

Submitted: September 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: September 7, 2023

Department of Journalism & Digital Communication Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with state law and University and Board of Governor regulations 10.003, tenured faculty in the Department of Journalism and Digital Communication participate in post-tenure reviews (PTRs) every five years. The PTR is an evaluation of the five years of employment leading up to the review. Faculty subject to review prepare, in advance, a packet consisting of a narrative of accomplishments, the previous five years of annual evaluations, an up-to-date CV, supplemental evidence of accomplishments, and any disciplinary record (if applicable).

Quantifiable annual evaluation criteria, along with professional standards codified by our specialized accrediting body, inform the Department's PTR guidelines. Annual workload assignments across the review period inform the weight given to each category of review—research, teaching, service—when calculating a faculty member's overall PTR score.

Overall PTR scores, based on weighted averages across all categories in the five-year review period, reflect the following levels of performance:

1. Exceeds expectations. The faculty member demonstrates a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across their discipline and unit. The faculty member's record shows sustained, satisfactory professional conduct in compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations 10.00, and University regulations and policies.
2. Meets expectations. The faculty member demonstrates a record of performance expected for the discipline and unit in a sustained fashion across the review period. The accomplishments meet those of faculty of similar rank and specialty at other high-ranking research institutions. The faculty member's record shows sustained, satisfactory professional conduct in compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations 10.003, and University regulations and policies.
3. Does not meet expectations. The faculty member's record of performance does not meet expectations for the discipline and unit in a sustained fashion across the review period but shows room for improvement. The accomplishments fall short of those of faculty of similar rank and specialty at other high-ranking research institutions. **A faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory evaluation during the five-year review period, without subsequent evidence of improvement; or who receives multiple unsatisfactory evaluations within a single category of**

review, without subsequent evidence of improvement; or who exhibits a pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations 10.003, or University regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.

- 4. Unsatisfactory.** The faculty member fails, over multiple review periods, to meet expectations, in a manner that shows disregard for previous feedback and recommendations for improvement; or demonstrates incompetence or misconduct, as defined in University regulations and policies. **A faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation in two or more of the previous five years, or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years, may be deemed unsatisfactory. This rating reflects a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations 10.003, policies, and procedures.**

Research

Evaluation of faculty research for post-tenure review considers the total scholarly activity in the five-year review period across three categories.

Scholarly works

Scholarly works are peer-reviewed and represent the primary form of Departmental research. They include but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed journal articles
- peer-reviewed book chapters published by reputable university or academic presses
- scholarly books (equivalent to three-to-five journal articles, depending on the scope of effort)
- successful grant applications and related activities, e.g., grant administration (equivalent to one-to-five journal articles, depending on the scope of effort)
- peer-reviewed proceedings in international conferences
- edited books or other edited collections

Creative works

Creative works are significant publication efforts of a journalistic, nonfiction nature. Such works include:

- non-scholarly books
- long-form reporting series
- multimedia productions

- interactive and data-driven journalistic projects
- documentaries and other substantive journalistic products based on investigative reporting, historical analysis, public records research, and related techniques
- community journalism and engagement projects

Public scholarship & other publications

Additional forms of scholarship can earn credit toward research. These efforts include, but are not limited to:

- invited book chapters not subject to peer review
- self-published works validated by external reviews
- invited, peer-reviewed papers or presentations
- non-refereed, published journalistic articles
- book reviews, essays, commentaries and other critical-analytical publications
- invited presentations
- research fellowships
- photo essays
- other professional works

Credit for works-in-progress

Credit can be given for unpublished works in progress when there is evidence of substantive planning, research, or writing. The faculty member under review should indicate whether they would like to receive partial credit for work in progress and describe what was accomplished in the five-year review period.

Evaluators should award partial credit after determining the total credit that the effort constitutes and then gauging how much progress has been made. Examples of achievements that warrant partial credit include:

- instrument, scale, or measurement design
- data collection
- draft research manuscripts
- book manuscript contracts from reputable publishers
- submitted (but unpublished) manuscripts
- grant applications

These examples can be adapted to other types of scholarship to provide credit for work in progress.

Criteria for evaluating faculty research

1. **Exceeds Expectations**
 - a. **10** or more peer-reviewed journal articles in high-quality publications (published or in press), or equivalent forms of scholarly work **OR**
 - b. **eight** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; and **three** or more creative works **OR**
 - c. **six** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; **three** or more creative works; and **six** or more forms of public scholarship **OR**
 - d. **four** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; **six** or more creative works; and **six** or more forms of public scholarship
2. **Meets Expectations**
 - a. **five** or more peer-reviewed journal articles in high-quality publications (published or in press), or equivalent forms of scholarly work **OR**
 - b. **four** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; **one** or more creative works; and **one** or more forms of public scholarship **OR**
 - c. **three** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; and **three** or more creative works **OR**
 - d. **three** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; **two** or more creative works; and **two** or more forms of public scholarship
3. **Does Not Meet Expectations**
 - a. **fewer than five** peer-reviewed journal articles in high-quality publications (published or in press), or equivalent forms of scholarly work **AND**
 - b. **fewer than four** peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; **one** creative work; and **one** form of public scholarship **AND**
 - c. **fewer than three** peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; and **three** creative works **AND**
 - d. **fewer than three** or more peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent forms of scholarly work; **two** creative works; and **two** forms of public scholarship
4. **Unsatisfactory**
 - a. No evidence of published scholarship and limited evidence of works in progress.

These criteria reflect a research workload of no less than 30% for each year of the review period. For any year in which the assigned research workload averages less than 30%, one fewer peer-reviewed journal article, or equivalent forms of scholarly work, creative work, or public scholarship, should be expected at each level.

Teaching

Faculty earn credit toward their teaching score across four categories:

1. contributing to student learning and growth
2. supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession
3. engaging in curriculum development
4. exploring innovative approaches to instruction

Evidence of teaching excellence across these categories can take many forms. The sections below provide examples but are not exhaustive.

Contributing to student learning and growth

Facilitating student learning is core to the Department's mission and integral to the evaluation of faculty performance for post-tenure review.

Evidence of such contributions includes:

- student publications emanating from a class the faculty member taught
- qualitative comments from student evaluations affirming learning experienced
- scores on critical assessments, pre/post test comparisons that document growth from the beginning to the end of a semester
- positive external/professional assessments of student work tied to a class the faculty member taught
- high marks on student evaluation items *Description of Course Objectives & Assignments, Communication of Ideas and Information, Expression of Expectations for Performance, Stimulation of Interest in the Course, and Facilitation of Learning.*
- documentation of students engaged in applied learning
- documentation of student mastery of core competencies
- invitations to professionals to speak in classes, and other provided opportunities for students to network with professionals

Faculty may include other forms of evidence, to be considered at the discretion of the reviewer.

Supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession

This category involves connecting students to opportunities outside the classroom, including student clubs and media, and jobs and internships. It also encompasses the kind of informal coaching and mentorship that happens in advising sessions, office hours, and other co-curricular activities.

Examples of evidence of supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession can include but are not limited to:

- qualitative comments affirming support received on student evaluations
- notes from students affirmed support received
- notes from students crediting the faculty for help finding a job or internship
- high marks on student evaluation items *Availability to Assist Students In or Out of Class* and *Respect and Concern for the Students*
- participation on ARP and thesis committees
- supervising independent studies and directed readings courses
- other forms of advising and mentoring, including supervising teaching assistants or research assistants

Faculty may include other forms of evidence, to be considered at the discretion of the reviewer.

Engaging in curriculum development

This category involves developing new teaching material, ranging from updating examples to conceiving new classes or programs of study. New assignments, new modules, and new course proposals are examples of curriculum development.

Evidence includes:

- syllabi
- lesson plans
- assignment descriptions
- new University-approved course creations
- online course development with Innovative Education

Faculty may include other forms of evidence, to be considered at the discretion of the reviewer.

Exploring innovative approaches to instruction

This category focuses on the use of innovative instructional and pedagogical techniques to foster student learning, both in the classroom and online. Examples include adopting methods new to the course or instructor, and devising and testing novel methods.

Evidence includes:

- syllabi

- lesson plans
- assignment descriptions
- documentation of high-impact practices

Faculty may include other forms of evidence, to be considered at the discretion of the reviewer.

Criteria for evaluating faculty teaching

1. **Exceeds Expectations.** For each year of the review period, evidence of contributions to student learning and growth and documented accomplishments in at least two of the following additional categories: 1) supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession; 2) engaging in curriculum development; 3) exploring innovative approaches to instruction.
2. **Meets Expectations.** For each year of the review period, evidence of contributions to student learning and growth and documented accomplishments in at least one of the following additional categories in each year of the review period: 1) supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession; 2) engaging in curriculum development; 3) exploring innovative approaches to instruction.
3. **Does Not Meet Expectations.** For each year of the review period, evidence of sustained contributions to student learning and growth but no evidence of additional instructional accomplishments; or intermittent evidence of contributions to student learning and growth across the review period, and limited evidence of other contributions.
4. **Unsatisfactory.** Lack of sustained evidence of contributions to any category of teaching.

Service

Journalism and Digital Communication faculty are expected to contribute to the mission, values, vision, and goals of the Department, College, Campus, and University and Department. They are also expected to contribute to the profession and to the public's understanding of, and appreciation for, journalism and professional communication.

Many activities count as service, including the following partial list:

Internal service (Department)

- participation and leadership in Department committees
- participation and leadership in Department programs and initiatives

Internal service (College, Campus & University)

- participation and leadership in College, and Campus, and University committees
- participation and leadership in College, and Campus, and University events

External service (professional)

- participation or leadership in professional associations or activities
- editorial support for publications and journals in the field
- participation in conferences and workshops related to the practice or teaching of journalism or other subject matters
- professional consulting
- peer evaluations of outside individuals, such as external reviews for tenure and promotion candidates

External service (community)

- volunteer activities to help educate the public about journalism
- judging professional competitions
- providing expert information for media interviews and public presentations

Criteria for evaluating faculty service

1. **Exceeds Expectations.** At least 10 substantive service-related contributions over the five-year review period.
2. **Meets Expectations.** At least seven substantive service-related contributions over the five-year review period.
3. **Does Not Meet Expectations.** At least five substantive service-related contributions over the five-year review period.
4. **Unsatisfactory.** Fewer than five service-related contributions over the five-year review period.

Final rating

The post-tenure review process results in one holistic evaluation score. This score is a weighted average of the scores in research, teaching, and service, based on annual assignments during the five-year review period.