

Faculty Standards and Criteria

College of Journalism and Communications

University of Florida

approved by the faculty of the College, December 15, 1995

revisions approved by the faculty of the College, Aug. 19, 1997, May 1, 1998, and April 23, 2009

Introduction

At the University of Florida, the terms of employment offered to new faculty in tenure-earning positions normally involve a five-year period of annual appointments to enable new faculty to establish their careers as teacher-scholars. During these early years, the candidate is asked to compile a record of achievement demonstrating distinction in at least two of three areas: teaching, research and creative activities, and service. Candidates who attain institutional norms for excellence and who demonstrate distinction are awarded a form of job protection that is quite unique in modern society: tenure. Arguably, decisions about whether to award tenure and/or to promote a faculty member are of unique importance. Tenure is rightly understood as a necessary component of academic freedom, the unique protection afforded scholars in higher education from political, social, and bureaucratic pressures. The strengths of the protections afforded by tenure have led, in recent years, to many attacks against the practice. The best protection against efforts to weaken or eliminate tenure (and its consequence, academic freedom) lies in faculty clearly demonstrating that tenure decisions are made with great care, deliberation, and wisdom.

This document discusses the standards and criteria by which such careful, deliberate and informed decisions are made with regard to earning tenure and promotion in departments within the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Florida. It is provided as a supplement to and clarification of the College's application of Board of Trustees and University of Florida guidelines and policies regarding tenure and promotion. It is, thus, subservient to those policies and, therefore, should be used in conjunction with such documents as the UF Faculty Handbook and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Florida Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida as well as the College Constitution. *Faculty members in each of the College's four departments are expected to meet the same criteria for tenure and promotion; hence, this document constitutes department-specific clarification of the criteria.*

Teaching and Learning

Faculty of the College of Journalism and Communications recognize the distinction between "learning" and "teaching" and the collaborative nature of the teaching-learning process. For our part, college faculty strive to provide the best possible environment in which students may learn.

Faculty help create a productive teaching-learning environment (1) by using teaching methods that are ethical; (2) by delivering instruction in substance and through methods consistent with what has been promised by the faculty member in accordance with course descriptions published by the University of Florida, and (3) by developing a teaching process and its foreseeable effects in a manner consistent with institutional and professional goals and obligations.

College faculty recognize there are multiple outcomes of effective teaching, including (1) factual learning; (2) learning new ways of thinking; (3) developing an appreciation, or motivation to pursue a career or research question introduced in class.

Faculty are committed to setting the highest standards for their own performance and depend on the active

engagement of students for the teaching-learning collaboration to be effective.

Teaching

In accordance with the University of Florida's mission, the College of Journalism and Communications recognizes "Teaching undergraduate and graduate through doctorate" students as its fundamental purpose. To demonstrate "distinction" in teaching, two general questions must be addressed: (1) Do the faculty member's teaching and other instructional activities have merit? and (2) Does the faculty member perform appreciably better than the average faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field as reflected in student evaluations and peer and administrative reviews?

In determining "average faculty member," reviewers will consider faculty of similar rank in the candidate's field across the nation and at peer institutions rather than only faculty within the University or the candidate's college or department.

"Distinction" is demonstrated by above-average performance over the complete time period being reviewed for an individual candidate and not by above-average performance in any one class or one academic year. Excellent performance in one class during one semester alone does not demonstrate "distinction." Likewise, below-average performance in one class during one semester does not preclude "distinction."

What Is Considered When Determining Distinction?

To earn "distinction" in teaching, faculty must demonstrate above-average performance in teaching quality in accordance with individual faculty assignments. Faculty teaching performance review will include:

- Teaching and Other Instructional Activities: Ordinarily, faculty are expected to be judged "above average" in productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit, in peer and administrative reviews of teaching and other instructional activities.

- Student Evaluations: Ordinarily, faculty ratings from the State University System (SUS) Teaching Evaluation Form are expected to be substantially above "average," that is, substantially above a 3.0 on a 1-5 scale where 1 is "Poor" and 5 is "Excellent."

When determining if faculty performance on student evaluations, teaching and other instructional activities is above average, reviewers will consider factors, such as size and level of course, difficulty of course, number of times a faculty member has taught a course, and innovative approaches being tested by faculty that might influence the ratings.

What Are Considered "Teaching" or "Other Instructional Activities"?

In accordance with individual faculty assignments, "teaching" or "other instructional activities" include:

- Regular class instruction, including instruction in laboratory and professional work settings, e.g., college's media, and supervision, evaluation and grading of class-related work;
- Direction of and serving on committees for student projects, including dissertations, theses, competitions, and independent studies;
- Student advising;
- Curriculum and program development;
- Training and supervision of graduate and/or teaching assistants;
- And other teaching-related activities, e.g., research related to teaching; organization and participation in seminars on teaching; continuing education in the form of workshops and campus teaching-improvement programs; organizing and conducting credit and non-credit workshops for practicing professionals.

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching and Other Instructional Activities

Review of individual faculty teaching activities will focus on productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit, and the overall contribution of a faculty member's teaching activities to accomplishing the teaching mission of the University and College. The following issues will be considered, consistent with the faculty member's teaching assignment and nature of the courses. That is, not every criterion applies to every faculty member or every course.

Regular classroom instruction

(a) Course Syllabi: Do syllabi reflect current state of knowledge for the subject? Are they provided to students at the first class meeting each term?

(b) Course Objectives: Are the course objectives reasonable? Are the syllabus and course well organized? Are the objectives consistent with the mission of the department's curriculum? Does the course complement or needlessly replicate content of other courses in the department or college?

(c) Classroom Presentation of Content: Is the material logically arranged and consistent with stated course objectives? Is the content accurate, current and comprehensive?

(d) Materials provided to students in the class: Are the materials relevant to the course objectives? Are the materials current? Are the materials easily understood and utilized by students?

(e) Text and/or Assigned Readings: Are the text and/or assigned readings appropriate to the course objectives? Are the text and/or assigned readings current? Appropriate emphasis will be given this criterion for faculty who are not solely responsible for selection of the text and/or assigned readings.

(f) Assignments and Term Papers/Projects: Are the assignments/papers/projects appropriate to the course objectives? Are they challenging? Are they appropriate in frequency and length?

(g) Examinations: Is the content of the examinations appropriate for promised course content? Do the examinations focus on important aspects of the course with appropriate breadth and depth?

(h) Student Performance: How well do students perform on assignments, term projects/papers? Were student efforts accepted for presentation or publication? Did the student work receive special recognition or win awards?

(i) Performance in Assigning Appropriate Grades, including grade distribution and justification and comparison of a faculty member's grade distribution to comparable sections, the department, and the college: Was the grading fair and consistent? Were the standards for grading clearly presented to the students? Were the standards consistent with the department's and the college's?

(j) Performance in Justifying Grades to students via written comments or other helpful feedback, for example comments on projects or term papers: How did the faculty member provide feedback? Was feedback appropriate for the class objectives? Did the faculty member provide constructive comments on papers and tests?

(k) Originality/Creativity: Did the faculty member make improvements or create new teaching techniques, policies, or procedures? Was the contribution significant?

Direction of Student Projects, including Theses, Dissertations, Independent Studies & Team Competitions

(a) Productivity and Merit, with emphasis on Merit: How many theses and dissertations has the faculty member directed? What was the quality of these theses, dissertations and independent studies? Were the projects accepted for presentation or publication? Did the efforts receive special recognition or win any awards?

(b) Originality: To what extent did the faculty member foster independent and original thinking among students and inspire them to pursue the subject on their own?

Student Advising

(a) Productivity and Merit, with emphasis on Merit: Did the faculty member take an active interest in students' individual academic and career choices? How well informed is the faculty member about department, college and university policies and procedures that are of concern to an advisee? How many students did the faculty member advise? What was the quality of the product of these efforts?

(b) Originality: Did the instructor create materials, policies or procedures to facilitate and enhance the process and/or outcome of student advisement? Was the contribution significant?

Curriculum and Program Development

(a) Productivity and Merit, with emphasis on Merit: Did the faculty member contribute to the currency and comprehensiveness of curriculum and program development? Was the contribution significant?

(b) Originality: Did the instructor publish research or create materials, policies, or procedures that contribute to curriculum and program development? Was the contribution significant?

Training and Supervision of Graduate and/or Teaching Assistants

(a) Productivity and Merit, with emphasis on Merit: Did the faculty member take an active interest in training and supervising graduate and/or teaching assistants assigned to the faculty member? How many were supervised? How were they trained? What was the outcome of the training/supervision? Did the trainees win awards in recognition of their teaching?

(b) Originality: Did the instructor create or innovate materials, policies or procedures to facilitate and enhance the training and/or supervision of graduate and/or teaching assistants?

Additional Evidence of Teaching Accomplishment

Additional evidence may be provided by faculty members to demonstrate the merit of their teaching. The following list suggests the type of additional evidence that may be provided:

- (a) Unsolicited letters from students;
- (b) Letters from peers or professionals, including evaluations of guest lectures;
- (c) Research related to teaching journalism and communications;
- (d) Organization of and participation in seminars on teaching;
- (e) Continuing education in the form of workshops and campus teaching-improvement programs;
- (f) Organizing and conducting credit and non-credit workshops for practicing professionals.

Research and Creative Accomplishment

An important factor in determining merit for tenure and/or promotion shall be evidence of a faculty member's contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the field in the form of research or creative achievements. According to the University of Florida Regulations, evidence of scholarly productivity is an expectation for all assistant, associate and full professors.

While the evidence used to demonstrate excellence may vary, evaluation of scholarly work and creative activities for tenure and promotion at all ranks will address the relevance, continuity, accomplishment, and significance of the work. Because the specific criteria for evaluating research and creative work can differ somewhat, each is addressed separately below.

What follows is a guide for both candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion and for the committees that

will evaluate them. Tenure and promotion committees reach decisions regarding tenure or promotion based on the totality of the candidate's achievements rather than on the basis of a set of sufficient criteria. Candidates should be aware that there is no checklist that guarantees tenure. Even if it were possible to craft such a list, the standards for research accomplishment have evolved over the history of the college and will likely continue to do so.

Research

The solicited views of senior external referees (Full Professors) must indicate that the candidate's work has made a significant contribution, sufficient to be recognized for its quality nationally and internationally. The process of selecting these external referees is outlined elsewhere in this document.

The inclusion in a tenure/promotion packet of sole-authored publications is neither necessary nor sufficient for tenure. That said, sole-authored publications provide committees with the clearest evidence of a candidate's merit because they demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to formulate and execute a research idea, conduct all necessary analyses, prepare a manuscript, submit the work for publication, and carry out revisions mandated by peer review. Multi-authored publications, in contrast, are more ambiguous with respect to whether the candidate has all of the necessary skills for publishing research findings. This is not meant to suggest that candidates should avoid collaboration. Rather, candidates should consider the benefits of pursuing both sole-authored and collaborative works. Candidates should be advised that sole-authored publications are the clearest indicators of one's contribution to scholarship and are so recognized by many college and university faculty and by many external reviewers.

Collaborative research, both among college colleagues and with faculty in other parts of the University of Florida and at other institutions, is valued and of growing importance in the study of mass communication. Collaboration enriches the research program, and teams of researchers with different areas of expertise are increasingly essential to progress in many research areas. Multi-authored publications do, however, pose a special challenge for evaluators in judging whether the scholarly output provides sufficient evidence of the research abilities and likelihood of future success of the tenure or promotion candidate. First-authored publications that provide evidence that the faculty member is a driving force in a portion of the collaborative work (in addition to any second-, third-, or nth-authored papers) are important for providing evidence of excellence. In cases where the team may be publishing in outlets following traditions from a field (such as medicine) where authorship positions have a different conventional meaning, the faculty member should explain the convention and describe his/her role in the project to evaluators. This role should also be described in cases in which the faculty member's graduate student is first author on a paper. Grant proposals on which the faculty member is principal investigator help provide evidence for the ability of the faculty member to develop and articulate a compelling program of research. However, grant proposals, while important, are not a substitute for publications, so untenured faculty should strive for a balance of writing activities that allows time for both publication and pursuit of funding.

In evaluating a candidate's research, it is expected that the work will be subject to peer or juried review and will demonstrate high standards of relevance, continuity, accomplishment, and significance. In their tenure and promotion packets, candidates should carefully describe how their work meets these criteria and provide documentation of peer or juried review.

Relevance in research means that the work should be related to the college curriculum and the candidate's academic training, teaching area, or professional activities. **Continuity** in research is based upon the faculty member's identification of intellectual focus and clear agenda for research or creative activity, as well as evidence of growth and consistency of effort. The record should reflect the establishment of an independent program. The term "program" in this case usually reflects a consistent and common thread of emphasis of the research. Some works may be in collaboration with others, but the candidate should exhibit leadership in his/her field. **Accomplishment** in research refers to the consistency and quantity of research output during the period assessed for tenure and/or promotion. **Significance** pertains to actual or likely impact of the work on the field. Among the qualities to be considered in evaluating the significance of research are: originality; contribution to theory and/or practice; difficulty or complexity of the subject matter; thoroughness of analysis; scope, depth and substance of subjects covered; reputation and selectivity of the forum in which it is presented, and whether the work is refereed, juried or invited; the influence on other work as indicated by citations; and a publication's quality (its review, competitiveness, acceptance rate, and/or circulation, among other indicators.)

Evaluation of Research and Creative Accomplishment

The nature of the research/creative performance will vary from one academic or professional field to another, but the general test to be applied is that the faculty member be engaged continuously and effectively in research and/or creative activities of high quality and significance. The quality of such efforts should be the primary measure of achievement.

The review process includes an assessment of the individual's overall intellectual and creative development, the strength of an emerging and/or growing and coherent body of work, the regularity of publication or presentation, and the person's reputation for excellence in the field. When an individual is being evaluated in two or more distinct lines of research or creative work, regularity of publication or presentation will be assessed over the total body of work.

In evaluating research and creative accomplishment, the candidate's output should be appreciably better in quality and quantity than that of the average faculty member of the same rank in the same discipline at like universities, and it should be in accordance with his/her faculty assignment.

Contributions to literature and to professional practice may be judged creative if they demonstrate new ideas and scholarly activity. In fields such as graphic design, photography, film and video, peer or juried performance and exhibition may be a measure of excellence.

"Distinction" connotes performance appreciably better than that of the average faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field. The record shall contain evidence that such a comparative judgment has been made.

All works of a faculty member are important in the consideration for national/international reputation and promotion. For tenure consideration, however, it is particularly important to demonstrate a record of work published, produced or exhibited while at the University of Florida.

Indicators of Research and Creative Accomplishment

Typical indicators of research and creative accomplishment include: articles in refereed journals; book chapters; essays/entries in encyclopedias; articles/essays in non-refereed professional journals and magazines; books and monographs; textbooks and edited volumes for instruction; abstracts, book reviews and reviews of creative activities; papers presented at professional meetings; exhibitions, performances, commissioned works, audio/visual materials developed or other like creative works; software; patents and copyrights; contracts and grants submitted or funded.

Appendix A provides additional information regarding these indicators and their presentation in the faculty member's file.

General Criteria for Evaluation of Research and Creative Accomplishment

Authorship. (The items listed here are guidelines with likely exceptions. These are suggestions as to how others might view authorship and are not presented as universal. To be accurate, candidates should provide a brief summary of their contributions to works involving multiple authors.)

(1) Jointly authored publications and presentations are considered, but the candidate should balance these with single-author contributions.

(2) First-author publications are rated higher than coauthorships within a particular publication category.

(3) First authorships are important in documenting individual initiative, abilities and in developing national/international reputations.

(4) Generally, one third to two thirds of publications of junior faculty are anticipated to be of first authorship. Senior faculty with multiple graduate students often have a lower fraction of first-author publications.

(5) More emphasis will be given to coauthorships where the faculty member is/was the major professor or the resident research advisor of the first author.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to identify and document his/her contributions as an author. For single-authored works, the work itself is sufficient documentation; for multiple-authored works, a statement from one or

more coauthors indicating the faculty member's contribution may be included in the faculty member's file.

Refereed publications are rated higher than nonrefereed ones.

(1) It is expected that a number of a tenure-accruing faculty member's publications will be in refereed journals appropriate to the faculty member's area of communications expertise. Law Reviews are an accepted exception to peer reviewed publications for faculty whose expertise is in communications law. For all faculty, it is important that scholarly and creative performance be documented by peer review in which the faculty member's distinctive contributions to the field of communications scholarship are assessed.

(2) As a national/international reputation is established, a greater percentage of a faculty member's publications may naturally appear in book chapters, review articles, etc.

Publications of all types are evaluated individually. Highest ratings are given to papers published in the highest-quality journals appropriate for the area of study of the faculty member being evaluated. Papers published in journals that solicit articles by paying for those published will not be rated as highly as those which do not pay authors. Papers listed as "refereed" in proceedings or in publications whose contributions are not consistently or uniformly refereed are not considered to be strong publications.

Papers that present important new information will be rated higher than those which simply confirm the studies of others. Review articles, therefore, are not rated as highly as papers presenting original data or new information. Review articles are also evaluated individually as to journal quality, significance and impact on the field, breadth of the review, etc.

Works which require major efforts to produce will be rated higher than those with lesser efforts. Major efforts may need to be expended in complex studies with difficult and/or time-consuming techniques and in ones with large amounts of data to be generated and analyzed.

Reports and brief communications are not generally rated as highly as full papers.

Significance (defined above) or quality is prized over quantity. The appropriate number of research/creative works for tenure and/or promotion depends on both an individual's time assignments and on the quality of the publications.

Faculty should identify research/creative works that contributed significant new knowledge to their field of study.

SERVICE

University of Florida standards of service provide the basic foundation for the commitment to academic service in the College of Journalism and Communications. The broad criteria of service applied throughout the campus also apply here. In accordance with university policy, special emphasis is given to service that benefits the community colleges and public schools in Florida. The College of Journalism and Communications also puts special emphasis on service to communications media and related professions and to state and local government agencies.

The college has historically gained a measure of recognition and respect from other similar academic institutions throughout the nation because of the very nature of our service mission. Faculty involvement in service directly related to professional and scholarly expertise in advertising, journalism, public relations and telecommunication has assisted this college in attaining a unique position among our peer groups.

The undergraduate area of our mission has been enriched through faculty participation in educational programs for newspapers, magazines, electronic publications, commercial and non-commercial broadcast facilities and production units, public relations firms, corporate communication and numerous similar entities in the government and public sectors. It is essential that this service continue and be recognized.

Faculty with a major assigned responsibility for and significant faculty assignment in service (i.e. 15% FAR or more each semester and, for 12-month faculty, summer session) may include service as one of the two categories (besides teaching) in which they earn the distinction necessary for tenure or promotion. Evidence in this category must demonstrate the faculty member's leadership performance in service and, for promotion to [full] professor, a national or international reputation for his/her service contributions and achievements.

Our college subscribes to the goal of providing service that furthers the mission of the university, including service on departmental, college, and university committees, councils, and senates; service in appropriate professional organizations; participation in professional meetings, symposia, conferences, workshops; and service on local, state and national governmental boards, agencies, and commissions. Service standards as set forth by the Florida Board of Regents are fully supported by our college.

Highest priority is given these services in our college:

- Service directly related to the professional/scholarly expertise of the faculty member.
- Service to the college and university through work and leadership on committees.

--Service to public schools and community colleges of Florida.

Process

Feedback to Faculty

All faculty receive feedback regarding their performance through annual written evaluations by department chairs. In addition to these annual written evaluations, because tenure and promotion decisions represent a substantial commitment by the college and because time working toward tenure represents a large commitment of talent and effort by an individual, tenure-accruing faculty are provided with additional information about their progress through:

- (1) Annual formal meetings with their department chairs,
- (2) A pre-tenure review of their accomplishments from the department through the college level, usually performed during the third year, and
- (3) Classroom observations of teaching in the third year of service or the year before applying for tenure (and, for tenured faculty, in the year prior to applying for promotion), and
- (4) Student evaluations.

All tenure and promotion reviews shall be based on the College "Faculty Standards and Criteria" document which complies with criteria set forth in the University of Florida Regulations ("Rules of Department of Education, Division of Universities, University of Florida") and in the "Guidelines and Information" prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that the tenure and/or promotion packet is complete and contains all the information pertinent to the nomination.

Annual Meeting With Department Chair

Department chairs shall have a formal, face-to-face meeting with each tenure-accruing faculty member prior to preparing the annual evaluation. An interactive meeting permits the chair to obtain richer information than can be gleaned from a written report. It also permits the chair to provide specific and pointed feedback to the candidate about progress toward tenure and promotion. The chair may wish to discuss specific issues related to teaching, research accomplishments, and service contributions. The chair may also be able to offer specific advice about coping with teaching pressures, finding research resources, professional opportunities, etc. The outcome of this meeting should be noted in the annual evaluation letter that is prepared by the Department Chair and it will become part of the candidate's personnel file. The candidate should be afforded the opportunity to prepare a written response to the final evaluation letter which may also be added to his/her file.

Pre-Tenure and Pre-Promotion Year Reviews

Tenure-accruing faculty in the Spring of their third year of service or any other faculty member who elects to be reviewed, and tenured faculty in the year prior to applying for promotion to professor, are required to prepare a packet documenting their accomplishments according to the timetable in Appendix B. These packets are reviewed at the college level in the same manner as the sixth-year review. Candidates will provide evidence of accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service in the format used by candidates applying for tenure and promotion. The critical difference in the type of information provided for the pre-tenure/pre-promotion assessment versus the actual tenure/promotion review is that, for the early assessment, the candidate will not be required to solicit outside letters of recommendation. This review process is confidential to the extent provided by law and is internal to the college. Therefore, no written appraisal of the candidate shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file, included in the faculty member's subsequent tenure dossier or used in any way in future evaluations of the candidate for tenure. Candidates shall have the right to formally respond to the evaluations within five calendar days of receiving the relevant assessment and shall meet with the dean to receive the dean's assessment and to discuss the Committee's review and the dean's evaluations.

In conjunction with the college-wide pre-tenure assessment, departments are strongly encouraged to determine

appropriate and useful ways to organize a similar pre-tenure assessment procedure. However, because the Tenure and Promotion Committee includes representatives from each department and because faculty from each of the College's four departments are expected to meet the same standards, no separate departmental assessment procedure is required.

This early review is a beneficial procedure for both the candidate and the College. Candidates receive early, specific feedback about their performance in teaching, research, and service. This allows the candidate to assess his/her likelihood of receiving tenure given the accomplishments of two and a half years or to be awarded promotion to professor based on his/her record in these areas. In many cases the review may indicate that the candidate is making good progress and that only minor alterations in teaching or research productivity are needed. In other cases, a candidate may come to understand that he or she is not performing at a sufficient level to reasonably expect a positive tenure or promotion decision. This person will be spared from spending additional time in pursuit of an unreachable goal. In some middle cases, an early review may provide the impetus for candidates to make important changes midstream that help them to become more suitable prospects for tenure and promotion. Finally, early review may help some candidates to decide whether they will apply for tenure prior to their sixth year of credited service. Early review also is intended to stimulate untenured faculty to prepare and maintain materials that will be needed for the tenure application in their sixth years.

Early review provides the college with several important benefits as well. It allows the college to provide feedback about a candidate's progress before the sixth year, when such feedback is concomitant with a final tenure decision. If a candidate for tenure or promotion includes the review in his/her packet, it also provides the Committee with an appraisal from the midpoint of the candidate's term of service. Early review provides a way to ensure college standards of excellence regarding teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service will be salient to beginning faculty members. Finally, early review helps the college to encourage candidates not making satisfactory progress toward promotion and tenure to find employment that is better suited to their talents and abilities.

Classroom observations

Untenured faculty and tenured faculty planning to apply for promotion should be formally observed in each class they teach in the pre-tenure assessment year or the year prior to applying for promotion, respectively.

For the pre-tenure or pre-promotion review, classroom observations will be conducted by (1) two faculty of higher rank from the candidate's department and (2) a faculty member of higher rank from within the college and outside the candidate's department. Candidates and their department chairs will agree on potential reviewers in and out of the department. The department chair will then ask the identified faculty members to conduct the review.

For classroom observations during the pre-tenure/pre-promotion year assessment, observers will work out a schedule for classroom visitation with the faculty member. Observers may also wish to have a pre-observation or post-observation meeting with the faculty member. It is recommended that the faculty member be consulted concerning whether he/she would prefer that any specific member of the college not serve as a classroom observer. Observers should discuss in advance a format for the visitation and should work from a set of guidelines dealing with what is to be observed. Observations should result in a written appraisal detailing specific strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching style and skills. During the pre-tenure/pre-promotion assessment year, this document should also provide specific recommendations for improvement. The faculty member shall have one week from receipt of the peer evaluations of teaching to prepare written responses to each assessment document. The evaluators shall then have one week to amend their assessments, or to present written reactions to the faculty member's responses.

Student Evaluations

Student evaluations must be administered in every class and section for each course taught during fall and spring semesters and summer session.

Faculty are encouraged to have evaluations from at least 60 percent of students who complete a course. To accomplish this goal, faculty are encouraged to publish in the course syllabus that evaluations will occur in the last three weeks of the semester and/or to announce the evaluation date several times in class and well in advance.

Faculty are encouraged to provide in their packets their explanations of and comments on student course evaluations.

Departmental Action

The faculty member initiates the process for tenure and promotion. Eligible faculty members review the packets and vote by secret ballot, for or against tenure and/or promotion. Within five calendar days, the chair reports the results of the vote to the candidate, the dean, and the chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The department vote must take place prior to the review conducted by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

After eligible members of the department has voted, the department chair submits a letter including his/her written assessment of the candidate's qualifications with reference to the college's/department's written clarifications of the University's tenure criteria and makes his/her recommendation as to whether the candidate should be granted tenure and/or promotion. This letter will include elements listed in the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement's Article 19 (listed in Section 19.9.f.2 (a-d)). Within five days of writing this letter, the department chair shall give a copy of the written assessment and recommendation to the candidate, before adding it to the candidate's tenure dossier. The candidate then shall have 10 days from receipt of the department chair's letter to submit a written response. The candidate's response, if any, shall be included in the tenure dossier. The chair shall not forward the dossier to the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee until either the candidate submits a response, indicates in writing that he/she will not be submitting a response or the 10-day period for responding expires, whichever occurs first.

College Tenure and Promotion Committee

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee is an elected committee of eight faculty, as specified in the College Constitution. Faculty on the Committee are elected for two years (followed by a minimum of one year of ineligibility for reappointment). Terms are staggered so that each department normally has one new and one second-year representative. This helps to ensure the committee possesses experience with procedures, criteria, and standards for tenure and promotion. It also helps to ensure stability and consistency in the committee's performance from year to year. Committee members review the tenure and promotion packets, meet, and discuss the facts of each candidacy. Once the reviews are complete, the committee members provide individual assessments of whether the candidate meets the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The individual faculty members are not identified in connection with their assessments. After having completed their review and the individual assessments, committee members meet with the dean and provide an oral summary of the review, including a summary of the individual assessments, to the dean. Within five days of this meeting, the dean forwards those assessments to the candidate and his/her department chair. The candidate has 10 days from receipt of the Committee's assessments to submit a written response or to request a meeting with the dean to discuss the procedures used in the consideration of the candidate's case, the Committee's assessments, and the candidate's qualifications for tenure. The candidate's response, if any, shall be included in the tenure dossier.

Outside Evaluators

No more than one outside evaluator may have his/her primary knowledge of the candidate from serving as a teacher, mentor, or fellow student to the candidate. In addition, the candidate should clearly note in the descriptions of potential evaluators provided to the Committee whether the proposed letter writer knows of the candidate primarily through such a relationship.

Access to Outside Evaluations

Candidates have the option of waiving access to outside evaluations. The Committee should present all candidates with a form including the following language when candidates and department chairs submit their list of proposed outside evaluators to the Committee:

Candidates applying for tenure and promotion at the University of Florida have the right to access all information that becomes part of their application packet. The College of Journalism and Communications, as part of its normal procedures for considering a candidate for tenure and/or promotion, solicits letters of evaluation from respected outside reviewers. Such letters are likely to be considered most informative and frank by departments and the college when an applicant waives his or her right of

access. Please note that letter writers will be notified as to whether you have waived access to the letters or not.

I waive my right to view outside letters of evaluation solicited by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee

I DO NOT waive my right to view outside letters of evaluation solicited by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee

Procedures for Documenting and Making Changes in Final Packet Submitted for Tenure and/or Promotion

By university policy, once the candidate has submitted the complete tenure packet for review, normally only minor corrections or changes may be made to the packet and only if such changes have direct relevance to the tenure and/or promotion packet and do not alter the substantive nature of the document. Conclusions about a candidate's merits reached at different stages in the tenure process must be based on substantially similar evidence. Therefore, it is important to ensure that applicants present the most substantive case for tenure and/or promotion in the packet before the final submission date to the department and before the review process begins at the department level.

The following procedures should be followed:

- a. Candidates should solicit feedback about tenure/promotion application materials as early as possible. Spring semester of the academic year before tenure/promotion review is ideal. Senior faculty, the appropriate department chair, and the Dean's Administrative Assistant are all useful sources of feedback about the organization and constitution of a tenure packet. The university typically sponsors workshops on preparing the packet each year. Untenured faculty and tenured faculty planning to apply for promotion should be encouraged to attend these in the year prior to a review.
- b. Any changes to a tenure packet after the packet is declared complete by the department chair and Dean's Administrative Assistant should be noted in a log to be included in the tenure packet. The log should note the reason for the change, the nature of the change, the person making the change, the date of the change, and the candidate's signature acknowledging the change. This log should be available to all subsequent reviewers of the packet. When any material is added to, deleted from, or changed by anyone other than the candidate, a copy of all additions and deletions and other changes must be sent to, or in the case of deletion, explained to the faculty member within five calendar days. Within ten calendar days, the faculty member may provide a brief response which is added to the packet.
- c. To reiterate: normally, substantial revisions or changes in the packet are advised only if they reflect information which was unavailable to the candidate at the time of final submission. In most cases, a packet that is seriously deficient or unpolished should be returned to the candidate, and the candidate should, if appropriate and permissible, consider reapplying the following year. In all cases, it is the responsibility of candidates applying for tenure or promotion to prepare packets that conform to departmental, college, and university standards.
- d. The faculty member shall be informed of all decisions and the status of the tenure and/or promotion packet at each level of the College process within five calendar days of the completion of the review at that level. Within ten calendar days of being informed of the results of the department review, including the chairperson's and dean's recommendations, the faculty member may request a meeting with the appropriate administrator to respond. The dean shall provide to the candidate, in writing, reasons for the recommendation.
- e. All packets are forwarded to the Academic Personnel Board and to the president for final action.

Appendix A

Indicators of Research/Creative Accomplishment and Their Presentation in the Faculty Member's Packet

A. Creative Works. List exhibitions, performances, commissioned works, audio/visual materials developed, software written, or other like creative works. Published critical reviews of these creative works should be included in this section.

1. Published, juried or competitively recognized productions, writing for print media, film, radio, television. For each entry provide a brief description of the production, including title, format, length, nature of the faculty member's contribution to the project (e.g., writer, reporter, editor, designer, producer, director, cinematographer, response and/or critical reaction awards or prizes). Please note that the list that follows is alphabetical and does not reflect relative value.

Audio recordings; Campaigns; Graphic design and typography; Investigative reporting; Magazine articles; Media releases; Motion pictures; Multi-media presentations; Newspaper series; Photographic presentations; Public service messages; Radio programs or series; Radio programs or series script(s); Screenplay or teleplay; Short film or single television program script under sixty minutes; Story treatment for film or television; Television program proposal; Television programs or series; Television series presentation; Video presentations.

2. Other, non-juried productions. (Use above categories.)
3. Performance in a film, radio or television program or series. For each performance indicate title of film or program, role, length or role distribution, public response and/or other critical reaction, awards or prizes.
4. Other public performance, exhibition or production. Describe and note relationship to teaching or creative activity assignment(s).

B. Patents and Copyrights. Please include date(s) with each item and give an indication of the significance of its (their) contribution to the profession.

C. Publications should be listed chronologically or in reverse chronological order. The format of the citation is the nominee's choice, but should contain the information requested below. Please include the names of all authors. The name(s) of the senior/principal author(s) is/are to be underlined.

1. Books, Sole Author (Title, Publisher, Place of Publication, Date, # of Pages)
2. Books, Co-authored (Co-author(s), Title, Publisher, Place of Publication, Date, # of Pages)
3. Books, Edited (Editor, Co-editor(s), Title, Publisher, Place of Publication, Date, # of Pages)
4. Books, Contributor of Chapter(s) (Author, Co-author(s), Title of Book and Chapter, Publisher, Place of Publication, Date, # of Pages)
5. Monographs (Author, Co-author(s), Title, Series of Volume, if applicable, Publisher, Place of Publication, Date, # of Pages)
6. Refereed Publications (Author, Co-author(s), Title, Name of Journal, Publication, etc., Volume, Date, Inclusive Pages)
7. Non-refereed Publications (Author, Co-author(s), Title, Name of Journal, Bulletin, Circular, etc., Volume, Date, Inclusive Pages)
8. Bibliographies/Catalogs (Author, Co-author(s), Title, Publisher, if applicable, Place of Publication, Date, Inclusive Pages)

9. Abstracts (Author, Co-author(s), Title, Name of Journal, Publications, etc., Volume, Date, Inclusive Pages)
10. Reviews (Author, Co-author(s), Title and Author of Work Reviewed, Where Review was Published, Date, Inclusive Pages)
11. Miscellaneous (Author, Co-author(s), Title, Source of Publication, Date, Inclusive Pages). Please note that the list that follows is alphabetical and does not reflect relative value.
 - a. Audio-visual research publications such as oral history, etc.
 - b. Citations by others in scholarly or professional books and journals. For each citation provide the following: author, title of book, journal, or article; date; page. Include title of work which was cited.
 - c. Editorships of professional and scholarly journals.
 - d. Electronic publication of research results.
 - e. Expert testimony based on professional qualifications and experience in court cases or before governmental committees or agencies.
 - f. Mass media-related software patented, widely accepted, or peer reviewed.
 - g. Memoranda or briefs of law.
 - h. Research or creative consultation, paid or unpaid, which emphasizes systematic data collection and analysis and which results in a tangible product.
 - i. Translations.
 - j. Work in progress. For each entry give indication about publication or presentation plans.
 - k. Working papers/reports.

The following information should be considered when compiling the publication listing:

1. A paper is considered to be refereed if it appears in a journal or proceedings whose papers are published only after review and acceptance by one or more independent advisor professional expert(s) of national or international standing.
2. Refereed proceedings should be listed as a separate category under Refereed Publications and the candidate should provide a brief explanation of the review process for the proceedings. This may be listed as a footnote to the publication list.
3. Materials listed under non-refereed publications should include not only those journal articles which have not been refereed, but also extension publications delivered in print or via electronic format, and electronic bulletins.
4. When listing publications, please do not use the term "forthcoming." Use one of the following:
 - a. **accepted or in press** - publication has been accepted by the publisher and will appear in print in the future. If a publication listed is "accepted" or "in press" a copy of the letter of acceptance must be attached to the back of the packet. Please write the name of the article on the acceptance if it is not already stated and indicate the approximate length of the publication. These letters should appear in the same order as the articles appear in the publication listing.
 - b. **submitted** - publication has been submitted to a publisher for review. Those publications in category "a" may be part of the requested publication list. Publications in category "b" are to be at the rear of the packet under "Further Information." If the publication is still in the writing stage, please do not include it in the packet. Books which are under contract but have not yet been completed are to be listed under "Further Information."
5. Graduate students, post-docs, residents, fellows and interns listed as authors should be identified. The preferred way is by means of asterisk with a footnote explaining what the asterisk identifies.
6. Be sure that pagination is listed correctly. If an article is longer than one page, give first and last page numbers.
7. Media releases picked up by major media are considered "Miscellaneous" publications.

8. "Reviews" are to be used for reviews written by the nominee. Reviews of a nominee's works, if included, should be listed under "Further Information."
9. Publication citations including words in foreign language should have the English translation listed in parenthesis.
10. All publications must appear in one of the categories provided.
11. Theses and dissertations are not to be included in the publication listing.

D. Lectures, speeches or posters presented at professional conferences/meetings since last promotion (not to exceed ten years) or last five years for tenure nominees, whichever is more recent. This listing is to be categorized by type of meeting/conference, i.e., international, national, regional, state, local, etc. The entries must also tell if the lecture/speech was invited. The list should include separate categories for invited seminars, refereed papers presented at such meetings, and participation as an invited panelist, organizer, moderator, program chairperson or discussant/evaluator.

E. Contracts and grants funded since the last promotion (not to exceed ten years) or during the last five years for tenure nominees, whichever is more recent. Each entry should include the effective dates of the contract/grant, the value, the name of the funding agency, and the role of the nominee, i.e., PI, Co-PI or researcher. Additional information regarding contract and grant funding may be listed as an appendix under "Further Information." If applicable, this should include funding received while employed by another institution. Other information might include method of publication of results.

F. Consultations outside the university. This area is used for consultations which are not part of the nominee's assigned duties and responsibilities. There should be an indication of the work performed, the organization/employer, and the date(s).

Evaluating Specific Indicators of Research and Creative Accomplishment

As to specific criteria for research and creative activities, the methods of appraisal vary among disciplines. Although the kind of appraisals **suggested** below need not be provided for all of a faculty member's research and creative attainments, it often will be useful in evaluative statements to characterize the main body or the major pieces of work in these terms, keeping in mind the major criteria of relevance, continuity, significance and accomplishment.

A. Articles in refereed journals.

1. What is the scope of the journal? International, national, regional, etc.?
2. What is the standing of the journal in the discipline?
3. How rigorous is the reviewing process, including the standards applied and the acceptance rate?
4. Has the article or essay been widely cited in the profession?
5. Have its findings or concepts significantly advanced knowledge in the field?

B. Chapters in books and essays/entries in encyclopedias.

1. What is the standing or importance of the book in which the chapter or essay appears?
2. What is the standing of the editor, and what standards did he/she apply in selecting authors, chapters, and essays?
3. Has the work been widely cited or favorably reviewed?

C. Article or essays in nonrefereed professional journals and magazines.

1. What is the primary audience of the journal or magazine?
2. What is the standing of the magazine or journal in the profession?
3. What is the method for selecting materials to be published and what standards are applied in selecting materials?
4. Has the work been widely cited?
5. Is the work primarily scholarly in character or is it a form of public service activity?

D. Books and monographs.

1. What is the standing of the press which published the book and how rigorous is the review process of that press?
2. What is the professional reaction to the book, including citations in the discipline and reviews or other commentaries on its quality?
3. What, if any, awards, prizes, or other recognition has the book received?

E. Textbooks and edited volumes for instruction.

1. Does the book make contributions to scholarship by presenting new data or new conceptual/theoretical formulations?
2. What is the standing of the press which published the book and how rigorous was the review process, including whether reviews were sought from important scholars in the field?
3. What is the professional reaction to the book, including reviews and other commentary on its quality?
4. Is the book widely adopted and in what quality or level of institutions?
5. Is the book primarily instructional, in which case it constitutes a contribution to teaching, or does it also advance scholarship?

F. Abstracts, book reviews, and reviews of creative activities.

1. What is the standing or the professional importance of the source in which the abstract or review was published?
2. What is the primary audience of the abstract or review?

G. Papers presented at professional meetings.

1. Was the paper refereed or invited?
2. What was the selectivity of the conference or other forum at which the paper was presented?
3. What was the scope of the conference (e.g., international, national, regional, local)?
4. Is there evidence that the paper has gained professional recognition--i.e., has it been subsequently cited, published in anthologies, abstracted, etc.?

H. Artistic and creative work.

1. What is the standing of the newspaper, publishing house, journal, magazine, press, etc. which publishes or presents a creative work of writing, essay, broadcast outlet, film or video festival, etc.?
2. What has been the reaction to the work, including reviews and commentaries by recognized critics in the field?
3. What is the standing and reliability of the reviewers and commentators?
4. Has the work been excerpted or reprinted in anthologies, journals or collected works, or otherwise recognized by republication or reference?
5. Has the work received awards, prizes, or similar recognition?

I. Performance and exhibition.

1. What is the nature of the performance or exhibit (e.g., solo)?
2. What was the standing of the forum in which it was presented, including the professional recognition for that forum and the scope of those participating (e.g., international, national, regional, local)?
3. What was the method of selection of those participating, such as invitation, competitive audition, etc.?
4. Has the performance or exhibition been reviewed?
5. What evaluation did reviewers make?
6. What is the standing and reliability of the reviewers and commentators?
7. What comments or references, if any, are available from professionals who viewed and/or heard the performance or exhibition?
8. Has the performance or exhibit won awards, prizes or other formal recognition?

J. Grants, fellowships or other awards to conduct research or creative activity.

1. Funds are required for research, but the amount required relates more to the type of studies than their quality. Securing outside support, particularly after peer review, says a great deal about the quality of a proposal and often about the quality of previous work. The packet should include details of a faculty member's role (e.g., PI, CoPI or CoI), together with the name(s) of other PIs. For less well-known funding sources, documentation of the type of review and competitive level will help in the evaluation. In addition to documenting all funded grants and contracts, candidates should include those proposals which were approved but not funded.
2. How rigorous and selective is the evaluation process for the award of grants or other support?
3. Is there evidence that grants, fellowships, and awards are based on the quality of past scholarly attainments, on performance under prior grants, or on other criteria which reflect the merit and standing of the grantee?
4. Is there evidence of important contributions to scholarship or creative fields which have already resulted from the grant or award funding?
5. Is there evidence of subsequent effective management of the grant?

K. Only abstracts that have not been subsequently developed into full manuscripts should be listed under abstracts. There the abstracts can be sorted as refereed or not.