

Promotion and Tenure Document Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication

Approved by the faculty: Nov. 2, 2015

Approved by the dean: Nov. 11, 2015

Approved by the Provost: Nov. 12, 2015

Introduction

This document is intended to guide candidates and evaluators of those candidates toward successful outcomes of the promotion and tenure process in the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication. This document applies to all tenure-track faculty members in the Grady College in the three Departments of Advertising and Public Relations, Entertainment and Media Studies, and Journalism. Discipline-specific criteria for promotion and tenure within Grady are outlined in this document. The starting point for understanding this process, the rules of operation, and the basic guidelines, criteria and documentation required for all candidates are given in the current version of the *UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure* (UGA Guidelines) and are available online at http://provost.uga.edu/documents/guidelines_revised_spring_14.pdf.

This document is meant to be in addition to information provided in the UGA Guidelines, to clarify and make more specific what is expected of candidates in Grady to successfully be promoted and/or tenured. In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Grady College will carefully adhere to the UGA Guidelines. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University's Guidelines. All faculty members are expected to be familiar with both this PTU document and the University Guidelines. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the University's Guidelines will supersede this document.

General Expectations

Certain expectations apply to all candidates regardless of appointment. All candidates should be evaluated against their job assignments, as documented by the department head. Evaluation relative to job assignment includes consideration of the percentage of time assigned to each of the three missions (teaching, research, and service), and the particular job responsibilities assigned (specific courses, research areas, etc.). Every faculty member is expected to participate in Departmental, College, University activities and/or committees as well as provide appropriate service to the University, professional groups, and society at large. All faculty members are expected to pursue external funding as a tool that fosters excellence in their scholarly programs.

The three primary missions of the University and College are teaching, research and service. In any promotion review, consideration should be given to the performance of the individual in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally. Their interpretation and weight should reflect the definition of the position to which the

individual has been appointed and to which he or she might be promoted.

For most faculty members, the primary basis for promotion and tenure will be evidence of the high quality of both research or creative work and teaching, with consideration also being given to evidence of valuable public service or service to the University and/or College. This College is committed to excellence in all three areas, but we recognize that equal excellence in each of them in individual cases is rare. Promotion and tenure will generally be awarded only if the evidence shows that a candidate's research or creative accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's teaching is also strong. It will be unusual and exceptional to award promotion merely on the basis of strong performance in only one of these areas.

Research and Creative Work: For promotion to associate professor, there must exist a body of original research or creative work sufficient in quality and quantity to have led at least to the beginning of a national reputation in the candidate's field. There must also be a strong indication of a commitment to original research or creative work that will lead to sustained contributions over time and to the judgment that growth in stature will continue. While external evaluations of the candidate's contributions to original research or creative work are a required component of a positive case for promotion or tenure, it is also required that the appropriate faculty in the candidate's department, college and dean make a careful independent judgment that the quality and quantity of the candidate's scholarly output is sufficient to justify the recommended action. The College recognizes that the process of seeking and obtaining external funding is, in itself a significant scholarly achievement and is therefore highly encouraged. However, an externally funded proposal is neither necessary nor sufficient for promotion and tenure.

In addition to the above, promotion to full professor requires unmistakable evidence that the candidate has achieved a national and/or international reputation for the quality and quantity of his or her research or creative work, and the likelihood of maintaining that reputation.

Teaching: An award of promotion and tenure will not normally be made unless there is evidence of both the candidate's sustained commitment to classroom instruction and the candidate sustained effectiveness as a contributor to the intellectual development of students through devices such as course design, course material, interaction with students outside of formal instructional periods (i.e., classroom sessions) and other mechanisms of enhancing student learning. Student evaluations must be part of the evidence in all cases, but by themselves they are not enough. Students are important judges of a teacher's fairness, organization and personal qualities in the classroom, laboratory, seminar and office, but the candidate's faculty peers are normally the better judges of the content of her or his pedagogy. Popular teaching and good teaching are not necessarily the same thing.

Service: Service to the University and/or the College is an obligation of every faculty member. Service to one's professional discipline and, in some cases, to the broader public is important and sometimes essential in terms of job definition. The proportions of each will vary widely among candidates for promotion. Quality and effectiveness of service are difficult to assess. The effort must nevertheless be made. For certain faculty members, strong external service can be given substantial weight in the promotion process. Genuine

contributions to institutional governance, through committees and otherwise, are a part of the obligations expected from faculty. Service is, therefore, a qualification for promotion and tenure, even though its relative weight will vary. In no case, however, can it stand alone to justify promotion and tenure nor can service compensate for inadequate student instruction or research or creative work.

Reviews, Tenure and Promotion

Annual Reviews for All Faculty: As required by UGA Guidelines, all faculty members (regardless of rank) in the Grady College must have an annual review. Annual evaluations must be conducted according to the defined discipline-specific criteria detailed in this document. Faculty progress toward achieving the discipline-specific criteria must be clearly documented in writing.

Annual Reviews, Third-Year Reviews, and Preliminary Consideration for Probationary Faculty. The Grady College will follow the processes and procedures in UGA Guidelines for Annual Reviews, Third-Year Reviews and Preliminary Considerations except for the following additions to the Annual Review process for probationary faculty. Faculty members hired in a position for which tenure can be granted but who are hired without tenure are probationary faculty. Faculty members in non-tenure track lines are also considered probationary faculty. These include clinical faculty members, lecturers, academic professionals, and research scientists.

The review process is outlined in the UGA Guidelines. Grady, however, offers tenure-track probationary faculty an additional level of review and feedback.

This process begins with a mentor. Each faculty member in a tenure-track probationary position shall select an official mentor during the first six months of her or his appointment and inform the department head of that choice. The mentor need not be from the same department as the probationary faculty member. The probationary faculty member is expected to meet with the mentor at least once a year, usually after the annual review, and discuss the outcome of the review and other matters of concern to the probationary faculty member.

Each faculty member is expected to complete an activities report that is forwarded to the department head for review. The Grady College is committed to providing additional feedback to probationary faculty as part of the yearly review process. Probationary faculty members are reviewed each year by all the tenured associate and full professors in the department where the probationary faculty member is appointed. Faculty members hired in a position for which tenure can be granted but who are hired without tenure are probationary faculty.

The activities report should address all discipline-specific criteria detailed in this document. Each probationary faculty member must submit to the chairperson of her or his department by March 1 an updated curriculum vita, a copy of her or his Faculty Activity Report, and a statement that discusses research, teaching and service activities for the period covered by the Faculty Activity Report, and teaching evaluations since initial

employment. The statement should not exceed two pages in length and should include a discussion of work in progress and planned work for the upcoming year.

The tenured associate and full professors of the department in which the probationary faculty member holds her or his position will meet to review and evaluate these materials. The department head or a faculty member appointed by the department head will summarize the discussion in a letter, which will be reviewed and agreed upon by the tenured associate and full professors. The department head will provide the approved copy of this letter to the probationary faculty member and discuss it with the probationary faculty member. The probationary faculty member may respond to the letter in writing within 10 days of its receipt, and a copy of this response will be shared with the tenured associate and full professors and placed in the personnel file of the probationary faculty member. A copy of the approved copy of the letter to the probationary faculty member and any response from the probationary faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean.

In any year, a department head or dean may determine not to extend a contract to a non-tenured faculty member.

Outlines of the promotion and tenure process are found in the UGA Guidelines. Procedures for promotion of lecturers, academic professionals, and research scientists are found here:

Lecturer: are found at <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies/appointment-promotion-and-tenure/guidelines-for-appointment-and-promotion-of-lecturers>

Academic Professionals: for promotion of academic professionals
<http://provost.uga.edu/documents/guidelinesapptpromotionacademicprofessionals.pdf>;

Research Scientists: for research scientists at:
<http://research.uga.edu/docs/policies/research/Research-Scientist-Appointment-Promotion.pdf>

Scholarly Qualifications for Tenured Ranks

The primary and secondary discipline-specific criteria listed below provide the framework for how promise or possession of a national reputation is determined. For each discipline-specific criterion, a candidate's performance will be compared to those scholars at similar rank in the candidate's area of study at peer and aspirational universities as well as to exemplars in the Grady College as described below. The exemplars displayed below are provided to add clarity regarding the degree of quality and quantity necessary to advance in rank.

Evaluating the quality and impact of journals is determined in the following ways:

1. By determining quartile and impact scores from UGA Elements and the SCImago Journal and Country rankings— <http://scimagojr.com/index.php>
2. By the journals' acceptance rates.
3. By recent studies that identify journal importance in a candidate's area of study, and
4. By the consensus view of the senior faculty in the candidate's department

Primary discipline-specific criteria:

Refereed journal articles and discipline specific publications

- Quality of journal
- Impact scores of the journal
- Journal acceptance rate
- Lead article in volume
- Citations (particularly important for full professor consideration)
- Download rate
- Quantity and quality at a rate comparable to recently promoted scholars at peer and aspirational programs (to be demonstrated by the candidate seeking promotion)
- Article awards

Scholarly books

- Quality of the publishing press
- Quality of the reviews of the book
- Citations (particularly important for full professor consideration)
- Book awards

Production and exhibition or publication of original works

- Quality of the festival or venue
- Quality of the reviews of the creative work
- Honors and awards for the creative activity

Externally funded projects, grants, commissions and contracts

- Prestige of funding source
- Level of funding
- Funding rate (when available)

Refereed Scholarly Book Chapters

- Quality of the publishing press
- Acceptance rate
- Citations (particularly important for full professor consideration)

Secondary discipline-specific criteria

In addition to the primary discipline-specific criterion, there are a number of secondary discipline-specific criteria that can also provide supporting evidence of a candidate's progress toward or attainment of a national and/or international reputation.

- Honors and awards not specifically tied to a particular work.
- Membership on editorial boards reviewing publications, or on juries judging creative works.
- Invited talks on scholarship or teaching.
- Conference papers and published proceedings.
- Published non-refereed book chapters.
- Scholarly books edited by the candidate.
- Scholarly reviews of publications written by the candidate.
- Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (e.g. patents, new product development, new art forms).

- Record of participation in and description of seminars and workshops (including short descriptions of activity, with titles, dates and sponsor), with an indication of the role in the seminar or workshops (e.g. leader, participant).
- Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (e.g. consultant, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journal, peer reviewer of grants, speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions).
- Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service-learning and outreach courses at home or abroad, where research and new knowledge are integrated.
- Application of research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, or educational institutions.
- Technology transferred or adapted in the field.
- Other evidence of impact on society of research scholarship and creative accomplishment.
- Evidence of graduate and post-doctoral students' scholarly achievements (e.g. publications, awards, grants).
- Election to offices, committee activities and important service to professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer review as related to research and other creative activities.

Teaching and Service Qualifications for Tenured Ranks

As noted before, the UGA Guidelines provide extensive information on documenting contributions to teaching and service.

Discipline specific criteria in the areas of Teaching and Service acknowledge the relationship that Grady has with the professions, locally, nationally, and globally. In teaching, introduce students to global concerns through study abroad, integrate the insights of the professionals into the classroom, involve alumni in the mentoring of Grady majors, engage in professional development that immerses faculty in the professional environment, or that engages them with the new technologies of the industries.

In service, faculty may consult, train, devise programs or projects, judge contests, apply scholarly or creative ideas to these organizations, or serve on boards or in elected office in national professional associations. Honors from professional organizations are valued.

Grady College P&T Promotion Exemplars

Following are exemplars of successful promotion profiles in the Grady College. They are meant to provide clarity about what an average successful promotion portfolio looks like. As a full-service mass communication college, Grady College serves a number of different foci, and therefore, faculty portfolios will differ depending on the candidate's position and expertise. Accordingly, this document provides exemplars for four different types of portfolios. . Each exemplar provides clear and convincing evidence that they meet or exceed the requirement for rank as defined by the UGA Guidelines using the applied

discipline-specific criteria in this document. Importantly, There there should be recognition that each case will be unique and may look different than these exemplars. For example, there may be some mixing of exemplar types. However, the “tenor” of a successful promotion case will be of comparable quality to the exemplars displayed below.

Exemplar 1: The Journal Track

Assistant to Associate Professor:

The candidate has developed a definable research stream in our field and was the author of 10 refereed articles (solo author on two, lead author on five, second author on two and third author on one). Half the articles are in top tier journals, four in secondary journals, and two in tertiary journals. Two articles were co-authored by graduate students the candidate was mentoring. Journal impact scores ranged from .15 to 3.5, and the acceptance rates ranged from 6% to 23%. Both sets of ranges are comparable to those yielded by recently promoted scholars at peer and aspirational units in the candidate’s area of the discipline. Two external grant proposals have been submitted with the person in the role as co-principal investigator. The candidate has received two top paper awards at national conferences. His/her work has been cited at a level comparable to researchers recently promoted to the associate rank at the following universities (e.g., Florida, UT-Austin, UNC-Chapel Hill). He/she has reviewed articles for four leading journals relevant to his/her area of expertise. The candidate has received strong student teaching evaluations, and has shown steady growth as a classroom teacher. He/she has served on graduate thesis/dissertation committees. The candidate received excellent reviews from outside scholars.

Associate to Full Professor:

The candidate has definitely established a national and/or international reputation in his/her field. Since promotion to associate professor, the candidate demonstrated a productivity rate on par or exceeding that expected to earn promotion to the associate rank. In accordance with the expectation of frequent citation and downloads, the candidate’s work has rates comparable with nationally known scholars at peer and aspirational institutions in the candidate’s segment of the field. The candidate serves on the editorial board of two leading journals. The candidate has been invited to speak to a number of outside groups. The candidate has received external grant funding to support his/her work. The candidate has directed a number of theses and dissertations.

Exemplar 2: The Book Track

Assistant to Associate Professor:

The candidate has developed a definable research stream in our field and was the author of one scholarly book published by a well-respected national press (e.g., Columbia University Press). The book has received favorable reviews by national scholars. The candidate has also published a refereed monograph, and four journal articles (one solo authored article, and lead author on two of the other three articles). Two of the articles are in top tier journals and two in secondary journals. The acceptance rate of the monograph is 10%, and

the acceptance rates for the journal articles range from 9% to 20%. Journal impact scores ranged from .15 to 3.5. Both sets of ranges are comparable to those yielded by recently promoted scholars at peer and aspirational units in the candidate's area of the discipline. The candidate received a \$12,000 grant from an external foundation to do archival research for his/her scholarly book. The candidate has received a top paper award at a national conference. His/her work has been cited at a level comparable to researchers recently promoted to the associate rank at the following universities (fill in the blanks, e.g., Florida, UT-Austin, UNC-Chapel Hill). They have reviewed articles for three leading journals relevant to his/her area of expertise. The candidate has received strong student teaching evaluations, and has shown steady growth as a classroom teacher. They have served on graduate thesis/dissertation committees. The candidate received excellent reviews from outside scholars.

Associate to Full Professor:

The candidate has definitely established a national and/or international reputation in his/her field. Since promotion to associate professor, the candidate demonstrated a productivity rate on par or exceeding that done to earn promotion to the associate rank. In accordance with the expectation of frequent citation and downloads, the candidate's work has rates comparable with nationally known scholars at peer and aspirational institutions in the candidate's segment of the field. The candidate serves on the editorial of two leading journals. The candidate's work has received two awards from national professional associations. The candidate has been invited to speak to a number of outside groups. The candidate has received external grant funding to support his/her work. The candidate has directed a number of theses and dissertation.

Exemplar 3: The Creative Track

Assistant to Associate Professor:

The candidate has developed clear momentum toward a national reputation as a creator for his/her work for the screen (as a producer, director and/or screenwriter). His/her credits include eight creative products, which include two narrative and three documentary short films, a web series, a short-form television piece, and a narrative music video.

He/she has participated in eight creative panels or presentations at film festivals, exhibitions, industry workshops, and creative academic and industry conferences. The candidate has presented his/her films at 20 or more juried film festivals, and his/her films have won or received "selection" awards. The candidate sought external funding through foundations, industry partnerships and other sources, and applied to obtain commercial licenses for his/her work.

The candidate has received strong student teaching evaluations, and has shown steady growth as a classroom teacher. He/she has served on graduate thesis/dissertation committees. The candidate received excellent reviews from outside scholars or creative professionals.

Associate to Full Professor:

The candidate has established a national and/or international reputation in his/her field. Since promotion to associate professor, the candidate demonstrated a productivity rate on par or exceeding that done to earn promotion to the associate rank (see above for details). This includes a minimum of five to seven creative products, and preferably, at least one long form narrative (long form television, webisode series, feature film etc.). The candidate has directed, organized, or served on the board of a festival or entertainment industry special event. The candidate has sought funds from multiple sources (in addition to industry or foundations) for creative work. The candidate has served on (or directed) a number of theses or dissertations or creative student productions. The candidate has continued to grow as a teacher, receiving strong student teaching evaluations.

Exemplar 4: The Scholar-Maker Track

Assistant to Associate Professor:

The candidate works in the field of media, communication and technology (broadly defined) and seamlessly integrates production, theory and aesthetics. He/she developed five creative products (video games, online content, new emergent media texts), which were selected for review and presentation at leading academic and industry conferences. The acceptance rates of these creative products at conferences ranged from 12%-17%. The candidate wrote four external grant proposals linked to these creative products in the role of co-principal investigator or primary investigator. He/she has served on graduate thesis/dissertation committees.

In context of this exemplar, the candidate may pursue one of two scholarly routes in addition to the production of creative products: the Journal Theme or the Book Theme.

Journal Theme: The scholar has developed a definable research stream in the field of media, communication and technology (broadly defined to include fields like gaming studies, computer mediated communication, media and technology studies, creative media industries, entertainment and media studies). The candidate authored six refereed articles (solo author on two, lead author on two, and second author two). Four of the articles were published in top tier journals, and two in secondary journals. Journal impact scores ranged from .15 to 3.5, and the acceptance rates ranged from 6% to 23%. The candidate has received strong student teaching evaluations, and has shown steady growth as a classroom teacher. They have served on graduate thesis/dissertation committees. The candidate received excellent reviews from outside scholars.”

Book Theme: The candidate has developed a definable research stream in the field of media, communication and technology and was the author of one scholarly book published by a well-respected national press (e.g., MIT Press series on “New Media, Game Studies and Digital Humanities”). The book has received favorable reviews by national scholars. The candidate has also published two journal articles (one as solo author and one as lead author). The articles are in top tier. The candidate has received strong student teaching evaluations, and has shown steady growth as a

classroom teacher. They have served on graduate thesis/dissertation committees. The candidate received excellent reviews from outside scholars.

Associate to Full Professor:

The candidate has established a national and/or international reputation in his/her field. Since promotion to associate professor, the candidate demonstrated a productivity rate on par or exceeding that done to earn promotion to the associate rank. In accordance with the expectation of frequent citation and downloads, the candidate's work has rates comparable with nationally known scholars at peer and aspirational institutions in the candidate's segment of the field. The candidate serves on the editorial of two leading journals. The candidate has been invited to speak to a number of outside groups. The candidate has received external grant funding to support his/her work. The candidate has directed a number of theses and dissertations.

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, the faculty, dean and the Provost, must approve any changes or updates to this PTU document. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document. After its approval, this document will become effective for all faculty members in the Grady College.

History and Procedures for this Document

This document replaces the previous departmental criteria for promotion and tenure, dated 2005, for the following faculty and applications for promotion:

(a) all faculty hired as of Fall 2015 or later; and

(b) all promotion applications, regardless of the faculty member's hire date, forwarded to the college in Fall semester 2019 or later.

For faculty hired before Fall 2015, promotion applications forwarded before Fall semester 2018 will be evaluated using these new criteria, but with the following caveats. Until 2018, if these new criteria would in any way disadvantage a faculty member who has been attempting to satisfy the 2005 criteria, then departmental decisions will be made in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 using the 2005 criteria. It is the department head's responsibility to make this transition clear to all faculty in the department. It is also the department head's responsibility to make this transition clear to all college- and university-level review committees (e.g., in the department head's cover letter in the candidate's dossier and application for promotion, in the Unit Level Criteria provided within the dossier, and in other ways as may be relevant).