

GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT ADJUSTMENTS

**Department of Communication, Michigan State University,
February 2009**

Regular and rigorous evaluation of faculty performance is essential to the Department's mission. This set of guidelines describes the procedures, criteria, and timetables employed to increase the academic excellence of the Department and to assure consistency of evaluation across time and across the various types of performance review. The policies are designed to be consistent with University rules as defined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

This document is divided into two major sections. The first deals with reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and the second section focuses on annual salary adjustment. The timetables for these two reviews will be coordinated, and scheduled to coincide with the preparation of the annual Professional Accomplishments report of each faculty member. Each section specifies the procedures and criteria to be applied in the evaluation process.

A. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1. All junior faculty will receive a yearly assessment of performance, along with recommendations, during Spring term of each semester. A committee consisting of three tenured faculty members will review the tenure files of each junior faculty member and write an evaluation. This evaluation will be discussed with all tenured faculty members for additional feedback before being sent to the junior faculty member. Finally, the committee as a whole will meet with each junior faculty member to deliver the evaluation and to discuss recommendations for future performance.
2. All candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated by a recommending body composed of rank-eligible faculty members who are appointed at least 50% in the Department of Communication; the Chair may attend the meeting but may not evaluate the candidate. The review will culminate in a formal vote; this recommendation is advisory to the Chair, who makes the final decision. The vote of the recommending body is to be forwarded to the Dean along with the decision of the Chair.
3. The reappointment evaluation will occur at the beginning of the spring semester of the third year of appointment in a tenure-track position in the Department; the recommending body is composed of all tenured faculty members. The evaluation for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure will occur at the beginning of the Spring semester of the sixth year of appointment in a tenure-track position (or prior year for

candidates seeking early promotion or those who served as a faculty member at another institution); the recommending body is composed of all tenured faculty members. The evaluation for promotion to Full Professor will occur at the beginning of the Spring semester of any year that a tenured candidate seeks consideration; the recommending body is composed of all full professors.

4. Two sets of materials shall be prepared by each candidate. The *distributed information* is circulated to each member of the recommending body at least two weeks before the review meeting. The *omnibus file* is a collection of documents available for examination in the file of the departmental administrative assistant.
5. The *distributed information* shall be in the form of a memo from the candidate to the recommending body that summarizes evidence the candidate wishes to bring to the attention of the recommending body. The memo is to be organized into three basic sections:
 - a. *Research*: a narrative describing the candidate's current program(s) of research, the major publications, honors, and grants received throughout the candidate's career, and the future research directions including works in progress. The document will also include a cumulative listing of all referred and non-referred publications, papers, reports, presentations, honors, and grants submitted and received.
 - b. *Teaching*: a document containing a summary of SIRS ratings for all undergraduate and graduate courses taught across the prior three years (average scores on five subscales); a cumulative listing of MA and PhD committees served on and chaired, and independent study students advised; and a description of curricular contributions, teaching awards, and graduate student productivity.
 - c. *Service*: a listing of activities in all five categories (outreach, professional, university, departmental, and student service); and a description of accomplishments in two designated categories of emphasis, highlighting significant recent activities and providing evidence of quality of performance.
6. The memo should be supplemented by the following appendices:
 - a. A full vita supplied by the candidate
 - b. Two scholarly works submitted by the candidate to represent his/her scholarship. If the written work is jointly authored, the extent and nature of the candidate's contribution should be described in the memo
 - c. A listing of materials available in the *omnibus file*
 - d. Evaluation letters submitted by the coordinators of the BA, MA, and PhD programs pertaining the candidate's teaching performance over the prior three years (if the coordinator has served for less than three years, he/she should consult with the

predecessor in preparing the letter). This evaluation is to be based on ratings of classroom instruction and informal feedback from students, involvement as an academic advisor, and curricular contributions

- e. Evaluation letters submitted by the two student associations (UCA and AGSCOM), pertaining to the candidate's teaching performance in the classroom and as an academic advisor, and the candidate's service to students (and, for candidates holding coordinator positions, evaluations of the administrative performance). Evaluation is to be based on criteria and procedures developed by each association, which are specified in the letter
7. The *omnibus file* may contain the following documents:
- a. Two additional scholarly works that the candidate wishes to be considered
 - b. Letters of recommendation solicited by the candidate from individual students and from individuals or organizations served
 - c. SIRS form reports
 - d. Course syllabi, exams, and exercises
 - e. Research proposals
 - f. Evaluation letters from three external reviewers solicited by the recommending body which comment on the quality of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments and promise
 - g. Any other information the candidate deems appropriate for consideration
8. In reviewing candidates, the recommending body will apply the criteria set forth on the following pages. As a reflection of multidimensional performance, the *Overall Evaluation* is based on a combination of research, teaching, and service with minimum standards for all three dimensions. In recognition of differential excellence specialization, specific areas of emphasis and performance targets will be negotiated between each junior faculty member and the recommending body and the Chair as part of the *Career Plan* (Appendix A).
9. The recommending body will evaluate the candidate's performance as *Outstanding*, *Strong*, *Satisfactory*, or *Unsatisfactory* on each of the three dimensions: research, teaching, & service. Levels of accomplishment involve subjective judgment based on general guidelines and individually tailored goals.
10. For reappointment, the candidate must receive a rating of *Strong* or *Outstanding* on one dimension and be rated at least *Satisfactory* on the other two dimensions. For promotion, the candidate must meet all three of the following rating criteria: 1) a minimum of *Satisfactory* on all

three dimensions, 2) at least *Strong* in research, and 3) a combination of *Outstanding* in either teaching or research or *Strong* in both teaching and research.

RESEARCH CRITERIA

11. Faculty members in Communication are expected to have a program of sustained research that leads to a steady stream of publications in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals. Research productivity is weighed very heavily in all decisions regarding tenure and promotion. To receive tenure and promotion, the faculty member must be a productive researcher, who is establishing a national reputation in his or her area of research, and who shows the potential to enhance the research reputation of the Department throughout his or her career. Standards for recruitment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must evolve upward over time, and not be guided only by past precedent in decisions of this kind.

Research productivity is defined as investigation aimed at the discovery of scientific knowledge, revision of accepted theories in light of new knowledge, or the practical application of knowledge. Therefore, evidence of productivity includes:

- A record of continuous publication in national and international peer-reviewed journals, with particular emphasis on first authored publications in top tier Communication journals as recognized by area experts inside and outside the department. It is incumbent of the candidate to inquire as to which journals are considered top tier during the probationary time.
- Publishing work that has an impact on the field as indicated by citations in other articles and/or recognition by outside reviewers.
- Other publications such as books, book chapters, and articles in non-refereed journals. Note that book chapters solicited by editors are an indication of recognition of expertise in a research area.
- Presentations at national or international conferences, including, but not limited to the National Communication Association and the International Communication Association. Regular participation in these two major conferences in the field is expected.
- Research grant activity (e.g., preparing and submitting grant proposals for internal and external funding).

The expectation for a Satisfactory rating in research output in the Department of Communication at Michigan State University is approximately two publications per year, as a long-term running average. Faculty seeking to be evaluated as "strong" in research should exceed expectations. An evaluation of outstanding requires exceeding the expectation by a substantial margin.

The 2 per year expectation also presumes a typical mix in terms of authorship order, type of outlet, quality, and impact. It is understood that the meaning of publications per year for performance evaluations is subjectively weighted by such factors as quality, impact, authorship order, and type of outlet. Averages below 2 per year may exceed the expectation if the body of work, as a whole, is of especially high

quality and has had substantial impact. Averages above 2 per year may fail to meet the expectation if the contributions to the publications appear minimal (e.g., as depicted by being low in the author order or when the topics of the research reflect programs of research other than one's own), when a substantial proportion of the work is not refereed, or when there is a notable lack of high quality work in the mix.

Evaluation criteria for each case will not be based solely on a quantitative assessment of productivity, but on evidence of a body of original scholarly work that enhances the research reputation of the Department and the candidate. Therefore, the candidate is expected to provide evidence of impact on the field. There are a variety of accepted ways to establish scholarly impact, including, but not limited to:

- Evidence of a scholarly niche, such that informed disciplinary observers can identify the candidate's unique specialty area.
- Publication in high impact journals as recognized by area experts and by national reputation such as ISI impact ratings. High impact publications representing the candidate's primary contribution to the article (e.g., first authorship) are most highly valued.
- Number of citations and downloads of published articles.
- Recognition of theoretical or methodological innovation and contribution to the field in disciplinary review articles and chapters (e.g., *Communication Yearbook*, graduate level texts).
- Research based honors such as awards, editorial boards, and grant review teams. Every candidate is expected to be a regular reviewer or a board member of at least one major journal in the candidate's area.
- Grants obtained for research in the candidate's identified specialty area.
- Productivity equal or superior to national peers in rank and specialty area.
- Recognition of impact as supported by strong external recommendation letters.
- Promising scholarly work in progress.
- Performance on expectations specified in the candidate's letter of appointment.

The candidate is responsible to make his or her case for tenure based on some combination of the evaluation criteria above and any other pertinent information. The candidate need not meet every criteria listed, but the preponderance of evidence should support the assertion that the candidate is a productive researcher, who is establishing a national reputation in his or her area of research.

TEACHING CRITERIA

12 The following criteria will be considered in evaluating performance on the *Teaching* dimension:

- a. Student ratings of classroom instruction over last three years
Reappointment: Aggregate SIRS scores of 2.8 on all subscales across all courses
Promotions: Aggregate SIRS scores of 2.5 on all items across all courses

Higher ratings will be based on:

- Stronger SIRS scores
- Improvement in scores over time
- Strong overall ratings from undergraduate majors on new standardized instrument
- Positive reviews of teaching performance from UCA, and AGSCOM
- Strong letters of recommendation from individual students
- Peer evaluation of course material and classroom performance
- Teaching awards and honors
- Supervision of independent study students

b. Adherence to the MSU *Code of Teaching Responsibility*.

c. Involvement as academic advisor to departmental and external graduate students

Reappointment: Serving on total of 4 MA or PhD committees

Promotion to Associate: Serving on total of 5 MA and 2 PhD committees

Promotion to Full: Chairing 2 PhD committees

(Totals will be adjusted for individuals recently appointed at Michigan State)

Higher ratings will be based on:

- Larger number of committees
- Scholarly productivity of current advisees and research team
- Supervision of independent study students
- Advising on outside doctoral committees
- Placement and performance of recent advisees

d. Curricular contributions.

No specified minimum; ratings will be based on:

- Development of new departmental courses and seminars
- Variety of courses taught
- Quality of course material
- Demanding course assignments (e.g., course load, large size, writing, advanced content)
- Dissemination of pedagogical research
- Professional development activities
- Development of off-campus, trans-collegiate, college-wide courses

Information base for evaluating teaching:

- Summary sheet reporting SIRS ratings on five subscales for all undergraduate and graduate courses (based on guidelines developed by the department regarding the collection method, administration timing, and normative standards by course or class size)
- Letters from departmental coordinators of the BA, MA, and PhD programs
- Letters from UCA and AGSCOM (based primarily on cumulative collection of systematic survey data regarding classroom and advising performance)
- Letters from individual students
- Listing of MA and PhD committees served on and chaired, and independent study students
- Description of curricular contributions, teaching awards, and student productivity
- Course syllabi, exams, and exercises

SERVICE CRITERIA

13 The following criteria shall be considered in evaluating performance on the *Service* dimension, which is composed of five categories:

Minimum criteria:

Reappointment: At least one activity in three of the five categories

Promotions: Substantial activities in two categories

Higher ratings will be based on:

- Quantity of time and effort (e.g., demanding committee or administrative role)
 - Significance of activity (e.g., important committee, distinction associated with position)
 - Quality of performance
 - Breadth of activities across four or five categories
 - Professional development of service capabilities
- a. Outreach service
- Application of research findings to benefit external publics and constituencies
 - Presentations and consultations with government agencies and community organizations
 - Dissemination of information about communication issues to general public
 - Service on standing committees in areas of professional expertise International service activities
- b. Service to academic profession
- Editing and reviewing scholarly works for journals and conferences
 - Leadership positions in academic associations
 - Chairing and organizing sessions and short courses at national conferences
- c. University service
- Participation on academic governance and other university wide committees
 - Leadership positions on university committees and advisory boards
 - Involvement in interdisciplinary transcollegiate activities
 - Contribution to university's diversity mission
 - Participation in non-department programs (e.g., foreign TAs training sessions, lectures and colloquia in other departments)
- d. Departmental service
- Administrative contributions beyond released time
 - Number of committees served on beyond one-committee norm
 - Leadership role on standing and ad hoc committees
 - Securing funding support for graduate assistants

- Organizing and participating in workshops and colloquia
 - Efforts in recruiting minority and graduate students to program
 - Representing department at conferences
 - Mentoring of junior faculty
 - Collegiality and professionalism in departmental citizenship
- e. Student service
- Guidance to individual students and student associations beyond normal involvement as an academic advisor on graduate committees (e.g., aiding DCA or AGSCOM, sponsoring informal student organizations, arranging internships, advising Honors College majors, consulting on career or grad school opportunities, working with UTAs, and reviewing grad student instruction)

Information base for evaluating service:

- Listing of activities in all five categories
- Description of accomplishments in two designated categories of emphasis
- Letters from individuals or organizations served.

14. Procedures and Timetable:

- a. The recommending body elects a chairperson in November; the chairperson sends a letter calling for reappointment or promotion requests to all eligible faculty members before the end of November. At the candidate's request, the chairperson will solicit letters of recommendation from three external reviewers drawn from a list of six provided by the candidate (none can be co-authors with the candidate), and also request evaluation letters from the coordinators and student associations.
- b. Each candidate must submit all materials to the chairperson of the recommending body by the first day of spring semester; last-minute information may be added at the discretion of the chairperson of the recommending body.
- c. The evaluation meeting will be scheduled for the second full week of spring semester. A preliminary recommendation will be developed for each candidate at that meeting. The chairperson of the recommending body will inform each candidate of the results to the preliminary deliberations. He/she is offered an opportunity to confer with the recommending body within one week to present additional information.
- d. By the end of the third week of spring semester, the chairperson of the recommending body will forward the final recommendations to the Chair (with major arguments if the Chair was not present at meeting) and report the outcome to each candidate in writing.

B. Annual Evaluations and Salary Adjustments

- a. In early January each year, all faculty members will submit a standardized form presenting relevant information regarding research, teaching, and service accomplishments during the prior calendar year; this form appears in Appendix B.
- b. Based on the compilation of information on this form, the Chair will evaluate the performance of each faculty member annually in January, and provide a written report for that individual's personnel file. At that time, the Chair will also determine each faculty member's ranking for merit raises to be awarded during the following academic year. In addition, the quantity and quality of accomplishments will be used by the Chair in allocating resources, assigning course loads, and suggesting service activities for individual faculty in the following academic year.
- c. The annual evaluation is based on performance during the January-December period. The merit raise ranking is based on both the calendar year performance and the cumulative record over the prior two years. This three-year record is intended to reduce variance due to wide annual fluctuations in productivity and in amount of raise money available from year to year, and lack of annual accomplishments due to sabbatical or medical leave status. The cumulative record applies only to years in which a faculty member was appointed at Michigan State.
- d. In determining merit raise ranking, the Chair will give equal weighting to research, teaching, and service, using the criteria from Section A of this document.
- e. At least 80% of the raise pool will be allocated to merit raises. The Chair will use any remaining money for adjustments due to salary inequities and structural anomalies related to affirmative action and salary compression within and across ranks, in conformance with university policies. No special consideration beyond merit will be given based on potential market value or attainment of promotion. Based on the merit ranking, the amount of each faculty member's raise will be computed as a percentage of the previous year's salary.

Appendix A: Career Development Plans

To help junior faculty members to focus their professional goals and make effective decisions in budgeting time and effort, all new Assistant Professors must develop a written *Early Career Plan* early in the first semester of their initial appointment. This is a two-year plan covering the period until the reappointment decision. After reappointment, Assistant Professors must develop a three-year Tenure Plan for the next stage of their career. In addition, Associate Professors are asked to develop a three-year Mid- Career Plan.

The career plans for untenured faculty members are to be drawn up by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Chair and the recommending body. The nature of the goals can be quite flexible, based on negotiation between the parties. The plans are subject to annual revision at the request of the faculty member.

Each individual's plan shall be very explicit in setting forth clear expectations about specific accomplishments to be attained before the review for reappointment or tenure. The plan may include the following components:

1. A characterization of the individual's areas of scholarly specialization
2. A listing of substantive goals involving research productivity, grant support, teaching proficiency, or service activities
3. An outline of research problems to be addressed, and an identification of journals where the research will be submitted, and the target number of publications
4. A discussion of strategies for attaining extramural funding (if grant-seeking is a goal)
5. A discussion of strategies for improving classroom teaching, and target SIRS ratings
6. A discussion of service goals and activities
7. A timetable for completing activities
8. A listing of specific needs which will facilitate accomplishing the goals (e.g., course assignments, released time, resources, travel, and mentoring from senior faculty)

Appendix B: Annual Accomplishment Form

A. Research

1. Identify new publications that appeared during the calendar year: (provide complete citation of articles, chapters, and books).

2. Number of conference activities in the following categories:

_____ Peer-reviewed papers at ICA and NCA?

_____ Peer-reviewed papers at other conferences

_____ Invited presentations at off-campus conferences

_____ Participation as discussant at conferences

3. List research grant proposals submitted or funded (specify sponsoring agency, monetary value, and status- C=Continuation, F=New funding, P=Pending, N=Not funded):

C F P N \$_____ Sponsor:

C F P N \$_____ Sponsor:

4. Provide brief statement describing (a) innovative and programmatic nature of research, (b) research- based honors such as awards, editorial boards, or grant review teams, (c) application of research to teaching and outreach, and (d) other evidence of research accomplishments.

B. Teaching

1. List class size and mean scores on five subscales of SIRS forms for each course:

Course	N	Involve	Interest	Interact	Demands	Organize
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. List number of MA students and names of doctoral students completing degrees:

_____MA adviser

_____MA committee member

Ph.D. committee chair:

Ph..D. member:

3. Provide statement describing (a) teaching honors and awards, (b) curricular contributions in developing departmental, off-campus, trans-collegiate, and college-wide courses and seminars, and (c) other evidence of teaching accomplishments.

C. Service

Provide statements describing accomplishments in two designated categories of emphasis, and briefly list activities in the other three service domains (see criteria on attached page):

1. Outreach service
2. Service to academic profession
3. University service
4. Departmental service
5. Student service

D. Special Considerations