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I. INTRODUCTION

As defined in the GSU College of the Arts Promotion and Tenure Manual, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure is bound by the College and School promotion and tenure manuals in effect on January 31 of the calendar year in which the reviews of the candidate occur.

Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are first made at the level of the School of Film, Media, and Theatre by the School’s Promotion & Tenure Committee and then by the Director of the School. The recommendations are then forwarded to the College’s Committee on Promotion & Tenure.

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

These Promotion & Tenure Guidelines of the School of Film, Media, and Theatre have also been formulated in conformity with the requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

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

These School guidelines are designed to provide information concerning expectations for performance and achievement at the School level for promotion and tenure as well as the manner in which School expectations intersect with the expectations set forth in the College manual.
II. POLICIES ON PROMOTION & TENURE

A. Eligibility (Time-in-Rank) Policies

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

B. General Policies

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

Every faculty member in the School of Film, Media, and Theatre has a responsibility to be aware of the contents of the College of Arts & Sciences and Georgia State University promotion and tenure manuals, including all deadlines.

It is the School’s conviction that there is no more important type of faculty evaluation than the promotion and tenure review process. Because of this, the School’s Promotion & Tenure Committee commits itself to the highest standards of professionalism and confidentiality with the continuing goal of always producing the fairest and fullest promotion and tenure recommendations of the highest quality that respects both the process as a whole and the faculty colleague being evaluated. To this end, the School agrees that e-mail should not be used for this confidential personnel process (with the exception of non-substantive matters such as scheduling meetings). Promotion and/or tenure deliberations at all levels are confidential; however, the Georgia Open Records Act may allow individuals to access certain documents related to a promotion and/or tenure decision.

III. PROMOTION & TENURE PROCESS IN THE SCHOOL

The promotion and tenure process begins in the School of Film, Media, and Theatre, where the School’s Promotion & Tenure Committee and the School Director evaluate the dossier of those faculty members who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure and who request consideration.

The qualifications of each eligible faculty member being considered must be evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth in the College Promotion & Tenure Manual and in these School guidelines on promotion and tenure.

The School of Film, Media, and Theatre has a Promotion & Tenure Committee that reviews and evaluates the credentials of all faculty members being considered for promotion to associate
professor with tenure. This Committee consists of all tenured associate professors and professors in the School, except the School Director and any members of the School serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion/tenure application at the College or University level. This Committee also reviews and evaluates the credentials of faculty members who already hold the rank of associate professor and who are candidates only for tenure. A subcommittee of the School Promotion & Tenure Committee, made up of all faculty who hold the rank of professor (except the School Director and any members of the School serving in a position that will review the candidate’s promotion/tenure application at the College or University level) will review and evaluate the credentials of faculty members who are being considered for promotion to professor or who already hold the rank of professor and are being considered only for tenure. In consultation with the School Director, the dean will augment faculty committees with members at the appropriate rank from other departments if the School of Film, Media, and Theatre does not have a sufficient number of faculty at the appropriate rank to constitute a committee of at least three members.

The Promotion & Tenure Committee is chaired by a tenured faculty member appointed by the School Director. The School’s evaluations are based on information derived from information submitted by the candidate, the School Committee, outside evaluators, and the School Director.

The School of Film, Media, and Theatre’s Promotion & Tenure Committee operates through a system of subcommittees that initially review and evaluate each candidate’s credentials. Subcommittees are typically appointed to evaluate the candidate’s Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service.

Though the candidate is required to provide a dossier documenting his or her case, organized according to the structure of the guidelines of the School and manual of the College, the Committee has the option of requesting additional information from the candidate or the School Director to help it assess the candidate’s dossier.

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

The report of the Promotion & Tenure Committee should summarize the strengths and/or weaknesses of the faculty member in Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service in light of the criteria included in these guidelines and the report should clearly indicate recommendations concerning promotion and/or tenure. All conclusions and recommendations should be substantiated by summaries and/or selected inclusions of written data gathered by the Promotion & Tenure Committee. If there is not unanimity, separate minority report(s) shall also be included.

After reaching its decision, the School Committee sends the School Director its written report. The letter from the School Committee must be signed by the Committee chair and all Committee members who agree with the recommendation and justification. Committee members who do not
sign the letter shall provide separate letters indicating their recommendations and the reasons for these recommendations. Signatures will be on a separate page from the letter(s).

The Committee shall present the evaluation to the School Director. The School Director will evaluate the candidate and write his/her own evaluation and recommendation.

A candidate for promotion and tenure shall receive from the School Director, in accordance with the College Promotion and Tenure Manual, copies of the recommendations of the School’s Promotion & Tenure Committee and the School Director. A candidate shall also receive copies of any minority reports from the School’s Promotion & Tenure Committee. The School Director will remove the faculty signatures from both the majority and minority reports before providing them to the candidate.

A candidate has a right to respond to any of these recommendations or reports from the School’s Promotion and Tenure Committee by writing to the Director. This statement becomes part of the candidate's promotion and tenure file. The candidate also has the right to respond in writing to the School Director’s letter and to send his/her response to the Office of the Dean.

IV. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

The School’s Promotion & Tenure Committee shall use these School guidelines that have been approved by the College Promotion & Tenure Review Board as its standard for evaluation.

A. Tenure

Tenure is established and governed by the policies and regulations of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. These policies state that tenure resides at the institutional level; thus, the criteria and guidelines for recommending the granting of tenure to members of the faculty of the School of Film, Media, and Theatre are those provided in these guidelines and in the Promotion & Tenure Manual of the GSU College of the Arts.

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

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

Candidates will be evaluated as either having met or having not met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in each of the following three areas: Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service. The evaluations should take into account expectations appropriate to the rank under consideration, the standards of the candidate's discipline, and the mission and resources of the School. School- and discipline-specific standards are defined in these Promotion & Tenure Guidelines. To be recommended for promotion and/or tenure by the School, a candidate must be evaluated having met the standards for the appropriate rank in all three areas.

C. Areas of Evaluation

The School of Film, Media, and Theatre will evaluate all candidates based on their performance in three areas of their academic life: Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the School of Film, Media, and Theatre should specify a cohesive focus for his/her Research/Creative Activity that connects to his/her Teaching and Service and should document the quality of his/her performance in all three areas.

1. Research/Creative Activity

Research/Creative Activity is a major component in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. In order to help the university realize its mission as a research institution, it is essential that faculty members in the School of Film, Media, and Theatre maintain a high level of scholarly and/or creative activities that advance the field of Film, Media, and Theatre and the candidate’s specialization within his/her particular discipline by creating or extending knowledge, modes of inquiry, and/or artistic expression. Specifically, these activities should evidence demonstrable professional growth by the faculty member over the period being evaluated.

The School of Film, Media, and Theatre recognizes that Research/Creative Activity can take many forms. The School believes that success in Research/Creative Activity can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach is inherently superior to another.

In the School of Film, Media, and Theatre, Research/Creative Activity can involve a range of accomplishments. It is appropriate, therefore, that the criteria and methods for demonstrating and measuring Research/Creative Activity are relevant to the various fields within the School of Film, Media, and Theatre. The quality of any submitted materials in Research/Creative Activity must be evaluated by external reviewers. Letters from external reviewers who are qualified to evaluate the candidate (solicited in accordance with the procedures described in the College manual) play an influential role in providing a supplementary perspective on the candidate’s achievements and stature in the area of Research/Creative Activity. Candidates are not to have any contact with external reviewers during the promotion and tenure process.
Applying for and obtaining external funding for one’s research or creative works are highly valued activities, and success in seeking grant support (particularly from national sources) will weigh as evidence of reputation in those disciplines. The School of Film, Media, and Theatre recognizes, however, the relative scarcity of external grant support in its constituent fields, and so lack of grant support does not weigh negatively against the candidate. Many of the most innovative projects in film, media, and theatre combine theory and practice. The School encourages such work and recognizes there may be overlaps in the categories of scholarly works and creative projects. Those achievements which fall into both these two categories will be evaluated using criteria drawn from both. For such achievements, the candidate’s primary discipline/expertise will be taken into consideration when evaluating the quality of the aspects of the work outside the candidate’s major field of endeavor.

The School of Film, Media, and Theatre expects that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly and/or creative productivity through both the quantity and quality of their professional record organized according to the categories of Research/Creative Activity listed in the college manual and as detailed below. In other words, excellence in Research and Creative Activity is defined more broadly than the aggregate total of publications, performances, or other scholarly and creative activities. Evaluation of an individual faculty member’s Research/Creative Activity will focus on the entirety of candidate’s contribution during the evaluative period. Thus, a candidate’s dossier may not include work in progress or work submitted but not yet accepted for publication. Scripts that win awards but are not published or produced or which are optioned or purchased outright may be submitted as part of a dossier.

The following four indicators might be used to evaluate the significance of any single Research/Creative Activity:

- Reputation/recognition (such as: standing of a press/journal/anthology within the field; international/national/regional/local standing of a festival/exhibition venue; prizes, awards, reviews; collaboration with and/or invitations by with substantial figures/institutions in the field; size of grant received and competitiveness of granting organization)
- Extent of the candidate’s involvement (primary authorship; level of collaboration; creative contributor position)
- Length/complexity of work;
- Circulation (scholarly citations; sales/attendance figures; Nielsen ratings; web metrics)

The candidate is encouraged to use some combination of these four indicators to make the case for and explain the significance of his/her work (although the candidate is not limited to these four significance indicators). The case for significance is particularly important as the dossier moves from the School to the College level and from the College to the Provost’s office. In some instances the significance of a work is readily apparent. In other instances the candidate may need to explain the significance of particular works and to document the level of his/her contribution.
The candidate’s explanation of a work’s significance is encouraged to configure these four indicators in a discipline-appropriate manner. The indicators listed above may not all be equally relevant in understanding the significance of a particular work. Scholarly works, for instance, typically do not generate large sales figures; theatrical performances may or may not be reviewed by the press; and some academic fields have few available prizes. Payment for work (“work-for-hire”) does not negate its significance, and in some cases (e.g., the purchase price for a screenplay) can be seen as an indication of significance. Grants are highly prized in film/media/theatre but are relatively few in number. In addition, the significance indicators are not necessarily distinct and may overlap. For instance, the broad circulation of a work may also contribute to its reputation.

The School recognizes that there is a rough hierarchy of scholarly journals, conferences, publishers, film/theatre festivals, production companies, theatrical companies, distribution companies, and other channels of dissemination that exist within the fields of film/media/theatre studies and production. The stature of the venue(s) where the work is disseminated contributes to the work’s reputation. In evaluating the character of the work’s venue, the Committee considers factors such as: (a) the geographic scope of the venue’s reputation, ranging from on-campus, local, state, regional, national, and international; (b) the competitiveness of the venue, usually demonstrated by acceptance rates; and (c) reputation or prestige of the channel as evidenced in the academic, popular, or industry press. The School recognizes that venues that appear local/regional may have a national/international reach within the particular field. In such instances, the candidate should document the stature of the venue using these factors as evidence.

While the School of Film, Media, and Theatre recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative scholarship and creative works, we acknowledge the importance and occasional difficulty of determining the relative contributions of co-authors or co-creators. Creative activity in film/media/theatre is often a team enterprise, and scholarly research may be co-authored. We strongly support interdisciplinary research, including when it results in publications and creative project exhibitions with multiple authors and creators. We recognize that creative activity may take place within a variety of configurations. Some production environments may operate using a strictly hierarchical structure of labor in which subsidiary production personnel make creative contributions to the overall work within the constraints of prescribed standardized positions. Other production environments may function with a looser configuration that makes a higher level of collaboration possible.

It is incumbent upon the candidate to document objectively his/her specific contribution to the collaborative creative or research project and describe how that contribution resulted in its recognition within the candidate’s discipline. The School will accord appropriate credit if the candidate’s contribution to a co-authored or collaboratively created work is established within the conventions of the candidate’s discipline.

The length/complexity of a work of Research/Creative Activity should be interpreted in light of the norms of the candidate’s subfield. For a candidate who does humanistic scholarship,
normally the book is the longest, most complex work and is given more credit. The live-action
fiction feature film is normally afforded more credit than a short film, and a full-length play is
given more credit than a one-act play. However, in certain subfields of production (e.g.,
independent animation, experimental media), the short film is more the norm, and the feature
length film is the rare exception.

Evidence about the circulation of scholarly work typically involves citations of the candidate’s
research. The School of Film, Media, and Theatre recognizes that creative activity within
film/media/theatre has the capacity in some instances to engage broadly with popular audiences.
Candidates working within popular creative media may cite the size of the audience as
determined by number of persons who attended, tuned in, downloaded or streamed the exhibition
or transmission. The School also values creative work that is challenging, innovative, and
difficult; such work may receive critical recognition but not circulate broadly among audiences.
The School values and affirms both creative traditions in its promotion and tenure process.

The School appreciates and acknowledges the rapidly changing means of dissemination for
research and creative work in the Film, Media, and Theatre arena and recognizes the increasingly
prominent role that online publication, new media work, and web-based resources play in the
production and dissemination of knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of
peer review are often difficult to apply to these new forms of scholarship. Therefore, candidates
should make their own case for the significance of such research/creative activity using the
significance indicators above.

The candidate is encouraged to configure the various significance indicators to make an overall
case for his/her accomplishment within the field. A scholarly candidate might discuss the
reputation of his/her publications, the quality of his/her publication venues, and the number of
citations of his/her work, noting the lengths of his/her works. A candidate whose work occurs
mostly in creative contributor positions in film/media/theatre and who works repeatedly with
notable, acclaimed directors may make a case that his/her reputation is high, although the extent
of the candidate’s involvement may be limited. A candidate who is the primary author of short
films that circulate widely online might place more emphasis on circulation than reputation or
length of work. A candidate whose work appears on popular national television network shows
might also emphasize circulation over reputation. A filmmaker/screenwriter or theatre
director/playwright whose work has been successful in festivals, juried contests, and other
notable exhibition venues might place more emphasis on reputation/recognition. A candidate
whose creative work takes place in strongly collaborative frameworks would document that
collaboration and make the case for the significance of that work through a combination of
reputation/recognition, length, and circulation.

The candidate may include brief prefatory statements before individual works of
Research/Creative Activity in the dossier to discuss the significance indicators relevant to those
works (if needed). If a work of Research/Creative Activity also has a Teaching component
associated with the work that occurs outside of the candidate’s teaching assignment (e.g., co-
authorship with a student, awards/recognition for theatrical performances by a student group
with creative faculty involvement), the candidate may assign proportional credit to be given the work in the Research/Creative Activity and Teaching categories.

Categories for Research/Creative Activity include:

a. Presentations at Professional Meetings: These include participation in programs at local, regional, national or international meetings of professional associations, including presentation of papers, serving as panel leader or commentator, and organization of and participation in workshops.

b. Scholarly Writings in Books, Monographs, Journals, and Reviews: These include books, monographs, published articles, chapters in books, book reviews, and encyclopedia entries, and those accepted for publication, broadcast and electronic distribution.


d. Awards & Grants: These include grants, contracts, scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and development awards funded internally and by external local, regional, national or international agencies that have supported the candidate’s scholarly research or creative activities.

e. Intellectual Contribution through Professional Activities: These include such activities as (but not limited to): memberships on editorial boards, evaluation panels, and boards of professional organizations; refereeing for scholarly journals and granting agencies; intellectual curation of exhibitions, symposia, and conference programs; and functioning as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations. The candidate should clarify the intellectual contribution of these activities. Do not include material that also appears in the Service portion of the dossier.

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

g. General Recognition Within One’s Discipline: This includes citation of works or contributions by other scholars; requests for colloquium presentations, workshops, or residencies; reviews of publications or performances; invitations to juried screenings and performances, or exhibitions of media art; guest performances and lectureships.

h. Specialized Professional Activities Appropriate to the Discipline: Included here are materials for which descriptions are not presented in any of the other categories above.

2. Teaching
The School of Film, Media, and Theatre regards quality teaching to be of foremost importance to the School and the University, as it is at the heart of what we do. It is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such, it recognizes teaching excellence and student-related achievements as central in the evaluation of faculty members. Faculty have a responsibility to provide strong undergraduate and graduate programs for our majors and for the students throughout the University who have programmatic need for Film, Media, and Theatre courses. Included in the evaluation process will be written documentation of evidence organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the college manual. Examples include:

a. Courses Taught During the Last Four Academic Years: The candidate must provide a list of courses taught during the last four academic years. The candidate must also provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught during the time period. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. The development of new courses or significant revisions to existing courses should be noted in this section. The candidate should indicate if the course is part of a study abroad, international student exchange program, hybrid/online course, signature experience, or field experience. If the candidate was granted probationary credit toward tenure, the four years should include courses taught at previous institutions.

b. Student Evaluations (include summers, if applicable): The candidate must include a summary of Student Evaluation of Instructor (SEI) numerical scores (no comments), which the College will assist the candidate in obtaining, and student evaluations from GoSOLAR (with written comments) for the last four academic years at Georgia State University.

c. Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction

d. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, Theses, and Dissertations: The candidate must specify if they served as advisor/chair or committee member for each student work.

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

f. Student Accomplishments: These include articles, books, conference papers, attendance at conferences, performances, film screenings, theatrical productions and readings, media presentations, awards, and other recognition of student accomplishments at GSU and elsewhere. This includes published/disseminated works that originated in classes taught by the candidate. Work that is co-authored with a student should be put into context by the candidate, and the candidate should assign for this work a percentage of credit to Research/Creative Activity and a percentage of credit to Teaching.

g. Individual Student Committee Activities: The candidate must specify if he/she was a member or chair of an individual graduate student’s curricular advisory committee and/or graduate examination committee.

h. Other Materials: This category might include: (1) the development of effective evaluation and assessment methods relative to student performance and the acquisition of knowledge and skills (to be reflected in examinations, teaching methods and pedagogical philosophy); (2) evidence of teaching innovation (in teaching/learning strategies for individual classes; in
the design/development of new classes/programs/concentrations/degrees); (3) the maintenance of high standards for the material taught and expectations for student performance (as manifested in grade distributions, syllabi, examinations, written and creative assignments, and other examples); (4) evidence of effective student mentoring activities; and (5) the development of discipline-appropriate study abroad programs.

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

In making the case for his/her promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may also address other variables, such as: (1) the extent to which the courses taught by the candidate during the last eight semesters included any new preparations or other courses which the candidate has taught repeatedly in the past; (2) the extent to which the candidate taught courses with a lecture format or others which included collaborative/group learning, or which had a particular focus on active class participation required of students, during the last eight semesters; (3) students’ perceived rigor of a candidate’s courses by students, as well as their grade expectations, during the last eight semesters; (4) the grade averages and grade distributions of the courses the candidate taught during the last eight semesters; (5) whether there have been any peer, institutional, or other evaluation of the candidate’s teaching abilities and methods; and (6) whether the candidate participated in any pedagogical workshops or meetings during the last eight semesters, where the focus was on developing instructional excellence.

3. Service

The School of Film, Media, and Theatre promotion and tenure committee considers only service activities that are related to the candidates’ academic areas of expertise. Service unrelated to one’s academic area of expertise therefore should not be included in the dossier. (Extra remuneration for academic or public service does not preclude its inclusion.) In general, service will be considered primarily on the basis of its direct benefits to Georgia State University, to the profession, and to the community (in a discipline-related fashion).

Appropriate service activities should be documented and organized according to the categories of services listed in the college manual. Complete descriptions and dates for any service category must be provided along with explanatory documentation. Examples include:

a. Contributions to the School of Film, Media, and Theatre: Chairing School committees, memberships on committees, development of programs and activities other than Teaching
and those related to Research/Creative Activity, participation in School-sponsored activities, and holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment.

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

c. **Committee Responsibilities at the College, University, or System Level**

d. **Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations:** (not including professional associations) Consultancies, memberships on advisory boards, and offices held.

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

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

g. **Administrative Contributions to Professional Associations** (Intellectual contributions to professional organizations count in the category of Research/Creative Activity.)

**D. Evaluation of Quality**

1. **Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity**

Based on the evidence submitted, the School Committee will evaluate the candidate as **having met** or **not having met** the required standards in Research/Creative Activity.

a. **Associate Professor**

In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of scholarly/creative work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline, as determined by peers within and outside of the University, while establishing a national reputation in his/her field. In addition, the successful candidate’s current trajectory in Research/Creative Activity will support successful progress towards the rank of Professor after promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

The candidate will be judged as having met the standard in Research/Creative Activity if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarly and/or creative work is highly accomplished.
A scholarly candidate, for example, might have a sole-authored larger work (a book) published by a highly-regarded press in the field along with a number of articles/chapters in venues of good reputation. The candidate may present an equivalent blend of research achievements to demonstrate that he/she has an emerging national reputation and a cohesive, growing research trajectory.

For a candidate whose discipline is creative, the candidate will be judged as having met the required standards in Research/Creative Activity if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s creative work is highly accomplished with a body of work that demonstrates characteristics of scale in terms of length/complexity and quality as recognized by the discipline.

A candidate who is the primary author of a feature length film (of greater than 60 minutes) disseminated in a competitive venue might also have written, produced and/or directed a number of short films (20 minutes or less), also receiving significant recognition. A candidate who is the primary author of short films/videos might have a significant number of works disseminated in highly-regarded venues. A candidate who is a director of live theatre productions might have a significant number of full-length play productions at highly regarded venues. A candidate who is a writer of dramatic works of performance for live theatre or recorded media might have disseminated through competitive peer reviewed venues such as recognized film festivals, stage and screen script competitions, production company options or acquisitions, a significant number of feature or full length scripts for films/videos, made-for-television pilot or episodic screenplays, or live stage plays. A candidate who primarily works as a creative contributor in film, media, or theatre might have a large number of works that have received recognition and/or wide circulation. The School recognizes that creative faculty may work in a range of media and in a variety of creative positions, and so the successful candidate may combine various achievements to demonstrate that he/she has an emerging national reputation and a cohesive, growing research trajectory.

b. Professor

The candidate will be judged as having met the standard in Research/Creative Activity if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarly and/or creative work has substantially surpassed those required for recommendation of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, both in the quality and number of achievements. A candidate also should have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as an external research grant recipient, noteworthy intellectual contributions to professional organizations, conference or festival session/panel organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, exhibition curator, programmer or jury member, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

As part of both the College and School reviews, the candidate will be evaluated on evidence of his/her current trajectory in Research/Creative Activity. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of work that has contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline, as determined by peers within and outside
of the University, while having established a national and/or international reputation in his/her field.

2. Evaluation of Teaching

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

   a. Associate Professor

   The candidate will be judged as having met the required standards in Teaching if the overall assessment of the Committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is highly accomplished. For example, the dossier provides evidence that student learning outcomes have been achieved; the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; evidence is presented documenting the pedagogically effective use of learning technologies; the course material presented might show impressive preparation; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

   b. Professor

   Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and even exceed the sort of involvement and accomplishment in Teaching required for an Associate Professor.

   The candidate will be judged as having met the required standards in Teaching if the overall assessment of the Committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is highly accomplished. For example, the dossier provides evidence that student learning outcomes have been achieved; the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; evidence is presented documenting the pedagogically effective use of learning technologies; the course material presented might show impressive preparation; and/or a great degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated. In addition, the successful candidate will normally demonstrate a record of effective graduate student mentoring and a record of leadership in curriculum/program development, assessment, and/or mentoring of other instructors.

3. Evaluation of Service

Based on the evidence available, the School Committee will evaluate the candidate’s service according to whether the candidate **has met** or **has not met** the standards required.

   a. Associate Professor
A candidate will be judged as having met the required standards in Service if the candidate has effectively performed School service tasks that have been assigned to him/her and has been active in assistance to colleagues.

b. Professor

Candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and even exceed the sort of Service involvement and accomplishments required for an Associate Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in the Service area are expected to surpass those required for recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

A candidate at this level will be judged as having met the required standards in Service if the candidate effectively has taken a significant leadership role in School service. Examples might include (but are not limited to): graduate director, Executive Committee member, chair of at least one significant School standing committee, assessment coordinator, or service in some other substantial capacity. In addition, the candidate must either have significant service on College or University committees or have significant administrative service in his/her principal national/international professional organization(s) or to governmental entities.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A1. Research/Creative Activity (Research)

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

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

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

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

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

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

A2. Research/Creative Activity (Creative Activity)
Poor: The faculty member does not maintain an active program of creative activity, or the
faculty member has produced a body of creative work that casts doubt on his/her
commitment to the field and likelihood of further progress.

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

Good: The faculty member’s creative work is of moderate quality but limited in scope and
impact.

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

Excellent: The faculty member’s creative work is highly accomplished, and he or she has
produced a body of work that shows national recognition and strong achievement in the field,
indicating that this achievement is likely to continue in the long term as well as in the near
future. The faculty member’s body of work has been disseminated in competitive, peer-
reviewed venues (e.g., film/theatre festivals, script/play competitions, production company
options, digital/web/mobile media contexts, and exhibitions/installations) to documented
high acclaim. An evaluation of excellent indicates that the faculty member’s current and
imminently forthcoming projects are likely to result in an assessment at this level when he or
she comes up for tenure, should the faculty member’s upward trajectory continue.

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

B. Teaching

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

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

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

**Very Good:** The faculty member’s performance is highly competent. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show diligent preparation; a better-than-average degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the faculty member might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s performance is highly accomplished. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows impressive preparation; course materials and assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate; a significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter is indicated; the faculty member demonstrates a high level of involvement and effectiveness in mentoring students; and the overall teaching record demonstrates a commitment to the instructional mission of the School.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be very high. The faculty member may have published a textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or will have received one or more teaching awards.

**C. Service**

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

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

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

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

**Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant School or other college, university, or university system administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.
Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the School and throughout the college and university. The faculty member may also have served effectively as a leader of a state, regional, or national professional association.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A1. Research/Creative Activity (Research)

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

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

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

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

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

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

A2. Research/Creative Activity (Creative Activity)
**Poor:** The faculty member does not maintain an active program of creative activity, or the faculty member has produced a body of creative work that casts doubt on his/her commitment to the field and likelihood of further progress.

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

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

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

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s creative work is highly accomplished, and he or she has produced a body of work that has led to national or international recognition and shows strong achievement in the field, indicating that this achievement is likely to continue in the near future as well as the long term. The faculty member’s body of work has been disseminated in competitive, peer-reviewed venues (e.g., film/theatre festivals, script/play competitions, production company options, digital/web/mobile media contexts, and exhibitions/installations) to documented high acclaim. Additional evidence for a rating of excellent might include the following: external creative grant recipient; an award of a prestigious screenwriting fellowship; a conference or festival session/panel; an invited screen or stage play reading; a screen play competition organizer or jury member; a writer-in-residence designee or jury member.

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

**B. Teaching**

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

**Fair:** The faculty member demonstrates minimal competence as a teacher. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest minimally proficient performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show minimal preparation; an acceptable degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a minimal level of involvement in mentoring students.
**Good:** The faculty member’s performance is adequate but not distinctly positive. For example, the student evaluation scores might suggest adequate or, perhaps, uneven performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show conscientious preparation and updated syllabi; a moderate breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a modest level of involvement in mentoring students.

**Very Good:** The faculty member’s performance is highly competent. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest very effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show diligent preparation; a better-than-average degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the faculty member might demonstrate an adequate level of involvement in mentoring students.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s performance is highly accomplished. For example, the student evaluation scores suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented shows impressive preparation; course materials and assignments are creative and methodologically varied and pedagogically appropriate; a significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter is indicated; the faculty member demonstrates an extensive level of involvement and success in mentoring and directing students; and the overall teaching record demonstrates a commitment to the instructional mission of the School.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will be very high. The faculty member may have published a textbook or series of articles on pedagogy, or will have received one or more teaching awards.

**C. Service**

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

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

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

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

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

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