



CELEBRATING 75 YEARS 1923-1998

OFFICE OF THE DEAN  
COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND  
MASS COMMUNICATIONS

December 14, 1998

Dr. Jerome Odom  
Office of the Provost  
Osborne Administration Building  
Campus

*Approved  
Jan. 9, 1999*

Dear Jerry:

Here is the college's revised Post-Tenure Review policy, with minor corrections suggested by your office incorporated and approved by the faculty of our college.

If there is anything else we need to do on this matter, please let me know.  
Happy holidays.

Sincerely,

A. Jerome Jewler  
Chair, Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee

cc: Dean Judy VanSlyke Turk

COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS  
POST-TENURE REVIEW  
Fall 1998

In compliance with University policy, the faculty of the College of Journalism and Mass Communications has approved this plan for post-tenure review.

## I. PURPOSE

As approved by the University faculty, post-tenure review is to be considered a developmental process. Faculty who, in the opinion of their colleagues, are making substantial contributions to the mission of the unit generally will receive a satisfactory review. Where an individual receives an unsatisfactory review, the unit is responsible for offering a development program for that individual to bring his or her performance to a satisfactory level as described below.

Post-tenure review will be conducted by the unit, will involve peer and external review, will become part of the faculty member's permanent file.

Over the course of an academic career, a faculty member is likely to develop interests and talents that may be different and more focused than those which were considered in the awarding of tenure. For example, the faculty member may take on an administrative position, develop innovative teaching techniques which not only earn praise from students but earn for that faculty member a reputation as a master teacher, develop a talent for professional service, and/or develop a new focus for scholarship and research that leads to a change in the product of that scholarship.

While the significance of the faculty member's contributions to the unit and the University shall be taken into consideration during post-tenure review, such contributions need not be equally divided among teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The bottom line shall be whether or not the individual is making a significant contribution to the unit.

## II. PROCEDURES

### A. TIMING OF REVIEWS

Beginning in academic year 1999-2000, each tenured faculty member of the College will undergo a post-tenure review every six years. One-sixth of the tenured faculty will be reviewed each year. The order of review will be determined by a faculty member's decision year for tenure, beginning with those tenured earliest.

The only exceptions to this schedule shall be faculty who notify the dean that they will be retiring within three years of their review date, faculty who have been promoted in the last six years, faculty who have been named to an administrative position in the last six years, and faculty holding named professorships or chairs that

are subject to periodic review.

(Faculty promoted within the last six years shall be reviewed six years from their date of promotion, while faculty named to an administrative position shall be reviewed six years from their appointment to such positions.)

A faculty member undergoing post-tenure review shall assemble the following materials and forward them to the Dean by the spring deadline for annual performance reviews:

A. Annual performance reviews for the last six years, the most recent being the one for the year in which the post-tenure review takes place. Materials should include the Dean's evaluations and those of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for each year, student and peer evaluations of teaching, and evidence of scholarship.

B. A brief (two to three pages) summary statement of growth and accomplishments during the six-year period being reviewed.

#### B. Outside Review of Materials

The Dean shall determine whether or not materials in the file require external review. An external reviewer must be someone who is not a member of the unit, but may be a faculty member in another unit at the University or someone outside the University. The following are examples of items that will not require additional external review because they already have been subjected to such review: professional or scholarly refereed publications, textbooks, and creative works that have won top awards. Other scholarship/creative work will be judged individually to determine if external review is required.

#### C. RATINGS

The Dean shall evaluate each faculty member's six-year file and shall assign one of the following ratings:

a. a rating of "superior performance," indicating that the individual is exceeding the current tenure and promotion criteria of the unit for the individual's rank.

b. a rating of "satisfactory performance," indicating the individual continues to make a strong contribution to the mission of the unit for the individual's rank, be it in scholarship, teaching, service, or a combination of these areas.

c. a rating of "unsatisfactory performance," indicating that the individual does not meet the criteria of "satisfactory" as defined above.

## D. STANDARDS

The following standards shall be used in determining a faculty member's rating:

### SUPERIOR

1. Teaching: Candidate's teaching is consistently rated among the best in the unit.
2. Scholarship: Candidate's scholarship ranks with that of the best colleagues of the same rank in the same discipline at like universities.
3. Service: Candidate's record of service is recognizably among the best in the unit.

### SATISFACTORY

1. Teaching: Candidate's teaching is consistently rated above or near the average for the unit.
2. Scholarship: Candidate's scholarship compares favorably with that of most colleagues of the same rank in the same discipline at like universities.
3. Service. Candidate's record of service is well above or well within the unit's average.

### UNSATISFACTORY

1. Teaching: Candidate's teaching is consistently below the average for the unit.
2. Scholarship: Candidate's scholarship ranks well below that of most colleagues of the same rank in the same discipline at like universities.
3. Service. Candidate's record of service is consistently below the average for the unit.

## E. INDICATORS

The following indicators for teaching, scholarship, and service (from the unit tenure and promotion criteria) shall guide the unit in assessing the record of the faculty member:

### Teaching

An important documentation of teaching quality is the college's required course evaluations. The results of the evaluations are quantifiable and are reported with an explanation of the faculty member's teaching performance over time. Subjective evaluations obtained in interviews with students and alumni or in letters solicited from them may be included if appropriate. Evaluations from unit peers also must be included. Other evidence of achievement and professional growth in teaching might include:

- \* Receipt of teaching awards.
- \* Receipt of faculty development grants to support innovations in teaching.
- \* Publication of teaching materials, whether in printed form or for computer-based instruction, regardless of the medium of presentation.
- \* Work in professional positions in the mass communications industry during summers or leave time or, with the approval of the dean, part-time during a regular term.
- \* Development and management of seminars and workshops for colleagues who want to enhance or improve their teaching skills.
- \* Appointment/election to leadership roles in teaching-related activities of professional associations.
- \* Development/enrichment of new courses or programs.
- \* Being asked to instruct seminar sessions for academic or professional associations.
- \* Being asked to serve as a visiting teacher at another institution.

## Scholarship

Evidence of scholarship may include, but shall not be limited to:

- \* Reprints and copies of work published, in press, or under review in refereed scholarly and professional journals, monographs or books.
- \* Copies of presentations given at academic or professional meetings.
- \* Copies of research grants submitted; funded research grants will receive greater weight.
- \* Copies of proprietary research reports completed in the faculty member's role of consultant.
- \* Awards and honors for research.
- \* Editorial positions on scholarly and professional journals.
- \* "Expert witness" testimony in court cases or before governmental committees.
- \* Electronic publication of research results.

## Service

Service may include, but shall not be limited to:

- \* Reviewing manuscripts for professional or academic journals.
- \* Reviewing manuscripts for professional or academic conferences.
- \* Professional contributions through services as an officer, committee chair or other administrative responsibility in appropriate scholarly and/or professional organizations.
- \* Development of programs or activities that contribute significantly to the interests of the college's professional or academic constituencies, such as: development and management of seminars and workshops for professional journalists entailing teaching professional

skills and practice.

- \* Active participation in the appropriate academic or professional organizations.
- \* Receipt of service grants, honors and awards.
- \* Consulting with other schools or mass communications businesses.
- \* Service to the college and university in the form of committee or administrative assignments, directing of workshops and conferences, and participating in promotional activities.
- \* Community service within the disciplines encompassed by the college.
- \* Professional achievement in journalism and mass communications fields.
- \* A high level of academic advising and professional counseling of students. Supporting evidence, which may be solicited by the dean or the unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, as well as provided by the candidate, might include:
  - \* Written statements from the constituent organizations for which the services have been performed that comment on the quality of the services.
  - \* Written evaluations of advising by a sample of advisees. Graduate students should also be included in this sample and their assessments of the quality of advising including thesis/project advising may be assessed.
  - \* Written evaluations of graduate advisors by a sample of graduate advisees who have recently completed their theses or projects.
  - \* Written evaluations of student club advisors by members of student organizations.
  - \* Written evaluations of advising by the faculty member's sequence chair and/or dean.

#### F. PROCEDURES FOR UNSATISFACTORY REVIEWS

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review will be asked to participate in a development plan to improve his or her performance. The nature of the development plan will be determined jointly by the Dean and the faculty member. One or more tenured colleagues shall be involved in the mentoring of the individual. At the next annual review, the Dean and the mentor or development committee will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. That assessment will be forwarded to the Select Tenure and Promotion Committee, which will review the evaluation and concur or dissent, in general or in any particular. The committee's response will be forwarded to the Dean and copies provided to the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination as to whether or not further measures may be needed.

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations and/or does not agree to a development plan may appeal to the unit Select Tenure and Promotion Committee. The findings of the select committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Dean for a final decision.