Department of Communication Studies

Guidelines for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

In accordance with university policies S15-7 and S15-8, the Department of Communication Studies recognizes RTP processes as an opportunity to acknowledge and promote professional growth. Our department guidelines are designed first and foremost to assist candidates with preparing dossiers and to help committees with reviewing and curating dossiers. In defining "excellence" as demonstrated leadership, the guidelines also encourage long-term career development.

The example profiles we include are rules of thumb and should not be treated as inflexible requirements. *It is expected that candidate profiles will not match our example profiles completely and precisely.* When summarizing achievements in each area, candidates and committees should highlight accomplishments comparable to the examples with "comparable" meaning similar level of difficulty, contribution, time commitment, and impact.

In general, dossiers should be complete, well organized, and structured to facilitate review. When in doubt, candidates should consult the department chair and seek input from colleagues.

In general, committees should review candidates with an eye to accomplishment rather than lack thereof and with a considered appreciation for diverse career profiles. Committees should be fair, realistic, and flexible in their evaluations, and, above all, exercise commonsense.

For topics not covered in these guidelines, such as procedures for constituting RTP committees and the required sequence of materials in the dossier, consult university policy and the dossier handbook.

Teaching

Excellent: A candidate demonstrates leadership in teaching as well as excellence in and outside the classroom. A profile might include a notable number of SOTE items at the highest end of the university normative range or exceeding the norm. Candidates might also achieve excellence with synergy in teaching and research (i.e., generating meaningful research opportunities for students), or teaching and service. A representative profile might include leadership on a major curricular re-design or establishment of a new resource for students.

Good: In addition to fulfilling regular teaching obligations, the candidate routinely engages in other forms of instruction, advising, and mentoring. A candidate's course design and course materials demonstrate some innovation. A representative profile might include notable course designs, obtaining approval for a new course, chairing M.A. theses and projects, and other mentorship. A representative profile might also include a notable number of SOTE items at the highest end of the university normative range or exceeding the norm.

Baseline: A candidate regularly teaches courses in her or his area of specialization and at least one course that serves the department more generally (e.g., COMM 101C, 199C, 200R, or 297). A candidate's syllabi and course materials demonstrate thought and care. For instance, a course schedule gives a good sense of how the course unfolds. In addition to classroom instruction, a candidate contributes to other aspects of student retention and success. A representative profile might include serving on project or thesis committees, writing M.A. exam questions, serving as a

respondent at a student conference, or offering workshops in the COMM Center. A candidate's SOTES fall within university normative ranges.

General guidelines for candidates: It is advised that candidates teach a minimum of two courses per academic year. Candidates may wish to note in their teaching statements any exceptional instructional challenges such as a newly approved course taught for the first time.

Guidelines for committees: In accordance with university guidelines, department letters should highlight synergy between a candidate's teaching, service, and scholarship. For instance, contributions to department assessment efforts might be considered a part of a candidate's teaching profile. Whenever possible, a colleague with experience in the candidate's area of specialization should speak to the candidate's contributions to a particular area of the department curriculum.

Scholarship

Excellent: A candidate demonstrates notable achievement in research by establishing new scholarly/artistic terrain or otherwise making significant contributions. A candidate seeking tenure might achieve excellence in volume by publishing several refereed essays, a book with a university press, and other completed work. A comparable profile that includes artistic works will include multiple finished works with positive reception by outside reviewers. A candidate seeking promotion to full might also achieve excellence with new areas of research or by securing national or international grants, or by achieving synergy in research and service or teaching (e.g., research that contributes to campus initiatives).

Good: A good scholarly/artistic profile exceeds the baseline expectations for achievement in research. A profile may exceed in any of the four evaluation factors. For instance, a representative profile with three refereed works might feature an award-winning piece or otherwise demonstrate notable impact. The profile will also include a body of other on-going works, the significance of which the candidate clearly articulates.

Baseline: A candidate's scholarly/artistic profile provides evidence of 1) a research program, and 2) prospects for future research. A research program includes several published or finished works. A representative profile might include three refereed publications, and evidence of an active scholarly/artistic program such as regular participation in conferences or grants secured for research currently underway. A comparable profile that includes artistic work might feature two refereed publications, one artistic work that has undergone outside review, and evidence of an active scholarly program.

General guidelines for candidates: Candidates are advised to help committees in weighing scholarly work for achievement in four areas: 1) volume, 2) selectiveness, 3) candidate's role, and 4) scope, impact, or contribution of the project. For instance, candidates should include journal acceptance rates and/or otherwise confirm the reputation of a venue and the significance of a work. Co-authored works should indicate the candidate's role and contribution, and as with all other finished works, should indicate any other significant factors (e.g., impact). Additional information is particularly important for genres other than the refereed essay or monograph such as encyclopedia entries, review essays, anthologies, and textbooks. Was it submitted to a competitive call or invited? Reviewed by an editor or multiple reviewers? What was the selection process for securing a specific performance venue? Has a textbook been adopted by educational

programs? If a candidate publishes, presents, or performs outside the field of communication, the candidate should identify a comparable venue inside the field to facilitate evaluation. International journals, for instance, will be weighted the same as comparable domestic journals. Candidates may need to provide a translation for research published in languages other than English. Candidates seeking outside review of artistic work should consult the help document on tenure provided by the NCA performance studies division: https://performancestudies.files.wordpress.com/2010/02/tenure-and-promotion.pdf. Candidates making the case for excellence in research are encouraged to provide external evaluations.

Guidelines for committees: Evaluation of a candidate's scholarship cannot be based on quantitative measures alone. Committees must give *equal consideration* to the following four factors: 1) volume, 2) selectiveness, 3) candidate's role, and 4) scope, impact, or contribution of the project. Further more, committees must evaluate a candidate's research relative to the expectations and protocols of the candidate's stated area of study (i.e., media effects, performance studies, critical/cultural). Regarding creative work, committees should give equal consideration to the following four factors: 1) venue of the work's presentation, 2) candidate's role in creating the work, 3) scope, impact, or contribution of the work on the filed or candidate's overall body of work, 4) critical response. *It is the committee's responsibility to affirm and curate those expectations for outside audiences.* When possible, a colleague with experience in the candidate's area of study should contribute qualitative comments to the department letter.

Service

Excellent: A candidate serves in leadership roles at the department, college, university, or national level. A representative profile might demonstrate the candidate's leadership in or contributions to several major initiatives, such as revision of the graduate curriculum or introduction of a new program or resource.

Good: In addition to regular participation in department service, a candidate chairs a department committee or taskforce for at least one year and shepherds agenda items to completion. Additionally, a candidate serves on a college or university level committee, or serve a national organization appropriate to the candidate's scholarly and creative work. The candidate provides evidence of completed agenda items such as approval of new department learning objectives.

Baseline: A candidate routinely participates in department affairs and demonstrates progressive knowledge of college and university affairs. A candidate, for instance, may serve as a department advisor or on a college or university-level committee in addition to participating in department affairs. A candidate may also serve in some capacity for a national or international academic organization appropriate to the candidate's scholarly and creative work.

General guidelines for candidates: Candidates should include documentation confirming service on college and university-level committees and for national organizations. Candidates are encouraged to demonstrate synergy between service and teaching by high-lighting teaching-related activities such as advising, service on thesis or project committees, and supervising independent studies, hosting performance showcases, and leading study abroad.

Guidelines for committees: In addition to highlighting synergy between a candidate's service, teaching, and scholarship, department letters should give a sense of the scope and significance of projects undertaken and note any special challenges the candidate managed (e.g., changes in

administration that delayed or upended an initiative). Committees should recognize candidate service to the broader community, at all levels, as appropriate.