay and evaluating progress toward tenure and promotion, the processes and expectations for annual evaluation and tenure/promotion are separate, and faculty are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the processes and expectations for both annual review and tenure/promotion. Consequently, an “outstanding” annual evaluation for a majority of years leading to tenure/promotion does not guarantee a favorable tenure/promotion decision since the latter is based on the candidate’s overall record; nor would a less than “outstanding” annual evaluation for multiple years leading to tenure/promotion necessarily preclude being approved for tenure/promotion.

Note:

1. In all categories below, faculty will only be evaluated in areas in which they have an annual assignment of effort. For example, **instructional faculty** will not be evaluated on research unless their annual assignment includes a percentage of effort in research.
2. Faculty members will be responsible for submitting accurate and complete annual reports in the designated format by the designated deadline. For tasks/assignments that take substantial amount of time, it is helpful to provide additional explanation and supporting materials to the FEC.
3. In cases of significant disruptions to normal working conditions (illnesses, emergencies, etc.), faculty members will endeavor to provide the FEC with information on the impact of the disruption on their work performance and the FEC will endeavor to take the impact into consideration when evaluating performance for that year.

B. Evaluation Procedure

In the early spring, faculty will be informed of the deadline for submitting their information to the department for purposes of evaluation. This process involves updating information and submitting supporting documentation (e.g., course syllabi, letters from an editor) in the Faculty Information System in Archivum, which can be done at any time during the year.

The Faculty Evaluation Committees will review the materials submitted and, using the guidelines below, will arrive at a numerical evaluation score for each member of the faculty. The FEC reviews all tenured and pre-tenure faculty as well as instructional faculty. All FEC members participate in the discussion of each faculty member’s annual evaluation, but only associate and full professors decide on numerical ratings for assistant professors and only professors decide on ratings for associate professors. The numerical evaluation should be made in view of the university and college’s mission and goals, the faculty member’s annual assignment, and the faculty member’s self-submitted report of annual activity. Performance in each assigned area of teaching, research, and service is to be rated as one of the following: “outstanding” (5), “strong” (4), “satisfactory” (3), “weak” (2) “unsatisfactory” (1). In addition to the numerical score, the committee will submit a brief narrative commentary on the evaluation. At the conclusion of their

review, the chair of the FEC will enter the evaluations and narratives into the Archivum system and DocuSign. The faculty member has up to seven days to review and sign off, which initiates the Chair's review.

The department Chair will conduct an independent evaluation of all the faculty, using the materials submitted. They will submit their numerical and narrative evaluations in Archivum. Faculty will have up to seven days to review and sign, thereafter the evaluation moves to CAS Dean's office.

Note 1: Faculty who do not submit materials for annual evaluation will likely be assigned an "unsatisfactory" (1) for that academic year of assessment.

Note 2: The department will ensure that spouses and partners may not evaluate each other.

C. Expectations

1. Teaching

The department's bylaws recognize the problematic nature of relying on student evaluations as the primary method of assessing excellence in teaching; hence, we encourage instructors to provide evidence of successful teaching that captures engagement in and commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate programs in a variety of ways.

The teaching narrative should begin with a brief summary of courses taught and other primary teaching activity during the calendar year followed by descriptions of teaching activity within each of the six categories listed below as applicable. Based on the faculty member's description and supporting materials, the FEC will assign a rating using the following system:

- **Outstanding** (5.0) teaching includes evidence of success in three or more categories. Alternatively, the committee may assign a rating of Outstanding on the basis of exceptional performance in one or two categories - such as the receipt of a major teaching, mentoring, or advising award during the evaluation year; leadership role in department, college, university-wide curriculum development during the evaluation year; service on a number of undergraduate honors, MA thesis, or PhD dissertation committees in the evaluation year that is unusually large in comparison with other department members and is not otherwise recognized; or another accomplishment deemed extraordinary by a majority of committee members. Evidence of such exemplary accomplishments must be included in the annual report for consideration.
- **Strong** (4.0) teaching includes evidence of success in two categories.
- **Satisfactory** (3.0) teaching includes evidence of success in one category.
- **Weak** (2.0) teaching means the FEC did not find evidence of any of the items listed in the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating, but peer or student evaluations are not generally problematic.
- **Unsatisfactory** (1.0) teaching means the FEC did not find evidence of any of the items listed in the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating. Additionally, the FEC found that peer or student evaluation(s) generally rate the candidate's teaching as ineffective or problematic.

Criteria for each of these ratings are listed below; these criteria align with those listed in the department's tenure and promotion document. We recognize that the list provided is illustrative rather than exhaustive, so we encourage faculty to describe teaching activities that are not specifically noted or adequately captured in these categories.

Curricular Rigor

- course syllabi include relevant scholarship appropriate to the content and level of the course
- course activities promote active learning, critical thinking, opportunities to enhance speaking and writing, creativity, and/or pedagogical inclusivity

Curricular Contribution

- creating special topics courses
- developing and seeking curricular approval for new courses
- developing online classes with Innovative Education
- substantially updating syllabi/assignments/instructional materials
- contributing to the department's required core undergraduate and graduate curriculum
- participating in USF's General Education and Global Citizens project
- participating in the assessment and revision of department degree programs
- establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community engagement opportunities, etc.
- teaching large lecture classes and mentoring GTAs via these classes

Peer and/or Student Evaluations

- peer evaluations rate the faculty member's teaching as effective
- student evaluations meet or exceed college averages

Undergraduate/Graduate Student Supervision, Mentoring, and Advising

- (co)advising MA and PhD students
- serving on MA and PhD student advisory committees
- supervising independent studies/directed research by graduate or undergraduate students
- serving on/directing undergraduate honors thesis committees
- observing/mentoring graduate student instructors
- presenting conference papers and creative works with graduate or undergraduate students
- publishing papers and creative works with graduate or undergraduate students
- supervision of internships for undergraduate and grad students

Evidence of Commitment to Teaching

- winning honors/awards for teaching (both intramural and extramural)
- participating in pedagogical training sessions, workshops, or conferences
- contributing to publications on pedagogy

2. Research/Creative Activity

Research, publication, and creative activity are to be evaluated with a view toward balancing the claims of short haul and long haul. In other words, a balance should be struck between giving credit for work done in the year under consideration and giving credit for overall career

development. If a colleague has been productive for many years, for example, the faculty member's ratings should not automatically be lowered because of a seemingly unproductive year; the colleague should be given an opportunity to present evidence relevant to the overall performance. Similarly, if a colleague is heavily involved in service that also requires a good deal of current scholarly knowledge—such as editing a journal or planning a conference program—their rating should not automatically be lowered if such service temporarily slows their original output; they should be given the opportunity to explain the relevance to their overall performance. And if work is produced that is beyond the highest standards for any given year, it should receive some carryover credit to subsequent years (see below).

Absolute evaluative numbers can be challenging to assign to individual items because quality must be evaluated as well as quantity. In this regard, evaluators should recognize that when a work is published, especially if refereed or invited, a certain qualitative judgment has already been made by peers, one to be heeded because it probably comes from a more impartial, and perhaps more informed, jury than a local committee.

Each activity below should be weighed in view of the faculty member's rank, the length and creative ambition of the work, the order of authorship (sole and/or first author carrying greater weight), venue of placement (see department T&P guidelines for more information on venues of publication), and its contributions to the specific field(s) sub-field(s) in which they primarily work. Contributions to the field may be demonstrated by major external prizes and awards for scholarly or creative work. The scholarly record and associated annual evaluation narrative ideally reflect a *coherent, organized, and systematic* program of scholarship.

Textbooks should be judged based on how much scholarly/critical effort went into their creation and how much pedagogical value they have. Textbooks contribute to evidence of commitment to teaching, but when appropriate also can carry some weight in the rating of research.

a. **Outstanding (5.0)** should be awarded for any of these numbered items:

1. Publication of a single-authored or co-authored book (merits an evaluation of “outstanding” in the year of publication and for 2 years thereafter).
2. Publication of an edited or co-edited book with a substantial scholarly contribution by the editor(s) (merits an evaluation of “outstanding” in the year of publication and for 1 year thereafter).
3. Receipt of a major research-focused award, grant, or fellowship that is nationally competitive (PI, co-PI, or mPI).
4. Publication of a revised edition of a book (with evidence of substantial revision), merits an evaluation of “outstanding” in the year of publication when combined with any one of following:
 - Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
 - Submission of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook

- Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
- Submission of a grant proposal
- Service as a journal editor or associate editor
- Organizing a scholarly conference
- An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
- A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)

5. Publication of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook, AND any one of the following:

- Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
- Submission of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook
- Substantial progress on a book manuscript (authored)
- Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
- Submission of a grant proposal
- Service as a journal editor or associate editor
- Organizing a scholarly conference
- An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
- A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)

For an outstanding rating, the overall scholarly record should reflect that the faculty member is in the process of developing or has developed a well-articulated, organized, coherent, and systematic program of scholarship.

b. **Strong (4.0)** should be awarded for any of the following:

1. Publication of a single-authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution, if co-authored), including in a handbook. [What distinguished b1 from a5 is the absence (in b1) of additional items listed after “AND” in a5].

2. Publication of a revised edition of a book (with evidence of substantial revision).

3. Any two of the following:

- Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
- Conference submission/presentations
- Submission of a journal article
- Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
- Submission of a grant proposal
- Service as a journal editor or associate editor
- Organizing a scholarly conference

- Substantial progress on a book manuscript (authored)
 - For community engaged scholars, smaller engaged research publications (e.g., blogs) and/or collaborative events with community partners
 - An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
 - A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)
- c. **Satisfactory (3.0)** should be awarded for achieving any one of the following:
- Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution in assessing the state of the field
 - Conference submission/presentations
 - Submission of a journal article
 - Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
 - Submission of a grant proposal
 - Service as a journal editor or associate editor
 - Organizing a scholarly conference
 - An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
 - A major engaged research publication for a non-academic audience (e.g., white paper)
 - Substantial progress on a book manuscript (authored)
- d. **Weak (2.0)** should be awarded to faculty whose record in the relevant year does not meet the departmental standard for satisfactory.
- e. **Unsatisfactory (1.0)** should be awarded to faculty whose record does not meet the departmental standard for satisfactory for more than one year, or who fail to submit materials for evaluation.

3. Service

Because service is part of each faculty member's contract with the university, it is appropriately evaluated as part of any performance review. The department's T&P document indicates that tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to show "substantive contributions of service to the University, profession and/or public," while the department's promotion guidelines for instructional faculty indicate that a record of teaching excellence can be complemented by service activities such as "committee membership," "community engagement," or "leadership roles." As a department we also recognize that the service load will differ among faculty and across ranks. For example, tenured faculty are expected to contribute more extensively than tenure-earning faculty to professional, university, and public service, while instructional faculty in most cases are evaluated primarily in terms of excellence in teaching.

In evaluating service-related activities, the FEC and Chair will examine all aspects of a candidate's service and will not rely on a single measure of performance. Applicants are fully responsible for providing evidence of their own service-related activities. In their service narratives, faculty members should briefly indicate level of responsibility to help the FEC and Chair understand the specific service commitments. For instance, membership in an organization might entail meeting attendance and event participation; serving on a committee of that

organization would entail more involvement; and chairing that committee would entail even more involvement.

Service falls into three general categories: to the university, to the profession, and to the community. University service is further broken down into service to the department, the college, and the university at large.

- a. **Outstanding (5.0)** should be awarded to faculty who maintain a consistent record of good departmental service according to their assigned duties AND demonstrate evidence of service in at least two areas to contribute to the **university, profession, and/or community** (listed below #i - #x).

Service to the department involves activities such as (but not limited to): a) serving on, or chairing, department committees, b) organizing and/or attending faculty meetings, colloquia, performances of creative works, ESJA events, job interviews, student recruiting activities, and other professional events (*Note: faculty are not required to attend social events*).

Regarding service to the **university, profession, and/or community**, faculty can engage in activities such as (but not limited to)

- i. holding leadership positions in important international, national, or regional professional organizations.
- ii. serving as a journal editor or book series editor in their area
- iii. serving on journal editorial boards as well as conducting ad-hoc journal peer reviews or book manuscript reviews for scholarly publishers
- iv. serving as a book review editor for a journal
- v. guest editing a special issue of a journal
- vi. reviewing paper submissions for scholarly conferences
- vii. organizing academic conferences
- viii. serving on grant review panels
- ix. participating actively in important university or college committees or organizations (e.g., those that meet regularly and address consequential issues)
- x. performing community service activities such as service to public schools, community colleges, local nonprofits, public lecture series and panel discussions, contributions to TV, radio, and newsprint, and other forms of community education

Note: Since many service roles, such as committees and editorial positions, require varying levels of time and effort, faculty members need to offer a brief yet clear assessment of the actual work entailed in fulfilling a given role for that year, along with supporting evidence where appropriate. Public/community engagement must relate to one's academic field/expertise and cannot involve unrelated personal hobbies or interests. Because the expectations about level of service contributions for promotion to Professor are significantly higher than that those for attaining the Associate rank, tenured faculty are encouraged to highlight leadership roles they have taken in their service work.

Note: A faculty member can be assigned a “5” if they perform good department service plus service in one additional area that is well beyond the standard assignment. For example, an assistant professor who serves on a university committee with an unusually busy schedule or an associate professor who spends substantial time editing a journal can be assigned a “5” without significant service in other areas beyond the department. Likewise, a faculty member can be assigned a “5” if they perform department service well beyond their standard assignment if they also demonstrate service in one other area. For example, an associate professor who chairs a faculty search with a large applicant pool might be assigned a “5” if they also perform substantive professional but not university or community service.

- b. Strong (4.0)** should be awarded to faculty who maintain a consistent record of good departmental service according to their assigned duties and demonstrate evidence of service in at least one area: the university, profession, or community.
- c. Satisfactory (3.0)** should be awarded to faculty who adequately perform departmental service activity according to their assigned duties but do not demonstrate any evidence of service contributing to the university, profession, or community.
- d. Weak (2.0)** should be awarded to faculty who do not who adequately perform departmental service activity according to their assigned duties.
- e. Unsatisfactory (1.0)** should be awarded to faculty whose record does not meet the departmental standard for satisfactory service for more than one year, or who fail to submit materials for evaluation

D. Appeals Procedure

In the cases of annual evaluations, if a colleague wishes to appeal the FEC's and/or the department Chair's evaluation, the colleague should ask to meet with the FEC and/or the Chair, as appropriate, as the first step in an appeals procedure. The FEC and/or the Chair may be asked to explain the basis of the evaluation and/or the colleague may wish to present new material or to shed light on old material.

If a colleague wishes further review of the FEC's and/or the Chair's evaluation, the colleague should inform the FEC chair and the department Chair in writing. The Department's Executive Committee will serve as an Ad Hoc Appeals Committee. This Ad Hoc Appeals Committee, after examining relevant documents and arguments, will consult with the colleague who wants the review and with the FEC chair and the department Chair. Whatever the committee's judgment of the appeal, its recommendation is to be sent on to the college dean with the comments of the FEC and/or the Chair (whichever is appropriate). The colleague who initiates the review may attach comments to any of the material in the file under consideration.