



College	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	
Unit	Hugh Downs School of Human Communication	
Document	Evaluative Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion	
Approved by the faculty	Yes	Date: 5/4/2005
Reviewed by the dean		Date:

Provost office approval

Vice Provost for Academic Personnel	Date

Office of the University Provost

300 East University Drive
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785
<https://provost.asu.edu/>

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Adopted by the Faculty May 4, 2005

The decision about tenure and/or promotion is one of the most important decisions that we make. It is a decision that combines an assessment of the record to date and a projection of a career into the future. The precise opportunities and expectations vary widely over the units within the College and across the University, but they all involve some measure of quality, quantity, and trajectory in the record. There is no single scale that can be used even within a unit, as the possible combinations of quantity, quality, and trajectory are innumerable. However, there are general principles that are applied as uniformly as possible across all cases.

Research and Creative Activity

As a premier research university, our expectations regarding the independent scholarly record of our faculty are high. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity. Several factors influence the assessment of the quality of a scholarly record.

The following guidelines provide a general estimate of the relative value of scholarship within the HDSHC. However, we underscore here that the critical test of any scholarly product is the quality of that product and its impact across targeted audiences as evidenced by published or solicited reviews, scholarly citations, and awards.

Grants

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
PI-externally funded grant	Faculty Associate or Consultant on externally funded grant	External grant proposal
Co-PI externally funded grant		Internally funded grant

Books

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Scholarly book	Edited Scholarly Book	Authored textbook
Editor of International or National Journal	Editor of a Regional Journal	Edited textbook

Articles/Chapters

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Refereed Article in International or National Journal	Refereed Article in Regional Report Journal	Chapter in a textbook
Contributed Chapter in Scholarly Handbook	Contributed Chapter to a Scholarly Book	Publication in Conference Proceedings
		Conference Papers
		Book Review

Creative Activity

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Performed and/or Reviewed at the National or International Level	Performed and/or Reviewed at the Regional level	Performed and/or Reviewed at the Local levels

The Tier Guidelines

During the fall semester of 2004 the faculty in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication convened a Policies and Procedures group to (a) align our policies and procedures with those in our new College, and (b) develop guidelines for scholarship to be used in annual merit reviews as well as tenure and promotion cases. The guidelines are represented in three "tiers," with each tier differentially organized and hierarchically and arranged according to level of achievement.

The usual way to accomplish impact across targeted audiences is through Tier 1 and Tier 2 research and creative activity. We believe that a community of scholars at a highly regarded, research intensive university recognizes and rewards excellence and that the primary determination of scholarly quality and worth should be made at the unit level.

Tier Guidelines

Explanation of Tier 1 categories:

The composition of the portfolio of published works is a primary indicator of scholarly quality, quantity, and trajectory. A collection of good but unconnected articles may not produce the same sense of impact that a set of articles advancing a coherent line of scholarship would. It is not unprecedented, though, for faculty to shift scholarly areas of focus, even at the junior level. The personal statement provided by the candidate is a very important guide to the significance of each scholarly piece and their connection to each other.

We encourage collaborative work; thus coauthored articles and creative works are given important weight by the Personnel Committee. It is, however, necessary to identify the contributions of the candidate to these articles and works. In general, if the contribution of the candidate is primarily technical, it does not count as much as if the contribution is of a more substantial nature. A significant portion of the overall research record should include articles and works to which the candidate has made the primary contributions.

Another issue is the connection of published work to the dissertation. Highly regarded articles from the dissertation do count, but not as much as highly regarded articles reflecting scholarship beyond the dissertation. A published book based on the dissertation may warrant a favorable performance review in the year of its publication, but it does not necessarily indicate prospective accomplishments. For those areas of specialization where a book is considered standard for tenure, a book based on the dissertation that shows significant extensions and revisions is regarded more highly than one that does not.

Given that the decision regarding tenure is very much about future expectations, the trajectory of scholarly productivity is carefully considered. The acceptance/publication of articles or the exhibition of work or performance just before tenure is carefully scrutinized in order to determine the extent to which it reflects a genuine timely outcome of a growing scholarly record as opposed to a belated effort to increase its quantity.

There are, inevitably, other demonstrations of scholarly worth and impact. Serving as an editor of a scholarly journal, conference proceeding, or book is both a time-consuming honor and a practical demonstration of scholarly standing and judgment. Such work contributes to, and sometimes shapes, the nature of the discourse and scholarly conversation for years to come. We consider such work as part of a candidate's scholarly productivity as well as service to the discipline and/or to the public. Additionally, invitations to talk at other universities and prestigious events add to the scholarly record, but generally play a relatively minor role independent of other measures of the scholarly record.

Outside funding of research from federal agencies or prestigious foundations and institutes (in those areas of specialization where it is available) also can be viewed as a significant part of the scholarly record, depending on the relative size of the grant and the significance of the questions posed. A competitive grant based on peer review is more significant a research accomplishment than a grant that is not competitive or based on peer review.

In the creative and performing arts, tenure portfolios will reflect the faculty member's creative work--including exhibitions, performances, and reviews thereof. As with all faculty members, the significance of the work and career trajectory are of paramount importance.

The scholarly record should provide clear evidence of independent thinking and research/performance. Thus, although many junior scholars continue to do some collaborative work with a former Ph.D. or postdoctoral advisor, it is important to establish a

record of growing independence from former advisors.

Additionally, a scholarly rationale document should introduce each performance as a research project and be included in the tenure and promotion portfolio. This document should contextualize the performance(s) within a body of research and articulate its specific objectives. The document should include three sections: (1) a section identifying and discussing the theoretical knowledge out of which the performance arises and to which it contributes; (2) a section on methodology discussing the method(s) to be used in the study with particular attention to the function of performance as a method of inquiry and/or a method of representing results in the project; and (3) a section positing the significance of the study including an identification of topic areas or research groups that will benefit from the performance; where the performance contributes to theory building or performance methodology; and how the performance may be retrieved and cited (e.g., print archive, video archive, publication, etc.).

Tiers 2 and 3

Quality, quantity, and trajectory indicators in Tiers 2 and 3 follow from the criteria above but represent differing status levels within the discipline. However, this should not automatically diminish the evaluation of any particular work, as key articles, conference proceedings, book chapters, and textbooks may contribute significantly to the evolution of scholarship in the discipline or field.

Teaching

Excellence in teaching is expected. While demonstrated excellence in teaching may enhance a marginal tenure case, it cannot replace scholarly productivity as the primary criterion for tenure or promotion. Materials to be used in the evaluation of teaching include the following:

- Student evaluations of teaching
- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms)
- Examples of course outlines, syllabi, examinations and other items that indicate the nature of instruction
- Descriptions of the development or improvement of coursework
- Written statements that may have come from the director or others concerning the willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum development, or other related matters
- Formal advising of graduate students
- Service on committees of students advised by other faculty members

There may be other sources of support for a successful teaching portfolio. Those sources may include evidence of the impact of pedagogical writing or teaching about pedagogical methods. It may also include teaching awards and letters of appreciation for teaching in

extra-curricular settings (e.g., community workshops, seminars, or performances). It is the responsibility of the candidate to clearly articulate how any and all work represented in the teaching portfolio contributes to their scholarly agenda.

Service

In general, the category labeled "service" refers broadly to service within the unit, within the College, the University, the profession, and the community at large. A comprehensive listing of all service activities must be included on the candidate's curriculum vitae. In addition, letters or testimonies documenting the impact of service may be included in the portfolio.