Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
I. INTRODUCTION

As defined in the GSU College of Arts & Sciences Bylaws a candidate for promotion and/or tenure is bound by the College and Department 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 Department of Communication by the Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee and then by the chair of the Department. The recommendations are then forwarded to the College’s Area Committee on Promotion & Tenure.

The promotion & tenure processes and other faculty review processes described in these departmental 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 Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual. College policies and forms are available online.

These Promotion & Tenure Guidelines of the Department of Communication 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. In view of the multi-disciplinary nature of the Department of Communication, these guidelines seek to augment and clarify, wherever advisable and appropriate, distinctive criteria for the activities of the faculty of the Department of Communication as they relate to the policies of the College.

The academic discipline of Communication encompasses multiple professional, creative, and research traditions, all of which are organized around the idea that central to the human experience is the use of symbols for the purpose of making meaning. The Department of Communication exists at the juncture of these traditions and embraces perspectives from the social sciences, humanities, and the performing and media arts. Such a configuration re-affirms the importance of candidates for promotion and/or tenure assuming the responsibility for educating colleagues regarding the quality and importance of their own scholarly or creative work and also, through the inclusion of contextual information from peers and other sources, helping the Department identify and understand the trajectory of their efforts, as well as the national/international reputation they are working to establish.

The Department’s multi-disciplinary nature necessitates that the professional development of faculty members takes diverse forms. While crediting a broad spectrum of scholarly and creative activities, these guidelines assess the range of faculty work in terms of the positive and unique
contributions made to the advancement of the individual discipline, as well as to departmental
and institutional goals.

These departmental guidelines are designed to provide information concerning expectations for
performance and achievement at the departmental level for promotion and tenure as well as the
manner in which departmental 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 Department follows the rules, procedures, and calendar set forth in the College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Manual, and on the College website. University and College promotion and tenure calendars supersede any dates in these departmental 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 Department of Communication 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 Department’s conviction that there is no more important type of faculty evaluation than the promotion and tenure review process. Because of this, the Department’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 Department 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.
III. PROMOTION & TENURE PROCESS IN THE DEPARTMENT

The promotion and tenure process begins in the Department of Communication, where the Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee and the departmental Chair evaluate the credentials 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 departmental guidelines on promotion and tenure.

The Department of Communication 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 Department, except the chair of the Department and any members of the Department 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 Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee, made up of all faculty who hold the rank of professor (except the chair of the Department and any members of the Department 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.

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

The Department of Communication’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 Professional Development, 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 Department and manual of the College, the Committee has the option of requesting additional information from the candidate or the Department Chair to help it assess the candidate’s portfolio.

All final recommendations must be made by the appropriate departmental 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 Professional Development, 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. These may be included within the report itself or attached as an
appendix. If there is not unanimity, separate minority report(s) shall also be included.

After reaching its decision, the departmental Committee sends the chair of the Department a
written statement of its recommendation, along with a detailed justification of it. The letter from
the departmental 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.

The Committee shall present the report to the Chair of the Department of Communication, who
shall write a separate report which includes his/her assessment. After reaching his/her decision,
the Department chair will prepare a statement indicating his/her recommendation along with the
reasons for it. If either the majority report of the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee or
the Department chair recommends in favor of promotion or tenure, then this action generates a
departmental nomination of the candidate. In this circumstance, no self-nomination by the
candidate is needed or permitted.

A candidate for promotion and tenure shall receive from the Department chair, in a timely
fashion, copies of the recommendations of the Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee
and the Department chair. A candidate shall also receive copies of any minority reports from the
Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee. The Chair of the department 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 by writing to the
Area Committee on Promotion & Tenure. This statement becomes part of the candidate's
promotion and tenure file.

The candidate also has the right to respond in writing to the letters and reports of the
Departmental Chair and the Departmental Committee and to send his/her response to the Office
of the Dean.
IV. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

The Department’s Promotion & Tenure Committee shall use these departmental 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 Department of Communication are those provided in these guidelines and in the Promotion & Tenure Manual of the GSU College of Arts & Sciences.

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 Arts & Sciences.

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: Professional Development, 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 department. Departmental and discipline-specific standards are defined in these Promotion & Tenure Guidelines.

1. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor:

To be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor by the Department, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in both Professional Development and Teaching. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of 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. The candidate will also be evaluated on evidence of his/her current trajectory in Professional Development, which if successfully continued, will result in timely progress towards the rank of Professor after promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.
The candidate must also be evaluated as having provided effective Service to merit promotion to the level of Associate Professor. The rank of Associate Professor also presumes a demonstrated ability to assume responsibility for the training of advanced undergraduate and graduate students and a commitment to continue to be professionally active and productive. The candidate must also be judged as contributing significantly to the instructional and service activities of the Department.

2. Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor:

For faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the criteria for tenure are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor.

Faculty members already at the rank of associate professor seeking tenure must also be evaluated as excellent in professional development and teaching and as having provided good service.

3. Promotion to the Rank of Professor:

Such promotion is a recognition awarded to candidates who have distinguished records of achievement and standing in their professions and also at Georgia State University. Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor must substantially surpass those required for recommendation to Associate Professor. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have established a national/international reputation in his/her field and have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research, scholarship, and creative activities.

4. Tenure at the Rank of Professor:

The criteria are the same as those for a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor.

C. Areas of Evaluation

The Department of Communication will evaluate all candidates based on evidence in three areas of their academic life: Professional Development, Teaching, and Service. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Communication should specify what is distinct, unique, original, and individual about his/her contributions to his/her area of specialization within his/her academic discipline and instructional area. Distinct aspects and features of specialization within each discipline and within the areas of Professional Development, Teaching, and Service should be clarified and documented for the departmental and college promotion and tenure committees.

1. Professional Development
Professional Development is a major concern in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. In order to ensure quality instruction, it is essential that faculty members in the Department of Communication maintain a high level of scholarly and/or creative activities that advance the field of Communication and the candidate’s specialization within his/her particular discipline by creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. Specifically, these activities should evidence demonstrable professional growth by the faculty member.

In the disciplines represented in the Department of Communication, Professional Development can involve a range of professional activities from scholarly research and publication to creative activities. It is appropriate, therefore, that the criteria and methods for demonstrating and measuring Professional Development are relevant to the various disciplines of Communication. The evaluation standard for Professional Development for both scholarly and artistic works is that the quality of any submitted materials must be assessed by outside reviewers. Letters from outside reviewers who are authorities in the candidate’s field (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 Professional Development.

The Department of Communication recognizes that Professional Development can take many forms and employ a variety of methods. It may encompass basic and applied research, theoretical and empirical work, scholarship of discovery and integration, qualitative and quantitative methods, and creative endeavors. Each topic, method, approach and technique shall be judged only on whether it is appropriate to the stated Professional Development goal and whether it produces a valuable societal or disciplinary product. We believe, therefore, that success in Professional Development can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another.

For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who published his/her work in books but whose work undergoes comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, and chapters in books) and/or creative activity will be evaluated on the whole body of work, just as will those who specialize in one form of scholarly or creative expression. Likewise, candidates who pursue creative activities will also be evaluated through peer review. This review may involve formal outside adjudication at the time of the performance, exhibition, or presentation of a creative work.

Obtaining external funding for one’s research or creative works is a highly valued Professional Development activity and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in those disciplines. The Department of Communication recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in some departmental sub-disciplines. Grant support, however, is not a substitute for the peer-reviewed products of quality research and creative activity.

Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar.
Although no particular type of activity is specified for promotion and tenure, successful
candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

The Department also recognizes that there is a rough hierarchy of scholarly journals,
conferences, publishers, film festivals, production companies, distribution companies, and other
channels of dissemination that exists within the Communication disciplines. Some valuable work
that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge
may not be published in the best known journals or exhibited in the best-known venues. The
Committee may consider these distinct criteria to discern the quality of the candidate’s work and
the character of the venues where the work is disseminated, which collectively may be referred
to as channels of dissemination: (a) geographic scope of the channel’s reputation, ranging from
on-campus, local, state, regional, national, and international – in some cases, there may be
special value to on-campus exhibitions and performances, but that value must be demonstrated
and judged by the criteria below; (b) competitiveness of the channel; (c) reputation or prestige of
the channel as evidenced in the academic, popular, or industry press; (d) size of the audience of
the channel as determined by number of persons who attended, tuned in, downloaded or
streamed the exhibition or transmission; (e) distinguished awards given by the channel from
either peer, curator, or audience review; and (f) scholarly or artistic impact, as evidenced by
citations, press response, and academic research about the candidate’s work.

For those projects that fall outside of conventional creative categories – such as, experimental,
new and emerging media – it will be necessary for the candidate to establish the status of his/her
work in relation to generally understood standards of the candidate’s discipline and medium.

While the Department of Communication 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; communication
research and creative activity are often a team enterprise. We strongly support interdisciplinary
research, which by definition results in publications and creative project exhibitions with
multiple authors and creators. We cannot therefore assign higher intrinsic value to single-author,
jointly-authored, or collaboratively created works. Additionally, we know that order of
authorship or credit does not necessarily convey accurate information about one’s relative
contribution to the work. We will thus accord appropriate credit if the candidate’s contribution to
a co-authored or collaboratively created work is empirically established within the conventions
of the candidate’s discipline.

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.

As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications or creative
projects may appear in the scholarly or artistic outlets of other disciplines. We recognize that
work in the general academic field of Communication can and does regularly make contributions
to the knowledge base of a broad range of disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work
appearing in related professional publications, insofar as its quality is appropriately
demonstrated. Likewise, a candidate’s creative collaborations with other artists outside and
within the discipline of Communication will be given consideration. While interdisciplinary work is high valued and encouraged, it is still expected that a candidate will be able to make the case that his/her core program of work maintains a strong connection to and is within the discipline of Communication.

Many of the most innovative projects in the field of Communication combine theory and practice. The Department encourages such work and recognizes there may be overlaps in the categories of scholarly works and creative projects. Those achievements which fall into the two categories will be evaluated using criteria drawn from both.

Criteria for evaluating creative projects will include consideration of the length and complexity of the project, the means of disseminating the work to an audience, and the evaluation of the completed work by outside peer review. While the length of a work may be significant, it should be considered in conjunction with its influence, scholarly and artistic quality, and complexity.

Supporting materials for creative projects and their dissemination venues might include reports invited by the Department from outside peer reviewers in the professional and/or academic sphere, evidence of the size and significance of an award competition, the approximate purchase price of scripts (where appropriate) or the price of a script option, and/or published reviews of articles, films, plays, or books authored by the candidate, if available. Peer evaluation of a written screen or stage play may be more difficult to obtain than that of a live production or media work. Certain creative works – i.e., scripts, plays, or new media and web or digital productions – may win awards but not be publicly disseminated, published, or produced. 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 production of a conference paper and/or published article based on a creative production could lend additional merit to the dossier. For example, a new media work might be submitted to a conference and thereby become a part of the normal conference reputation and refereeing procedure.

The Department of Communication appreciates 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 must make their own case for the quality and breadth of an intellectual project.

The Department of Communication resists the idea that qualitative evaluations can be defined solely by number of publications, performances, or other scholarly and creative activities. We expect 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 professional development listed in the college manual and as detailed below. Evaluation of an individual faculty member’s Professional Development will focus on the entire profile of that individual’s contribution.

a. Presentations at Professional Meetings: These include participation in programs at local, regional, national or international meetings of professional associations, including presentation of papers, organization of panels or programs, serving as panel leader or
commentator, organization of and participation in workshops, symposiums and juried
competitions. The presentation of academic research or creative works will typically receive
greater weight in the review process than more administrative tasks.

b. Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews: These
include published articles, chapters in books, books, monographs, and book and performance
reviews, and those accepted for publication, broadcast and electronic distribution. Book reviews
typically receive less weight than the other publications listed here.

c. Achievements in the Visual & Performing Arts: These include creative projects
in film/video, broadcasting, digital media, and live performance.

d. Awards & Grants: These include grants, contracts, scholarships, fellowships,
travel awards, personal development awards funded internally and by external local, regional,
national or international agencies that have supported the candidate’s scholarly research or
creative activities. International and national external awards and grants will generally weigh
more heavily than those from regional or local competitions.

e. Significant Professional Services: These include memberships on editorial
boards, editorships for professional journals, referee for professional journals, referee for
granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, consultant for artistic projects, and critic
or juror for professional organizations.

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 or workshops, reviews
of publications or performances, invitations to juried screenings and performances, or exhibitions
of media art, guest performances and lectureships. International and national recognition will
generally weigh more heavily than regional or local recognition.

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 (e.g.,
significant writing in the mass media). These materials may not include work in progress or work
submitted but not yet accepted for publication.

i. Other

2. Teaching

The Department of Communication regards quality Instruction to be of foremost importance to
the Department 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 Communication 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:

- **Courses Taught During the Last Eight Semesters**

- **Perceptions of Students**, including official student evaluation instruments for the past eight semesters.

- **Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction**

- **Evidence of Instructional Service Beyond the Classroom** (i.e., independent studies, practica, honors theses, theses, and dissertations)

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

- **Student Publications & Creative Accomplishments** (e.g., published 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)

- **Instructional Portfolio**: This category includes selected materials the candidate has compiled as required in the College’s Teaching Assessment Policy.

- **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) the development of new, innovative and relevant courses at the appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of established courses (to be reflected in course syllabi and other curricular materials); (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) the advisement of students on various levels and in various degree programs seniors, majors, Honors students, or graduate students – this responsibility entails knowledge of and attention to departmental, college and university programs, policies and procedures; (5) evidence of effective student mentoring activities; and (6) a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching methodology.

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 clock time of the different classes taught by the candidate, whether they were mid-day (or at times most preferred by students) or late night or early morning during the last eight semesters; (3) 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; (4) students’ perceived rigor of a candidate’s courses by students, as well as their grade expectations, during the last eight semesters; (5) the grade averages and grade distributions of the courses the candidate taught during the last eight semesters; (6) whether there have been any peer, institutional, or other evaluation of the candidate’s teaching abilities and methods; and (7) 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 Department of Communication has inherently and by definition a special responsibility to provide discipline-oriented service activities. These include service to the University community, the local community, and relevant local, national and international professional communities. The professional/academic interface is a distinguishing characteristic of the disciplines in the Department of Communication and requires that consideration be accorded the service function in all faculty evaluations, including the evaluation for tenure and/or promotion. For example, interaction with the press, electronic media, and the performing arts communities is essential to the development of the Department and to the academic performance of faculty members.

Only those service activities, however, which are related to the candidate’s area of professional competence will be included in an evaluation of Service.

Collegiality, in the broadest sense, is a necessary and highly valued aspect of all candidates seeking promotion and tenure in the Department of Communication.

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

a. Assistance to 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.

b. Contributions to the Department of Communication: Chairing departmental committees, memberships on committees, development of programs and activities other than teaching and those related to professional development, participation in Department-sponsored
activities, and holding positions of significant service responsibility that impact workload assessment.

c. Contributions to the College, University, or University System
d. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: 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. Offices Held in Professional Associations
h. Other

D. Metrics/Measures of Quality

1. Evaluation of Professional Development

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate as having met or not having met the required standards in Professional Development.

a. Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank Associate Professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be excellent in Professional Development.

The candidate will be evaluated on evidence of his/her current trajectory in Professional Development. In keeping with University standards, the recommended candidate must be deemed to have developed a substantial body of 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.

The candidate will be judged as excellent in Professional Development if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarly and/or creative work is highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number (6-8) of influential refereed articles and/or refereed book chapters of distinguished quality; or a larger number of refereed articles and/or refereed chapters of very good quality; or a refereed book and at least 4 refereed articles and/or chapters, all of very good quality. A candidate also should have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as an intramural or external research or creative grant recipient, a conference session organizer or participant, a creative event producer, a journal editor or referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.
For a candidate whose discipline is creative and is a principal author or producer of works of single channel media art such as film, television, video, radio, interactive media or Internet webcast, the candidate will be judged as having met the required standards in Professional Development, 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 or size, and quality, and complexity as recognized by the discipline. Such a candidate, for example, might have disseminated through peer reviewed or competitive venues, a significant number (6-8) of influential refereed short films/videos written, produced and/or directed under 20 minutes; or a larger number of refereed short films written, produced and directed of very good quality; or a refereed medium length film or television pilot or episode of 20 to 60 minutes written, produced and/or directed and at least 4 refereed short films written, produced and/or directed under 20 minutes, all of very good quality. A candidate, who creates and disseminates a feature length film of greater than 60 minutes as writer, producer and/or director might also have written, produced and/or directed two short films or one medium length film of high quality and significant recognition. A candidate also might have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as collaborating as a crew member with other directors and producers, as an intramural or external creative grant recipient of an award of a competitively offered residency, private fund or investment, an organizer of a conference or festival session/panel, a curator of a media exhibition, a film festival organizer or jury member, a creative event producer, a journal editor or referee, a grant reviewer or a filmmaker/artist-in-residence designee or jury member.

For a candidate whose discipline is creative and is primarily a writer of dramatic works of performance for live theater or recorded media such as film, television, radio, interactive media or Internet webcast, the candidate will be judged as excellent in Professional Development if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s creative work is highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, 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 (3-4) feature or full length scripts for films/videos, made-for-television pilot or episodic screenplays, electronic media games or live stage plays. The screenwriter candidate might also submit a combination of feature or full length screen or stage plays and a larger number of refereed short film/video screenplays or short plays where four short scripts of up to 20 pages roughly equals one long script of 90 to 120 pages. Where the work is judged of very good quality, a larger number of finished works would also qualify the candidate as highly accomplished. A candidate also might have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as an intramural or 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 journal editor or referee, or a writer-in-residence designee or jury member.

The Committee recognizes that new and emerging media provide artists and scholars unique channels of dissemination where the candidate’s medium of authorship is intrinsic to the message that medium transmits. For a candidate whose discipline is creative and is a producer of new and emerging media work such as electronic media games or interactive media for Internet-based, set-top, digital media installation or other electronic distribution means, the candidate must establish three principal frameworks for evaluation.
First, the candidate submitting new and emerging media in his/her dossier must provide a means
to measure the complexity and scale of the work that roughly associates the total time of the
audience’s engagement with the work to the audience’s depth of experience with the subject that
the work presents. A work of new media should describe how many minutes it would take for the
audience to engage in the work intended for each session or episode, and the number of sessions
or episodes the audience would be expected to engage the work to complete its viewing. The
increments of time engagement should parallel the equivalent increments of scale applied to the
linear media forms where a short film is recognized with a length of up to 20 minutes, a medium
length film is approximately 20 to 60 minutes, and a feature length film is approximately 60 or
more minutes.

Second, the candidate submitting new and emerging media in his/her dossier must provide a
means to referee the work by which his/her distinguished peers can judge the candidate’s work in
competition with other works vying for similar dissemination opportunities and recognition.
Here too, the candidate should consider (a) geographic scope (b) competitiveness, (c) reputation
or prestige, (d) size of the audience in describing the channel of dissemination and judgment of
the work.

Third, the candidate submitting new and emerging media in his/her dossier must establish and
rank evidence of impact within the discipline arising from exhibition and/or dissemination of the
work. The candidate should provide evidence, as described above for linear media, with (e)
distinguished awards and (f) scholarly or artistic impact. These three frameworks
(complexity/scale, means to referee the work and evidence of impact) will be considered by the
Committee for establishing the quality of each of the candidate’s work.

For the candidate who elects to submit all or part of a dossier of work that consists of
collaborative contributions, as defined previously, where the candidate performs the role of
cinematographer, editor or sound design, a leading role as an actor, a rough ratio of two works of
collaborative contribution to one work of principal authorship will be considered as described
above for candidates submitting work as directors and producers of films/videos and television
programs.

For the candidate who elects to submit all or a part of a dossier of work that consists of creative
collaborations, as defined previously, where the candidate performs the role of all other practicing
crew or cast member, such as an audio mixer, Foley artist, art director or production designer,
lighting director, supporting actor/actress, or other collaborative contributor, a rough ratio of
three works of collaborative contribution to one work of principal authorship will be considered
as described above for candidates submitting work as directors and producers of films/videos and
television programs.

The impact of the candidate’s contribution to any work in the dossier should be explained as
described above for creative collaborators, and will be considered by all reviewers of the dossier.
Some collaborative contributions might rise to the status of co-authorship, with the candidate
needing to make this case. The candidate must explain the precise nature of the collaboration so
that reviewers can accurately determine the expected quantity and quality of the candidate’s
work, and the impact of the candidate’s contribution to the work’s recognition.
b. Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available only to those candidates whose Professional Development is judged as excellent.

Both the quality and number of achievements required for a recommendation to the rank of Professor must substantially surpass those required for recommendation of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As part of both the College and Department reviews, the candidate will be evaluated on evidence of his/her current trajectory in Professional Development. 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.

The candidate will be judged as excellent in Professional Development if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate’s scholarship or creative activities are highly accomplished. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a large number of influential refereed articles and/or refereed book chapters of excellent quality; or a larger number of refereed articles and/or refereed chapters of very good quality; or a larger number of recognized films/video/television pilots or episodes, screen or state plays, or works of new and emerging media of excellent quality; or a refereed book and a significant number of refereed articles and chapters, all of very good quality. A candidate also should have been very active in other research and/or creative roles, such as an external research grant recipient, conference or festival session/panel organizer or participant, journal editor or referee, exhibition curator, programmer or jury member, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The quality of a faculty actor’s creative/collaborative work will be judged based on available external professional peer review. The hiring process for professional productions is one form of peer review, as such positions are often highly competitive, and applicants are usually screened diligently. Other forms of peer review could include winning a prestigious award or honor, reviews by nationally recognized theatre critics or in professional journals, a commission to collaborate on the production of a new play or the review of a production by an independent professional peer.
2. Evaluation of Teaching

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

a. Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank Associate Professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be **excellent** in Teaching.

The candidate will be judged as **excellent** in Teaching if, from Section IV(C)(2) above, 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; a significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; 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 required for an Associate Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in Teaching are expected to surpass those required for recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank Professor is available only to those candidates who are judged to be **excellent** in Teaching.

The candidate will be judged as **excellent** in Instruction if, from Section IV(C)(2) above, the overall assessment of the Committee from the evidence available is that the candidate’s performance is superb. 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 a continuing devotion to improving and updating course content and syllabi, as well as overall curricular reform; the candidate might participate in college, university-wide, or national committees that focus on instructional improvements and issues; a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

NOTE: It is the candidate’s responsibility to demonstrate by appropriate metrics the quality of his/her Teaching in the Department of Communication.
3. Evaluation of Service

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

a. Associate Professor

For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least good in service.

A candidate will be judged as good in service if the candidate has effectively performed departmental 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. For promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor, the candidate must be evaluated as at least very good in service.

A candidate at this level will be judged as very good in service if the candidate effectively has taken a significant leadership role in departmental service. Examples might include (but are not limited to): graduate director, Executive Committee member, chair of at least one significant departmental standing committee, assessment coordinator, or service in some other substantial capacity (such as, University senator, self-study committee member, etc.), and has been very active in assistance to colleagues. In addition, the candidate must have significant service on College or University committees, and have significant administrative service in his/her principal national/international professional associational organization(s) or to governmental entities.

NOTE: It is the candidate’s duty to demonstrate by appropriate metrics the quality of his/her Service to the Department of Communication, the College of Arts & Sciences, Georgia State University, and also to the larger national and international community.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A1. Professional Development (Research)

Poor: The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, 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 professional development, 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, which 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. Professional Development (Creative Work)

**Poor:** The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, 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 professional development, 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 festivals, script competitions, production company options, screenplays, etc.) 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 overall average is very good, in the 4-out-of-5 range); 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 (often in the mid 4-out-of-5 range); 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 department.

Outstanding: In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will often be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. 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 departmental 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 departmental 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 departmental 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 department 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.
A1. Professional Development (Research)

**Poor:** The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, 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 professional development 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 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. Professional Development (Creative Work)

Poor: The faculty member does not maintain an active program of professional development, 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 professional development 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 festivals, script competitions, production company options, screenplays, etc.) 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 journal editor or referee; 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 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 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; some level of participation in curricular reform might be manifested; 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 overall average is very good, in the 4-out-of-5 range); 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 (often in the mid 4-out-of-5 range); 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 department.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. 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 departmental 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 departmental 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 departmental 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 department 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.