

Department of Communication Bylaws

I. Department Policy

1. Voting Rights

All full-time faculty members who are tenured, tenure-earning or non-tenure earning are eligible to vote on matters pertaining to the department other than promotion and tenure. A simple majority is appropriate for all matters, with the exception of bylaw approval and amendments. Proxies will be accepted in all matters, except for personnel decisions.

Please refer to Sections 1.9.2 and 1.9.3 under “II. Tenure, Promotion and Annual Evaluation Guidelines” for tenure and promotion voting procedures.

2. Department Meetings

The Department meets at least once a month each semester during the academic year. Preliminary Meeting dates and times are set at the beginning of each full semester, and advanced notice of a change to established meeting times must be made no later than two weeks prior to the meeting. Requests for agenda items are announced the week before the meeting. Minutes will either be recorded or extensive notes taken and filed by the department’s administrative assistant for future reference.

3. Office Hours

Full-time teaching faculty shall be available to students during posted office hours as specified by the college. Generally, faculty should anticipate offering 2 office hours weekly per 3 credit hour course offered. Part-time faculty will be reasonably available to students depending on their workload. Both part and full-time faculty will be available at other times by appointment.

4. Departmental Committee Duties

Committees may be formed at the request and discretion of the department head to study the feasibility of certain projects, to review curriculum, to plan recruitment efforts, or to attend to similar departmental needs. Committees may be project-specific or standing. Committee members will be informed about the nature and length of their membership before agreeing to serve. These duties will count under service for the purposes of annual evaluations.

5. Bylaw Review

All full-time faculty members will vote annually to either: 1) reaffirm the existing bylaws of the department, or 2) undertake review and revision of Department bylaws during that year. If review is recommended, the Chair will appoint a Bylaw Committee to undertake such duties. The bylaw vote will take place during the first faculty meeting of the Fall semester, each year.

II. Tenure, Promotion and Annual Evaluation Guidelines

This section provides guidelines for promotion, tenure and annual evaluation for all full-time faculty members in the Department of Communication.

TENURE-LINE FACULTY: Teaching, Service, and Scholarship sections apply for promotion, tenure, sustained performance evaluations, and annual evaluations.

NON-TENURE EARNING FACULTY: For faculty members who do not have scholarship requirements, only the Teaching and Service sections apply.

JSU has adopted a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are four performance categories relevant to faculty and staff in the department of communication: Teaching Effectiveness and Mentorship (Academic Advisement), Scholarly/Creative Activity, Service/Community Engagement, and Collegiality. These assessment criteria form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions. JSU relies on well-vetted department bylaws, which are reviewed by the Deans of each College, to set the basis for meeting and exceeding the expectations of each department and discipline.

1. The Department's Role in Preparation of Tenure-Track Faculty

1.1 Mentorship of Junior Faculty

The department chair is responsible for assigning a mentor for each full-time member of the faculty, in addition to performing personnel review of each candidate. The mentor is expected to review progress toward tenure and promotion annually and add their report to the Chairperson's annual evaluation of progress toward tenure each spring. For each mentor, the role should be included and counted towards their departmental service roles.

1.2 Faculty Annual Review (FAR)

An annual performance review of all full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty shall be conducted by the department head, dean/director, or supervisor by the end of the spring semester; it shall be based upon evidence of performance in the calendar year (Spring, Summer, and Fall terms). Faculty will submit their annual review materials to their supervisor at the beginning of the spring semester. The purpose of the FAR is to provide documentation for tenure, promotion, or reappointment, and to provide feedback to faculty members about their ongoing performance and the extent to which they have met applicable performance criteria for their role. Faculty evaluations may be used in decisions regarding salary, reappointment of non-tenured faculty, promotion, tenure, participation in faculty development activities, and/or administrative appointments. All full-time instructional personnel are to submit FARs each calendar year.

1.2.1 Criteria for Evaluation Procedures

As referenced above, the evaluation process used in each school shall be based on Teaching Effectiveness and Academic Advisement, Scholarly/Creative Activity, Service/Community Engagement, Collegiality, and/or Professional Effectiveness of Librarians. For some faculty, Faculty Administrative Responsibilities may also be addressed in the evaluation process.

In determining the effectiveness of faculty members, the combined workload of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service/community engagement shall be determined by each school in conjunction with the institution's mission. The workload percentages for evaluation should reflect the actual workload of the faculty member. Any overload and/or administrative responsibilities should be included. A factor in determining overall annual performance must be the relative percentage associated with each of the areas of performance.

After a review of all evaluation information, the department head's and/or dean's conclusions will be communicated to the faculty member in an evaluation meeting. The evaluation meeting must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the supervisor.

1.2.1.1 Development of Formative Plan

Following communication of the department head's or supervisor's evaluation, the department head/supervisor and the faculty member will establish a formative plan that sets the goals, objectives, and workload percentages for the next evaluation period. The

formative plan should be consistent with the goals and needs of the department and university. It should also provide each faculty member with a means to organize and develop the subsequent FAR in considering how they effectively addressed the goals for the plan.

1.2.1.2 Third Year Review*

At the time of the third annual evaluation, tenure-track faculty will be reviewed on the performance of the past thirty-six months to ensure that the candidate for promotion and tenure is appropriately progressing toward meeting the promotion and tenure expectations. The detailed Third Year Review portfolio will be submitted to the department head and/or dean as part of the FAR. The department head and/or dean will review the portfolio and document findings on the [Third Year Review form](#). The Third Year Review Form (Word Document) should be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file within the department; a copy sent to the provost's office. Additionally, the department head may choose to write a letter for the faculty member's file inclusive of strengths, recommendations, and a full tenure/promotion appraisal.

*Department heads/deans should be cognizant of service credit received by faculty members when determining timing of third year review. For instance, a faculty member receiving two years of service credit toward promotion and tenure would receive a third-year review at the end of the first year at JSU.

1.2.2 Evaluation Procedures of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty serving in roles as full-time temporary or part-time temporary should receive an evaluation of teaching effectiveness annually, based upon their teaching schedule. The evaluation should be completed by the supervisor and sent to the Dean's office of the respective school. The supervisor of the adjunct should use the [Adjunct Faculty Teaching Evaluation Form](#) for completion of this process.

1.3 Teaching Effectiveness

1.3.1 Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Evaluation procedures must properly reflect that teaching is the priority of faculty members. Faculty members at Jacksonville State University are scholarly teachers who provide evidence that their teaching is effective. Effective teaching will be documented through student and peer evaluations as well as through self-evaluation. Students will evaluate teachers on the professional aspects of teaching and on their response to instruction. Peers may evaluate pedagogical content knowledge as well as the

professional aspects of teaching. Faculty members will provide a self-evaluation on the relationship between their instruction and relevance to the discipline.

Given JSU's mission as a learning-centered community, the following areas of effective teaching should be addressed:

1. Content expertise, which includes command of one's subject, knowledge of current developments in one's discipline and pedagogy, and the ability to relate one's subject to other areas of knowledge.
2. Instructional delivery skills, which include the use of interactive technology skills that promote or facilitate learning, effectiveness in communicating with students, the ability to stimulate and broaden student interest in the subject matter, and the ability to motivate students to engage in independent work.
3. Instructional design skills, which include the ability to design and implement effective program, course, and/or instructional experiences to promote student learning.
4. Student learning outcomes and assessment skills, which accurately measure that learning has occurred.

1.3.2 Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Each program or department should use as many of the following sources as are appropriate and feasible to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness:

1. Course materials (syllabi, assignments, exams, etc.) reflective of knowledge, organization, innovation, and teaching/pedagogical skills including, if in use, the learning management system organization of each course.
2. Student evaluations. The evaluator using these data must be cognizant of the relevant class and course characteristics that affect student ratings.
3. Evaluations by the department head, program director, or dean.
4. Evaluations by peers from inside and/or outside the university.
5. Self-evaluation.
6. Further course work or other continuing educational activities such as seminars and workshops in one's field.
7. Professional development, including, but not limited to, participation in seminars and workshops on pedagogy.
8. Evidence of student-learning outcomes.

9. Evidence of course development/revisions and/or program development/revisions.
10. Evidence of student work if applicable.
11. Evidence of work with graduate students, including theses, dissertations, and degree completions.
12. Teaching Awards/Honors.

1.3.3 Regarding Review of Course Evaluations

When reviewing faculty performance through the lens of student evaluations, senior colleagues and the department head should be cognizant of the following factors in review:

- In this performance area, the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.
- Quantitative course evaluations, while helpful in understanding general performance, should be interpreted with caution as they may not fully reflect of a professor's performance in the classroom. Low response rates on evaluations merit a more holistic evaluation.
- In calculating Student Teaching Evaluation averages, faculty may either provide an average of student responses on all evaluation categories, or a calculated average of the two items: "Overall, assessment of instructor" and "Overall, I would rate the course organization". Depending on the design of the SAI questionnaire, these two items may be at different locations within the questionnaire from semester to semester.
- All Student Teaching Evaluations for a given semester must be calculated the same way (i.e. a faculty member may not select to calculate all items for one course and only "Overall, assessment of instructor" and "Overall, I would rate the course organization" for another course in the same semester).
- The SAI evaluation scores for each course will be calculated on a 5-point scale where a ranking of excellent = 5.0, very good = 4.0, good = 3.0, fair = 2.0 and poor = 1.0. The overall SAI evaluation score for an academic year will be calculated by averaging all of a faculty member's courses for that year. For example, a faculty member teaching three fall courses with SAI scores of 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7 and three spring courses with SAI scores of 4.6, 4.8, and 3.9 would have a total SAI evaluation score of 4.46 for that academic year.
- Course teaching evaluation averages may also be weighted at the discretion of the Department Chair in consideration of variables such as courses noted for their difficulty, graduate courses, major courses with an unusually high number of non-majors, etc.

These considerations are noted for reference to remind applicants and relevant reviewing faculty and administrators that assessment of teaching effectiveness should be holistic in nature, and account for the forms of evidence suggested in section 1.3.2 as a larger body of evidence that better reflects a colleague's performance in the classroom and with students.

1.3.4 Departmental Classifications of Performance

The following classifications are to provide guidance to evaluators in assessing colleagues on an annual basis for the sake of professional development and continual improvement. They are by no means exhaustive or prescriptive but provide guidance to help inform the review process.

Note: The assessments serve as benchmarks, and one poor course evaluation should not preclude a colleague from a successful application for tenure and/or promotion. The ideal, and evaluative expectation is for a colleague to demonstrate consistent, progressive improvement over their tenure review cycle. A colleague's capacity to demonstrate progressive growth, innovation, and progression is the mark of value in the classroom.

Note: Colleagues should also be aware that efforts to be experimental in the service of providing an industry-current, innovative curriculum are encouraged and will be considered as part of holistic assessment. Further, the onus is on the evaluator in the department to balance considerations of the net impact of experimentation against evaluation to ensure a valid effort to make the curriculum stronger does not result in undue penalty from students in evaluation.

1.3.4.1 Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected either by (1) teaching evaluations averaging below 3.5, (2) a combination of many negative indicators, or (3) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning.

Additional Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems, quantitatively or qualitatively in comments.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations or align with programmatic learning outcomes.
- Course fails to meet objectives established in syllabi.

- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are ineffective or unfair).
- Goals, course content, and/or performance reflect a lack of consistent improvement efforts.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g. consistent lack of preparation or organization, frequent absences or tardiness, unhelpful feedback, weak standards, chaotic or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g. not responding to student inquiries, not keeping office hours, documented incidents of favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) avoided or poorly executed.
- Ample evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

Implication: Requires major remedial work

1.3.4.2 Fair

Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but includes major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department standards of excellence and teaching evaluations average below 3.75.

Additional Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Course fails to meet objectives established in syllabi.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are ineffective or unfair).
- Goals, course content, and/or performance reflect a lack of consistent improvement efforts.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g. consistent lack of preparation or organization, frequent absences or tardiness, unhelpful feedback, weak standards, chaotic or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g. not responding to student inquiries, not keeping office hours, documented incidents of favoritism).

- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) avoided or poorly executed.
- Ample evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

Implication: Remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

1.3.4.3 Good

Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness including teaching evaluations average above 3.75 but includes some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is slightly below the department standards of excellence.

Additional Indicators:

- Student evaluation narratives document adequate impact on learning.
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals, course content and/or performance give evidence of continuous improvement efforts.
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective.
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) are executed with reasonable skill.
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates in teaching development activities.

Implication: Performance at this level suggests positive potential but some change is needed to qualify for tenure and promotion.

1.3.4.4. Excellent

Demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. In general, performance at this level meets department standards of excellence.

To receive an Excellent teaching evaluation, a faculty member must have an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.0 or greater and one additional performance indicator from the list below, or an overall SAI evaluation score of 3.75 or greater and three or more additional performance indicators listed below:

Additional Indicators:

- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and university requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- A majority of student evaluation narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Voluntary participation in professional development activities focused on improving teaching quality.
- Participant in a conference presentation focused on pedagogical issues.
- Development of a new course or evidence of significant revision of an existing course
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Recognition by the University or a professional communication association of excellence in teaching
- Consistent usage and evidence of High Impact Practices in assigned coursework
- Consistent and very high ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities or special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences).
- Peer teaching evaluations assessed at the Distinguished or Excellent level.
- Other evidence of advanced pedagogical practices and/or student impact as identified by the department chair.

Implication: Performance average at this level during the three-year period of employment prior to application for tenure and/or promotion at JSU merits a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

1.3.4.5 Distinguished

Demonstrates the highest degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators below. In general, performance at this level exceeds department standards of excellence and is viewed as a significant departmental factor for tenure and promotion.

To receive a Distinguished teaching evaluation, a faculty member must have an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.25 and one additional performance indicator from the list below, or an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.00 and five or more additional performance indicators listed below:

Additional Indicators:

- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and university requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- A majority of student evaluation narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Voluntary participation in professional development activities focused on improving teaching quality.
- Participant in a conference presentation focused on pedagogical issues.
- Development of a new course or evidence of significant revision of an existing course
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Recognition by the University or a professional communication association of excellence in teaching
- Consistent usage and evidence of High Impact Practices in assigned coursework
- Consistent and very high ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities or special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences).
- Peer teaching evaluations assessed at the Distinguished or Excellent level.
- Other evidence of advanced pedagogical practices and/or student impact as identified by the department chair.

Implication: A performance average of Distinguished during the three-year period of employment prior to application for tenure and/or promotion at JSU easily justifies a favorable tenure and promotion decision.

1.4 Academic Advisement/Professional Consultation

1.4.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Academic Advisement/Professional Consultation

The following criteria should be addressed when evaluating student advisement/professional consultation:

1. Ability to help students select a course of study appropriate to their interests and aptitudes.
2. Ability to assist students in academic and career planning.
3. Use of the services and support from the Office of Career Services.
4. Use of EAB-GradesFirst/Navigate to improve student academic outcomes.

1.4.2 Evidence of Effectiveness in Academic Advisement/Professional Consultation*

Effectiveness in advisement/professional consultation should be assessed and documented by the following:

1. Evaluation by supervisor.
2. Self-evaluation.
3. Student evaluations.
4. Letters of reference.
5. Participation in workshops or seminars designed to improve academic advisement skills.
6. Documentation from EAB-GradesFirst/Navigate.

NOTE: 1.4.2 is in place as a means of evaluation for the duration of the current period of advising down upperclassmen in the department of communication. Once complete, the department will amend 1.4 to focus on professional consultation and mentorship and amend 1.4.1 to reflect future evaluation of faculty performance.

1.5 Scholarly/Creative Activity

Departments should recognize and evaluate a wide variety of scholarship activities consistent with the department's and the University's missions. Scholarly activities should not be rigidly categorized. Many activities and products can be classified as more than one type of scholarship.

To ensure consistency within the school, the dean, along with department heads, will approve departmental criteria, and its equivalents, for departmental scholarly requirements. In the evaluation of such activities, quality should prevail over quantity.

Consistent with its mission and vision as a regionally engaged institution, Jacksonville State University defines scholarship broadly through the Boyer model (Glassick, Huber, Maeroff, 1997), which includes four categories of scholarship:

Scholarship of Discovery: The scholarship of discovery encompasses what academics historically have referred to as basic or traditional "research," as well as creative work in our fields of production and strategic communication. Its primary purpose is understood as "contributing to the stock of human knowledge and the intellectual climate of a college or university."

Examples: refereed publications based on research, scholarly books, book chapters, entries in reference works, broadcasts, digital media, and/or monographs.

Scholarship of Integration: The scholarship of integration involves faculty members "overcoming the isolation and fragmentation of the disciplines, making connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclination to split knowledge into ever more esoteric bits and pieces."

Examples: Interdisciplinary publications, professional development workshops across units and/or disciplines, presentations of research at scholarly and professional conferences or invited conference presentations/roundtables, and non-academic publications that address discipline-related concerns.

Scholarship of Application: The scholarship of application moves toward engagement as the scholar asks, "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?" Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understanding can arise from the very act of application. In brief, theory and practice interact in such ventures and improve each other.

Examples: research grants; development of centers for study or service; research projects that address issues of local, state, or other need; preparation of documents such as briefs, manuals, or other publications based on research for the good of the community (theory into practice); consultation arranged through the Office of the Provost and VPAA or as requested by other organizations; service as an editor or

editorial board member of a discipline-related professional publication or other form of media (newspaper, magazine, literary magazine, scholarly professional journal, CD, video, website); service as a leader in the competitive review, programming, execution of an academic disciplinary conference at the regional, national, or international level; new program development; conference planning—including paper, poster, abstract reviews, etc. Application of research for assessment; program reviews; accreditation reports, including surveys created, administered, and analyzed. Evidence of unpublished discipline-specific scholarship that is peer reviewed.

Scholarship of Teaching: The scholarship of teaching “initiates students into the best values of the academy, enabling them to comprehend better and participate more fully in the larger culture.” Reciprocal benefits flow as well to the faculty members who enrich their teaching by building on what they learn in exchanges with students.

Examples: Publications of findings in a pedagogical journal or presentation with peers at a conference external to JSU; service as an editor or editorial board member of a discipline-related pedagogical publication or other form of media (newspaper, magazine, literary magazine, scholarly professional journal, CD, video, website); service as a leader in the competitive review, programming, execution of a disciplinary pedagogical conference at the regional, national, or international level.

Public Scholarship: Public scholarship can be defined as scholarly activity intended to serve the public interest. Though rooted in academic practices such as service, service learning, community or industry engagement, and civic education, public scholarship is much more than the sum of these activities.

Examples: Exercise of expertise in news publications, news broadcasts, public talks, workshops, or public events where your expertise in the discipline contributes to public knowledge on a discipline-relevant subject. This can extend to workshop events put on for the benefit of industry professionals and community members or organizations who would benefit from leveraging knowledge or theory or principles of best practice in your field of expertise.

1.5.2 Criteria for Scholarly/Creative Activity:

Scholarly/creative activity should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

- Sustained inquiry in one’s discipline during each year of service.
- Scholarly productivity demonstrated by publication or, when appropriate, creative publications, broadcast, or juried competition with creative productions.
- Submission of significant proposals for research grants and projects.
- Presentation of scholarly findings/creative work at professional meetings.
- Submission of significant program/school/university-related documents (e.g., policies/procedures, annual reports, manuals/handbooks, new program proposals, curriculum development documents required to meet accreditation requirements, etc.).

- Sharing expertise with the university community.
- Engagement with responsible news media, profession, and community where expertise and help improve civic or professional life.
- Use of research in developing new curricula, teaching methods, library services, or programs.

1.5.3 Evidence of Scholarly/Creative Activity:

Excellence in scholarly/creative activity should be assessed by evidence produced by the following types of procedures and activities:

- Documented self-report of activities.
- Evaluation by professional peers.
- Publications, presentations, and/or creative publications or productions.
- Awards of grants, prizes, commendations, residencies, or proposals submitted for external/internal funding opportunities.
- Demonstrated skills in the methods of one's scholarly discipline.
- Technical reports, program proposals, accreditation documents, or other reports that are peer evaluated.
- Community response to outreach programs, other evaluations or studies of impacts and outcomes of outreach or partnership activities that have led to scholarly reports, policies, academic and/or professional presentations, publications, etc.

1.5.4 Guidelines for Evaluators:

Some considerations of note to those performing evaluation at the departmental level:

- In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions.
- In assigning a scholarship rating in annual evaluation, the chair should use the trajectory of the faculty member's scholarship activities, up to two years prior to the evaluation period. This is to capture the trajectory of longer-term projects such as books, archival scholarship, revise-and-resubmit processes, and transitioning from completed projects to new scholarship production.

In assessing scholarly and creative work, the greatest emphasis will be given to the following (order as value criteria):

- Single-authored work, followed by
- First-authored work
- Multiple-authored work
- Peer reviewed work
- Citation of work by other scholars
- Awards or recipient of published critical acclaim

Scholarly achievement is divided into three tiers, with descending importance from Tier 1 to Tier 3. Faculty members will be evaluated based on the total points they earn and the distribution of the points among the three tiers.

Tier 1:

- a. Books published with an academic press of which the faculty member is the first or single author (3-5 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award and book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- b. Books published with an academic press of which the faculty member is not the first or single author (1-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award and book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- c. First or solo authored peer-refereed journal articles (1.5-2 points depending on the prestige¹ of the journal)
- d. Second or third authored peer-refereed journal articles (1 point)
- e. Published textbooks (2-3 points depending on the contribution of the faculty member² and the book's impact, demonstrated by factors such as the number of adoptions, prestige of the press, support letters from the publisher, winning an award and so on.)
- f. Advanced forms of public scholarship, including planning, coordination, and execution of a workshop program for industry and/or civic parties (2 points).
- g. Leadership as a program planner, division head, or as part of the core governing body in a regional, national, or international academic conference (1-3 points, depending on the profile of association and role).

¹ Indicators of journal prestige include, but not limited to the following: 1. The journal is indexed in SSCI (Social Sciences Citation Index) and H-index; 2. Number of citations; 3. International, national or regional journal; 4. Award-winning. The exact points awarded to a journal publication can be determined by members of the mentoring committee who are experts in the specific research field.

² The order of authors for a textbook may not reflect the actual contribution of the individual author. For example, one may have written the majority of chapters in a textbook but is listed as the third author because he/she joined writing the textbook long after the textbook was established.

- h. Leadership on major academic accreditation councils related to the unit's academic disciplines (2 points per role).
- i. Leadership on the editorial staff of a disciplinary research or pedagogical journal (.5-3 points, depending on the role with the journal and the profile of the journal in discipline.)

Tier 2:

- a. Peer-Refereed Conference Presentation of original research which has been blind reviewed (.5-1 point depending on the prestige of the conference and requirement of a fully-developed paper vs abstract)
- b. Proposal writer of peer-reviewed conference panel presentation when accepted (.5 point)
- c. Invited (non-refereed) or editorial reviewed journal articles & book chapter in a scholarly book (1 point)
- d. Grants and research contracts (.5-1.5 points depending on the prestigious of the granting organization and amount; more points should be assigned if the faculty member is the principal or co-investigator)
- e. Public-facing scholarship projects, such as digital editions of primary source collections with editorial/scholarly notes to aid the reader in interpreting the materials (.5-1 point depending on the scope and impact of the work; more points should be assigned if the faculty is a principal investigator, editor, or director)
- f. Invited scholarly presentation at an academic setting (.5-1 point depending on the prestige of the event)
- g. Third author and beyond journal articles (.5 point)
- h. Book chapter in a scholarly book (1 point)
- i. Academic books published with a respected trade press, of which the faculty member is the first or single author (1-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award, book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- j. Editor of a book volume with an academic press (.5-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award, book reviews published by an academic journal)
- k. Invited (non-refereed) journal articles and articles in conference proceedings (including proceedings journal, i.e. the paper is competitively selected and editorially reviewed after it is presented at an academic conference (.5-1 point), depending on the prestige of the journal, authorship order, online only (vs. print publication) and whether it is competitively selected and editorially reviewed.
- l. Public scholarship including Op-Ed pieces related to areas of professional and/or academic expertise (.5-1 point per publication, depending on profile of outlet).

- m. Service as a competition committee chair with a regional, national or international conference associated with the discipline (1 point per role).

Tier 3:

- a. Contribution to a textbook, such as excerpt or an exercise/case study in a textbook (.5 point)
- b. Encyclopedia Entries (.5 point)
- c. Published book review (.25 point)
- d. Invited scholarly presentation and speaking engagements at venues other than an academic setting (.25-.5 point depending on the prestige of the event)
- e. Non-refereed conference presentations (.25 point)
- f. Member of peer-reviewed conference panel presentation (.25 point)
- g. External grants and research contracts applied for (.25-.5 points depending on the prestige of the granting organization and amount requested; more points assigned if the faculty is principal or co-investigator)

1.5.5 Criteria Ratings for Scholarship and Creative Activity

1.5.5.1 Poor

A faculty earned 2 or fewer points.

1.5.5.2 Fair

A faculty earned 3-4 points.

1.5.5.3 Good

A faculty member must earn 5-7 points with at least 2 points from Tier 1.

1.5.5.4 Excellent

A faculty member must earn 8-10 points with at least 4 points from tier 1, with at least one journal article or book being first or solo-authored with the exception of a textbook.

For textbooks, the faculty member does not have to be the first or solo-author. Please refer to Tier 1. item e and Footnote 2 on Page 17.

1.5.5.5 Distinguished

A faculty member must earn 11 or more, with at least 8 points from tier 1.

1.6 Service/Community Engagement

The university considers service to include activities related to the university, the school/department, the community, and the profession. Community engagement, as defined by the Carnegie Campus Compact and JSU, is collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

1.6.1 Guidelines for Assessment Service and Engagement

- Along with teaching and scholarship, service is an important part of one's responsibility as a university faculty member. At the outset of their employment, the department chair will advise new faculty members about how this activity can be incorporated strategically into their work assignments. Although service may be somewhat lighter for new faculty members in the process of establishing themselves as teachers and scholars/artists than for experienced faculty members, new faculty should be encouraged to render high-quality service.
- As is the case with scholarship, some service activities are more meritorious than others. Most meritorious are those that involve major time commitments and contribute to the well-being of the department, college, university or profession. Service activities will be assessed annually.
- In general, more weight should be given to services where a faculty member holds a leadership role and services that require significant time involvement.
- In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions. The ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Associate Professor, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Professor.

1.6.2 Criteria for Service to the University/School/Department

Service should include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Service on departmental/program committees, attendance at departmental/program meetings, participation in decision-making, curriculum development, and program evaluation.
- Participation on school/university committees.
- Leadership in some area of school/university governance.
- Service as chair of a committee, director of a program, or officer of the faculty senate (without extra compensation).
- Service as an advisor to an approved student organization.
- Service as a representative of the university to the larger regional, national, or international community.
- Service as a mentor to a journal colleague in your disciplinary field.

1.6.3 Evidence of Service to the University/School/Department

Demonstration of university/school/department/program service activities should include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following types of evidence:

- Documented self-reflection of activities.
- Evaluations by the dean, department head, or program director.
- Committee reports of participation.
- Documentation of mentorship efforts on behalf of junior colleagues.

1.6.4 Criteria for Service to the Profession/Discipline

Service activities in support of the profession/discipline include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Leadership positions in professional organizations.
- Appointment in a non-scholarly capacity to a state, regional, or national post.
- Participation in professional organizations.
- Presentation of papers (other than research) before learned societies.
- Service in the individual's professional area as a consultant or resource person.
- Review of creative work (without extra compensation).

1.6.5 Evidence of Service to the Profession/Discipline

Demonstration of service to the profession/discipline should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Documented self-reflection of activities.
- Evaluation by professional peers.
- Published citations or acknowledgments of contributions.

1.6.6 Criteria for Service to the Community/Community Engagement

Service to the community should reflect the application of knowledge and skills related to one's professional field and may include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following. Community engagement activities include, but are not limited to, inquiry into community, engaged teaching and learning, and/or forms of participatory action research with community partners that embody both the characteristics of community engagement and scholarship.

- Lectures or performances to community groups.
- Participation as a member of, or as a consultant (without compensation) to, non-profit organizations designed to serve the general public.
- Service Learning. Service learning is a pedagogical technique in which students participate in volunteer community service as part of their work for class. Students apply the skills and knowledge from their classes in their service and reflect, in the classroom, on the people, organizations, agencies, and social institutions they encounter. Students use volunteer work as a foundation for their course work throughout the semester. For faculty, service learning may be considered service to the university as a part of curriculum development and, by definition, service to the community.
- Public art installations.

1.6.6 Evidence of Service to the Community/Community Engagement

Demonstration of appropriate service to the community should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Self-reflections adequately documented.
- Recognition of service by community groups or leaders.

- News articles or announcements.
- Pedagogical documents from teaching, including but not limited to, handouts, syllabi, and/or assignments.
- For community engagement, evaluation of community partnerships, documentation of community response to outreach programs, or other studies of impacts and outcomes of outreach or partnership activities that have led to scholarly reports, policies, academic and/or professional presentations, publications, etc. These examples may also reflect scholarly activities.

1.6.7 Characteristics and Rating Levels for Faculty

1.6.7.1 Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is well below the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization.
- Faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs.
- Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function(s).

Implication: Remedial work is required; May include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context. No support for tenure or promotion.

1.6.7.2 Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation).

- Spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness.
- Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

Implication: No support for tenure/promotion.

1.6.7.3 Good

Demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university.
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity.
- Usually effective in service as citizen of department.
- Balance across service obligations may be a struggle.
- Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Implication: Acceptable performance early in career is demonstrated but expectation is that service excellence is the standard that produces positive personnel decisions.

1.6.7.4 Excellent

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the department standards for excellence. Demonstrates consistent involvement in service activities.

Indicators:

- Scope and effort level are substantive with demonstrated impact.
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective.
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission.
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community.

- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as a judge in a science competition.

Implication: Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

1.6.7.5 Distinguished

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively).
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions.
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions.
- Community service provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Implication: Performance easily qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

1.7 Faculty Administrative Responsibilities to the University/School/Department

Across the university, many faculty are assigned administrative responsibilities which vary from program to program. Some faculty may serve as department heads, program coordinators, program chairs, grant coordinators, etc. The department head should evaluate the administrative assignment of the faculty to determine if the responsibilities are indeed administrative versus service activities. Faculty also serving in administrative roles should be evaluated on that role during the Faculty Annual Review. Faculty serving as department head, are evaluated by the dean.

Specific criteria and evidence to evaluate effectiveness should be determined in consultation with the department head and/or dean and align with the goal of the administrative role.

Faculty administrative responsibilities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Program oversight.
- Grant oversight.
- Recruitment/marketing.
- Program reports.
- Coordination or oversight of capstone courses, field placements, practica, co-op/internship experiences, etc.
- Program admission decisions and advisement.
- Mentorship and training of faculty.
- Assistance with program evaluation and/or accreditation activities.
- Evaluation of program outcomes.
- Overall management of an academic department.
- Program leadership and coordination of unit-level accreditation and reaffirmation efforts.

1.7.1 Evidence for Faculty Administrative Responsibilities to the University/School/ Department

Demonstration of appropriate administrative responsibilities should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Documented self-reflection of administrative responsibilities.
- Enrollment trends.
- Documented marketing activities.
- Trended program reports regarding capstone courses, field placements, practica, co-op/internship experiences etc.
- Advisement reports.
- Recruitment and retention reports.
- Program outcomes reports.
- Other reports or documentation which reflect administrative effectiveness or successful completion of responsibilities.
- All evidence sources listed may not be applicable for all administrative roles. Other evidentiary sources may be identified as appropriate.

1.8 Collegiality

1.8.1 Criteria for Collegiality

- Demonstrate a willingness and ability to work effectively with colleagues to support the mission of the university and the common goals of the academic unit, which includes working professionally with colleagues to create an academic community that values the contributions of all members and encourages cooperation and collaboration.
- Any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, will be addressed in faculty annual reviews.

1.8.2 Evidence of Collegiality

Demonstration of collegiality should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Self-reflection adequately documented.
- Effective team teaching, if applicable, as evaluated by the dean/department head.
- Letters of support by professional peers.
- Recognition of collegiality by peers, community groups, and/or leaders.
- Letters of support from committee members, program/department colleagues, colleagues external to the university.

1.9 Promotion

1.9.1 Promotion Policy

Faculty are promoted on the basis of the fulfillment of qualifications associated with teaching/advisement, scholarly activity/creative work, community engagement/service, collegiality, and/or professional effectiveness of librarians. Any credit for prior service, which has been recognized and agreed to, must be confirmed in writing in the first contract at the time of the initial appointment.

In order to deliver programs and curricula, university needs, at times, may result in unique appointments reflective of clinical and/or other special appointments in rank. This type of appointment must be approved by the dean, provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, and president.

It is expected that faculty members will apply for promotion and tenure simultaneously, whenever applicable.

Special circumstances allowed to stop the promotion/tenure clock should be nonprofessional with a significant impact on the productivity of the assistant professor and should be approved by the department head, dean, provost, and president. Requests for an extension must be submitted in writing to the department head. The faculty member is not required to request an extension if productivity is minimally impacted. Promotion/Tenure period extensions are granted in one-year increments. One year is normally the maximum probationary period extended for any combination of reasons. Requests should be made within a year of the special circumstance and prior to the department deadline for submission of promotion/tenure application. Exceptions to these limitations should be approved by the president upon recommendation by the provost.

1.9.2 Promotion Procedure

Annually, generally in September, the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs will call for nominations and applications for promotion from all faculty. The promotion process proceeds from the department head, to the dean, to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, to the president. Candidates for promotion are responsible for compiling a portfolio and for meeting appropriate deadlines. The responsibility of applying for promotion rests with the individual faculty member. The schedule for the promotion and/or tenure process can be found on the Academic Affairs website. The candidate should prepare the portfolio for submission according to the [Portfolio Guidelines](#).

Any credit for prior service, which has been recognized and agreed to, must be confirmed in writing in the first contract at the time of the initial appointment. A faculty member may request rescission of service credit as long as the request is submitted in

writing to the department head by June 1. If the faculty member has more than one year of service credit, only one year can be requested at a time. If an additional year of service credit needs to be rescinded, the faculty member will follow the same process the following academic year. The department head will review the request and notify dean and provost of recommendation. If the dean or the provost deny the recommendation, the decision is final.

Candidates for promotion must prepare a portfolio for submission according to the [Portfolio Guidelines](#). The submission process may be terminated in early stages of the review if the portfolio packet is determined to be lacking necessary evidence to support promotion. This decision may be made by the faculty member submitting the portfolio or by the dean reviewing the portfolio. Once the portfolio is submitted to the provost, the process cannot be terminated. Further, no additional evidence may be added to the portfolio once submitted to the provost.

If a faculty member begins employment between January 1 and May 31st or is promoted at the beginning of the spring semester, the partial academic or calendar year shall not count as part of the probationary period, unless by choice of the faculty member.

Assistant professors who have completed five academic years of full-time employment in a tenure-track position at the university, or who have a combination of university full-time employment and credit for prior service with a total of five complete academic years and have been reappointed for the sixth academic year, may be considered for promotion during the sixth academic year.

Associate professors who have met minimum criteria and time-in-rank requirements for promotion, including any prior service, should make application for promotion through their department heads. Any credit for prior service, which has been recognized and agreed to, must be confirmed in writing in the first contract at the time of the initial appointment. Associate professors must have a minimum of five complete years of time in rank as an associate professor, including the "year in wait." The "year in wait" refers to the academic year between applying for promotion to associate professor and the actual year of beginning in rank as associate professor. Faculty who are successful in achieving associate professor rank are eligible to apply the "year in wait" toward the numbers of years required in rank when applying for full professor.

The department head's recommendation for promotion will be based on evidence contained in the portfolio. All faculty in the candidate's discipline, department, or school having rank equivalent to, or higher than, that being sought may be allowed to review the portfolio and be invited to submit letters to the department head. The portfolio, any letters from eligible faculty in the candidate's department and/or school, and the department head's recommendation will be included in the portfolio and forwarded to the dean, who will review the portfolio and also submit a letter of recommendation to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, who will then submit a recommendation to the president. The letters of recommendation should address the degree to which the candidate meets the appropriate criteria for the rank to which the candidate is applying.

When a department head applies for promotion, the application must be accompanied by a recommendation from the dean. When a dean is applying for promotion, the application must be accompanied by a recommendation from the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. These evaluations should address the degree to which the candidate meets the appropriate criteria.

In terms of unit level review, the Department of Communication in its present composition lacks the number of tenured faculty to support a unit-level P&T committee to provide recommendations and a vote to the department head for consideration. At the present time, the department head will rely on letters of review from tenured colleagues and those of equivalent rank or above to make determinations on viability for candidacy for promotion, in conjunction with his or her review of institutional and departmental standards for demonstration of excellence in the noted areas of evaluation.

After review of the candidate's portfolio, the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, on behalf of the president, will notify the applicant of the decision. This communication will occur on or around March 1. When an application for promotion is approved, the promotion will normally be effective in the fall semester of the following academic year.

Under special circumstances, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for "early" promotion. In these instances, an exemplary record must reflect exceptional accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service/community engagement. The department head and dean must approve early promotion submissions prior to submitting to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and president for review and approval. Candidates for early promotion must follow the same process of portfolio preparation as other candidates. Early promotion may only be considered according to the following criteria:

For early promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, faculty must have served a minimum of three years as an assistant professor with a minimum of three years at JSU and must have a completed third year review on file.

For early promotion from associate professor to professor, faculty must have served a minimum of four years as an associate professor with a minimum of three years at JSU.

Exceptions to this policy may be made upon approval of the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the president.

1.9.3 Promotion Appeals

The following establishes a promotion and tenure appeals committee and procedure for promotion appeals for associate professor and professor ranks only:

1. Should the faculty member wish to appeal the decision of promotion denial, the faculty member must, within 14 working days of the date of denial letter, file an appeal with the president of the faculty senate and the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. The initial request for appeal must be initiated by a letter in writing sent by certified mail.
2. Notification of receipt of appeal request to the faculty member from the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs will occur via certified mail within 14 working days of the faculty member's request for appeal.
3. Barring unusual circumstances, the promotion appeals committee should act on the appellant faculty member's appeal within 30 working days of the receipt of the faculty member's request to appeal.
4. The promotion and tenure appeals committee shall be composed of one tenured full professor elected from each school and the library to serve. Faculty senate officers shall oversee elections to this committee, and elections shall occur in the Fall, so that the committee is in place prior to any appeal. The committee should elect the chair. Members will serve a three-year term. A committee member who is in the same department of the appellant must recuse himself/herself from the committee.
5. The provost and senior vice president for academic affairs shall make available the appellant's promotion portfolio to the promotion and tenure appeals committee. The committee shall make its decision based on the promotion portfolio as submitted to the provost and whether that evidence meets criteria for promotion as set forth in the Faculty Handbook and school/department policies.
6. The promotion and tenure appeals committee shall submit its recommendation(s) to the provost for incorporation into the candidate's portfolio. The provost shall forward the portfolio and the committee's recommendation to the president for final decision.
7. The decision of the president is final.

1.10 Tenure

1.10.1 Policy

The ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are tenure-track ranks. Other ranks are not eligible to be considered for tenure. Tenure is not automatic; it is awarded because of demonstrated performance and collegiality. Tenure-track appointments shall begin with appointment to the rank of full-time assistant professor or a higher rank.

Faculty who were tenured at another institution may request tenured status or credit toward tenure at the time of hire. Such requests shall be made to the department head and shall have the dean's recommendation to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. The provost and senior vice president for academic affairs will make a recommendation to the president for review and approval. Any credit for prior service, which has been recognized and agreed to, must be confirmed in writing in the first contract at the time of the initial appointment.

Any credit for prior service, which has been recognized and agreed to, must be confirmed in writing in the first contract at the time of the initial appointment. A faculty member may request rescission of service credit as long as the request is submitted in writing to the department head by June 1. If the faculty member has more than one year of service credit, only one year can be requested at a time. If an additional year of service credit needs to be rescinded, the faculty member will follow the same process the following academic year. The department head will review the request and notify dean and provost of recommendation. If the dean or the provost deny the recommendation, the decision is final.

Tenure-track faculty members, regardless of rank, must apply for tenure during their sixth year (inclusive of prior service credit) if they have not been granted tenure earlier. Under no circumstances should the length of the tenure-track or probationary period exceed seven years of full-time service (inclusive of prior service credit) except when the probationary period has been extended due to special circumstances approved by the department head, dean, provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, and president.

Special circumstances allowed to stop the promotion/tenure clock should be nonprofessional with a significant impact on the productivity of the assistant professor and should be approved by the department head, dean, provost, and president. Requests for an extension must be submitted in writing to the department head. The faculty member is not required to request an extension if productivity is minimally

impacted. Tenure period extensions are granted in one-year increments. One year is normally the maximum probationary period extended for any combination of reasons. Requests should be made within a year of the special circumstance and prior to the department deadline for submission of promotion/tenure application. Exceptions to these limitations should be approved by the president upon recommendation by the provost.

It is expected that faculty members will apply for promotion and tenure simultaneously, whenever applicable.

The areas in which performance will be evaluated for tenure include teaching, scholarly/creative activity, service/community engagement, and collegiality. The following are minimum requirements for tenure consideration:

1. Earned terminal degree as defined by discipline.
2. Evidence of candidate's performance and collegiality.
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness.
4. Evidence of sustained scholarly/creative activity as defined by discipline.
5. Evidence of service/community engagement to and for the university.

Tenure shall not be construed to mean that a faculty member has the right to indefinite employment. Tenure does assure that if a faculty member's employment is terminated, the faculty member must be informed of the reason(s) for termination and provided an opportunity to present his/her case before the university hearing committee (UHC).

1.10.2 Procedure

Annually, generally in September, the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs shall call for nominations and applications for tenure from all eligible faculty. The responsibility of applying for tenure and the burden of demonstrating and establishing performance and collegiality rests with the individual faculty member. The tenure process proceeds from the department head, to the dean, to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, and to the president. Candidates for tenure are responsible for compiling a portfolio and meeting appropriate deadlines. The schedule for the promotion and/or tenure process can be found on the Academic Affairs website. The candidate should prepare the portfolio according to the Portfolio Guidelines. No additional evidence may be added to the portfolio once submitted to the provost.

If a faculty member begins employment between January 1 and May 31st, the partial academic or calendar year shall not count as part of the probationary period, unless by choice of the faculty member.

It is very important that all individuals and committees participating in tenure reviews understand that any individual who has received a tenure period extension must be held to the same standard – not a higher or more stringent one—to which other candidates without such an extension are held.

All tenured faculty in the candidate's department or school may be allowed to review the portfolio and be invited to submit letters to the department head. The department head's recommendation of those applying for tenure shall be based on evidence contained in the portfolio. In terms of unit level review, the Department of Communication in its present composition lacks the number of tenured faculty to support a unit-level P&T committee to provide recommendations and a vote to the department head for consideration. At the present time, the department head will rely on letters of review from tenured colleagues and those of equivalent rank or above to make determinations on viability for candidacy for promotion, in conjunction with his or her review of institutional and departmental standards for demonstration of excellence in the noted areas of evaluation.

The portfolio, any letters from eligible faculty in the candidate's department or school, and the department head's recommendation will be included in the portfolio and forwarded to the dean. The dean will review the application and will submit a recommendation to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, who will then give a recommendation to the president. The letters of recommendation should address the degree to which the candidate meets the appropriate criteria for tenure.

After review of the candidate's portfolio, the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, on behalf of the president, will notify the applicant of the decision. This communication will occur on or around March 1. Denial of tenure results in non-reappointment/non-renewal of contract beyond the following academic year.

Regardless of the stated term or other provisions of any tenure-track appointment, written notice that a tenure-track appointment is not to be renewed shall be given to the faculty member in advance of the expiration of the appointment. Failure to issue timely notice does not constitute an award of tenure.

Exceptions to this policy may be made in unusual cases upon the approval of the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the president.

1.10.3 Tenure Appeals

The following establishes a promotion and tenure appeals committee and procedure for tenure appeals:

1. Should the faculty member wish to appeal the decision of tenure denial, the faculty member must, within 14 working days of the date of denial letter, file an appeal with the president of the faculty senate and the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. The initial request for appeal should be initiated in writing by certified mail.
2. Notification of receipt of appeal request to the faculty member from the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs will occur via certified mail within 14 working days of the faculty member's request for appeal.
3. Barring unusual circumstances, the promotion and tenure appeals committee should act on the appellant faculty member's appeal within 30 working days of the receipt of the faculty member's request to appeal.
4. The promotion and tenure appeals committee shall be composed of one tenured full professor elected from each school and the library to serve. Faculty senate officers shall oversee elections to this committee, and elections shall occur in the Fall, so that the committee is in place prior to any appeal. The committee should elect the chair. Members will serve a three-year term. A committee member who is in the department of the appellant must recuse himself/herself from the committee.
5. The provost and senior vice president for academic affairs shall make available the appellant's tenure and promotion portfolio to the promotion and tenure appeals committee. The committee shall make its decision based on the tenure and promotion portfolio as submitted to the provost and whether the evidence meets JSU criteria for tenure.
6. The promotion and tenure appeals committee shall submit its recommendation(s) to the provost for incorporation into the candidate's portfolio. The provost shall forward the portfolio and the committee's recommendation to the president for a final decision.
7. The decision of the president is final.

1.11 After-Tenure Evaluation and Development Support

In the spirit of accountability intended to strengthen the department's position as an ACEJMC accredited program, and as a means of annual development and support towards promotion beyond Associate Professor, the department of communication shall observe a post-tenure review process as part of the Faculty Annual Review (FAR) reporting.

All tenured personnel will confer with the unit head each year as part of the FAR process and will need to report on the 5 key areas of evaluation associated with the promotion and tenure process. Faculty interested in seeking promotion to full professor or distinguished professor should leverage this session as an opportunity to document their annual progression towards those roles.

Accordingly, they should produce work in line with the evaluative dimensions of performance in each category (see standards 2.1.4.6 – Professor and 2.1.4.7 – Distinguished Professor for additional institutional expectations for eligibility for promotion; Unit expectations for establishing this evidence reflects the institutional standard of “sustained” performance, meaning scholarship, teaching, and service performance should all be maintained at the same level of performance as for tenure and initial promotion, in roles appropriate aligned with the faculty member's experience). Conversely, faculty who fail to meet expectations on these five dimensions will be subject to documentation and developmental planning to improve performance, akin to traditional FAR practices at the institution.

The unit head will review the colleague's FAR self-report and will discuss appropriate balance of duties in alignment with traditional FAR processes, with the addition of dialog about the colleague's intentions and timeline in working towards the next stage of promotion.

1.12 Special Appointment and Duties Documentation

It is common practice for faculty with key skillsets to maintain a special appointment (endowments, service releases, etc.). It is also common practice for a unit head to expect an accountability report as part of annual review.

As such, faculty on special appointments will include a memo as part of their FAR report documenting productivity as it pertains to special appointments each academic year in which they serve in these roles. The unit head will review the report and serve as counsel to the faculty member on the appointment.

1.12.1 Endowed Roles

As is custom, those serving in endowed roles are eligible to hold these roles for the duration of their tenure at the institution, presuming consistent, strong performance in meeting expectations of those roles. To ensure this, the unit head will provide support in daily operations, and make discussion of goals a part of annual review with colleagues in these roles.

1.12.2 Service Releases

On occasion, the strategic needs of a department merit a service release where a faculty member's time is reassigned to focus on key service roles that support unit accreditation. In such instances, the unit head will identify colleagues who can fill key roles and discuss terms for an equitable service release equivalent to one course's workload during an academic year.

Unlike an endowed role, the decision to maintain a service release is an annual consideration as part of a faculty member's contract and will be subject to review each year as part of the FAR report. The decision to renew will be made in a balance of consideration of unit strategic priorities, faculty members' performances, and resource availability to support reassignment hires to cover courses.