Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

2005

Communication: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt

Part of the Higher Education Commons

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

POLICIES and PROCEDURES MANUAL

Approved by CMC Department: April 28, 2010

Effective: Fall 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Communication, through its course offerings, internships, extra curricular activities and independent studies, is committed to providing an environment where students engage in theoretical as well as experiential learning opportunities. The Department mentors students to become effective, responsible oral and written communicators and lifelong learners, prepared to function in a globally interdependent community.

(Approved by the Department of Communication, October 8, 2003)

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

Functions of the APT Committee

The principle functions of the APT Committee are to:

- receive, review, and make recommendations on all applications and nominations for renewal of appointment, continuing appointment, promotion, sabbatical, and Discretionary Salary Increase for Department of Communication faculty members,

- oversee the process for the designation and annual performance review of the Department Chair, and

- in consultation with the Department Chair, review and evaluate credentials of those who apply to teach or are teaching Communication courses full-time in the Department of Communication at The College at Brockport or delegate these responsibilities to an individual representative or an *ad hoc* committee (e.g., a search committee).

The APT Committee is also responsible for:

- On an annual basis, developing and distributing to all departmental faculty an evaluation form designed to assess the chairperson's performance during that academic year. The Chair of the APT Committee shall write a summary of the evaluations received from the members of the faculty. The Chair of the APT Committee will then share that summary with the entire faculty and department chair.

- Offering assistance to faculty members in the preparation and assembly of teaching portfolios and supporting documentation related to teaching, scholarship, and service to accompany the request for personnel action.

- Reviewing and, if necessary, updating this "APT Policies and Procedures Manual" at least very five years.

Committee Membership

The APT Committee shall consist of at least three full-time faculty members who hold continuing appointment in the department. In addition, there shall be one alternate member who shall also be a full-time faculty member who holds a continuing appointment in the

Department. When circumstances necessitate that the Department depart from these policies, the Chair and members of the Department shall consult with the Dean to implement Committee membership specific to those circumstances.

Members of the Committee shall be elected by secret ballot by full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department for staggered two-year terms. Newly elected members shall join the APT Committee at the beginning of the academic year following their election. The annual elections will take place at the end of the spring semester.

APT Committee membership is also influenced by the following factors:

- An alternate faculty representative to the Committee shall participate in Committee actions when (1) a regularly elected member cannot attend or fulfill his Committee duties, or (2) a regularly elected member comes under consideration by the Committee for promotion, continuing appointment, reappointment, or discretionary salary increase. The alternate shall serve the remainder of the term of a faculty member vacating his or her position on the APT Committee. If the Department decides that professional staff members assigned to the Department should also serve on the APT Committee, the Department Chair shall request approval of those members from the School Dean.

- In the case of promotion and/or continuing appointment actions, only those who have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher may serve on the APT Committee. In the case of promotion to Full Professor, the APT Committee must include at least one Full Professor. If a Full Professor is not available among the members of the Department, the Dean, after consulting the Chair and members of the faculty in the Department, will appoint an emeritus Full Professor from the Department or a Full Professor from another department to the APT Committee for the purpose of reviewing a faculty member's application for promotion to Full Professor. In the event the Department does not have the number of qualifying faculty to constitute an APT Committee, the Dean, after consulting the Chair and members of the faculty of the Department, will seek to appoint emeritus Full and/or emeritus Associate Professors from the Department, when appropriate, to the APT Committee for the purpose of reviewing continuing appointments and promotion.

- Should a vacancy arise on the APT Committee, elections shall be conducted promptly to elect a replacement.

Faculty Personnel Action Process

Personnel actions include the actions of faculty reappointment, continuing appointment, promotion, sabbatical leave, discretionary salary increase, and designation of the department chair. Academic personnel actions proceed in the manner described below for review and recommendation, culminating in a personnel action decision by the College President. The procedure for review and recommendation of Discretionary Salary Increases is discussed separately on page 32.

- The responsibility of the Department's APT Committee is to provide a clear rationale in writing that evaluates the applicant's performance in three areas—teaching, scholarship, and service—using the appropriate criteria outlined in the forthcoming sections.

- The responsibility of the candidate is to provide:

  (1) A letter of application,
  (2) An organized and indexed teaching portfolio, and
  (3) An organized and indexed dossier of supporting materials related to scholarship and service. The candidate should strive to demonstrate that his or her performance in the three areas fulfills the appropriate criteria outlined on pages 11-29. Application materials should be arranged in a clear and consistent manner and be professional in appearance. See pages 30-32 for recommendations on developing the portfolio and dossier of supporting materials.

In accordance with College policy, the review process shall take place in the following order:

1. Faculty Applicant/Nominee
2. Department APT Committee
3. Department Faculty
4. Department Chair
5. School Dean
6. Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
7. College President

In all academic personnel actions, the applicant shall be notified in writing of the recommendation at each point in the process, and be allowed the opportunity to respond in writing to any stage of the review and stop the consideration process at any point prior to the President's decision.

1. Candidates shall submit application materials to the APT Committee Chairperson or designee on or before the due date established by the Provost's Office for the type of review to be completed. APT Committee members shall independently examine and evaluate candidate portfolios. In addition, an external reviewer from on or off campus may be used upon advance request made by the candidate or by the APT Committee with the approval of the candidate. External reviewers will be provided a copy of the APT Policies and Procedures Manual and access to the candidate's portfolio. Candidate portfolios will be kept on file in the department office and checked via a sign-out procedure to ensure that all APT Committee members review candidate portfolios prior to Committee action.

2. The APT Committee shall then meet and prepare a committee recommendation regarding candidate applications. The Committee will seek to reach its recommendation by consensus. When that is not possible, a five-point rating scale will be used to rate overall performance in the three areas. When using the rating

scale, evaluators will consider the middle point of the scale to be an "at rank" level of performance. An "at rank" level of performance is relative to the faculty member's stage in his or her career in the Department of Communication. See page 11 for a description of the performance rating scale. A letter containing the APT Committee recommendation addressed to the Dean, including a clear summary statement of the supporting rationale, will be sent to the candidate and to the Department Chair by the date established by the Provost's Office.

3. Following the completion of the APT Committee's review and submission of its recommendation to the candidate, the Department shall meet to discuss and vote on the Committee's recommendation. Upon reviewing candidate portfolios using the appropriate evaluation criteria outlined in the forthcoming sections, eligible Department members will vote to either approve or reject the APT Committee's recommendation. The APT Committee Chair shall preside over the meeting.

The APT Committee shall make candidate portfolios and the APT Committee recommendation letter available for review by eligible Department members at least five (5) business days prior to the Department meeting. Candidate materials will be kept on file in the Departmental office and checked via a sign-out procedure to ensure that all Departmental members review the portfolios prior to voting.

- **Eligible Voting Department Members:** Eligible voting members consist of: (1) full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who served for at least one year in the Department of Communication and have reviewed the candidate's file (First year tenure-track faculty shall deliberate on the application but may not vote until they have completed one academic year) and (2) Emeriti faculty who have engaged in three consecutive years of teaching and in the Department immediately prior to acquiring voting rights. Professional staff members are only eligible to vote on the election of the Department Chair. A quorum for all Department meetings shall be a majority plus one of all eligible voting members. Voting members may not cast their ballots *in abstentia* or by proxy. Exceptions may be made at the discretion of the Department Chair in the event of unusual circumstances.

- **Report of APT Voting Results:** Numerical tallies regarding the votes of the APT Committee shall be reported to the Department Chair, who will forward them to the Dean, Provost, and President. The APT Committee shall provide the Department Chair with the committee vote tally so that the Chair may forward all the tallies to the above offices. The tally shall not be reported to the candidate, Department, or any other party.

- **Department Voting Process:** During the faculty meeting at which a vote on the APT Committee recommendation is taken, candidates shall have the opportunity to address the APT Committee's recommendation as they deem appropriate regarding the candidate's dossier. Afterwards, the candidate will be asked to leave the room. The Department may then ask the APT Committee procedural questions about the Committee's review of the

application. Department members, including members of the APT Committee, will then vote by secret ballot to register agreement or disagreement with the APT Committee's recommendation. The Department Chair shall not participate in this vote but shall, with the Department Secretary, tally the ballots. The result, but not the specific tally, will be announced to the Department at the close of the meeting. The Department Chair will inform the candidate of the result immediately after the meeting. A candidate may choose not to participate in the meeting and this decision shall have no bearing on the review process.

4. Following the Department vote on the APT Committee recommendation, the Department Chairperson shall make an independent judgment of the applicant's performance in accordance with the deadline set by the Provost's Office. The letter shall include a clear summary statement of the supporting rationale for the recommendation. The Chairperson may find the recommendations and voting of the APT Committee and Department useful in arriving at his or her judgment, but is not bound by those recommendations or votes. The APT Committee recommendation and the Department Chairperson's recommendation (which may include reference to the Department vote) will be added to the candidate's portfolio and sent to the School Dean for review and recommendation.

5. The Dean shall examine candidate portfolios as well as the recommendations of the APT Committee, Department Chairperson, and Department vote. He or she will make an independent recommendation to the Provost.

6. The Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs shall examine candidate portfolios as well as the recommendations of the APT Committee, Department Chairperson, Department vote, and Dean. He or she will make an independent recommendation to the President.

7. The President shall examine the aforementioned recommendations and send a letter to the applicant in accordance with the notification dates determined by the Office of Human Resources and the Provost's Office.

Faculty Workloads

In accordance with the *Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report* (1998), "The normal expectation is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship…and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities." In practice, only unusually demanding "service responsibilities" will meet this expectation in the absence of an active program of scholarship. "Faculty who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship [should] contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service." In practice, this alternative contribution will generally be in the area of teaching. The Department's definition of "active program of scholarship" is provided in the section titled **Indicators of Active Scholarly/Creative Activity** on page 19.

Of the three areas of performance, teaching is the highest priority at The College at Brockport. College policy established in the *Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report* mandates that teaching must always be weighed at least 50% and that scholarship must be weighed more heavily than service. Service must be at least 10% of one's workload. In sum, the teaching workload percentage is greater than the scholarship workload percentage which is greater than the service workload percentage: Teaching > Scholarship > Service where Teaching $\geq$ 50%."

In addition, consistent with the philosophy articulated in the *Roles and Rewards* document, the Department of Communication accepts in principle, and within certain parameters, a policy enabling individual faculty members to negotiate each year their workload with the Department Chair. The APT Committee shall take into consideration past workload agreements made between the Chair and individual faculty members in making its recommendations regarding promotion, reappointment, continuing appointment, sabbatical leave, and discretionary salary increase consistent with the criteria outlined in this document. Variable workload agreements will be kept on file and made available to the APT Committee and entire department for the purpose of personnel reviews.

In practice, faculty members shall negotiate with the Department Chair workload percentages each spring, in advance of the following academic year. The workload plan developed in the spring shall then be confirmed at the start of the fall semester in the event that unexpected circumstances warrant the need for adjustments to the plan.

The negotiation of workloads invariably requires balancing the interests of the faculty member with the programming needs of the Department as well as College guidelines on professional performance.

Variables taken into consideration in planning a workload are:

- The minimum expectations associated with an individual faculty member's academic rank: An outline of the minimum expectations according to academic rank is provided in the forthcoming sections on teaching, scholarship, and service performance.

- The minimum expectations set by the College regarding weighing of teaching, scholarship, and service as noted above. Faculty who are not active in scholarly/creative production will be required to bear a 4-4 teaching load. See page 19 for an explanation of criteria regarding active scholarly/creative work. Faculty with joint appointments in other Departments or administrative units may request to have their teaching, scholarship, or service workload adjusted.

- Employment at the College must be prioritized. Faculty members are to discuss with the Chair any external employment, which must be documented in annual workload agreements. See pages 36-37 of this document for the College's stances on outside employment and consulting.

Standards for Evaluating Teaching, Scholarship and Service Performance

The Department of Communication and APT Committee recognize that mastery of subject matter varies within the field, depending on whether the disciplinary area has a professional, creative, or traditional scholarly focus. Consistent with standards of the field, faculty who teach in the Communication Studies major must have a doctoral degree in an appropriate field, although in some circumstances an ABD ("All But Dissertation") will be considered for initial appointment with the caveat that the doctoral degree is completed within a specific time frame. Those individuals who teach in Journalism and Broadcasting must have at least a Masters Degree in an appropriate field combined with significant and current professional experience, although for some faculty positions a Master of Fine Arts or doctoral degree may be preferred.

For each area of a candidate's responsibilities or workload – teaching, scholarship, service – specific criteria for evaluation are described in the forthcoming sections. The Departmental standards within each area of responsibility are identified, accompanied by the following performance rating scale:

5 = Excellent
4 = Above Rank
3 = At Rank
2 = Below Rank
1 = Unsatisfactory

The rating scale will be used by the APT Committee as a basis for discussion about the level of a candidate's performance as revealed by a faculty member's performance and supporting documentation. Scores are determined separately for each of the three areas: teaching, scholarship and service.

Procedures for Deliberation

The APT Committee shall deliberate about each candidate's performance using all of the data provided in his/her portfolio and supporting materials. All submitted materials shall be maintained in a Department file under the supervision of the Department secretary during the review period. Each committee member is required to review each candidate's file before the deliberation process begins.

- Each Committee member will rate each candidate on a five-point scale for each of the three areas of performance. These individual ratings will be used as a basis for discussion of the candidate's performance.

- The Committee will collectively review and discuss the ratings while referencing the content of each candidate's portfolio and supporting materials. Individual members may make changes to their individual ratings in light of the discussion.

- A Yes-No secret ballot will be taken for each candidate by the members of the APT Committee. A majority vote of Committee members will be necessary to arrive at a decision on a candidate's performance.

Balancing Teaching, Research, and Service

The College and the Department of Communication recognize the importance of teaching, research, and service. In order to gain reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, a candidate must be at least "at rank" at the desired appointment level in all areas: teaching, research, and service.

Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Communication recognizes that teaching entails not only performance in the classroom, but an array of activities outside the classroom that support student learning and success. According to the *Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report* , teaching:

> Encompasses promoting, guiding, facilitating, and evaluating student learning. Faculty members are catalysts for creating and adapting learning environments in and outside the classroom that stimulate students to learn, to be curious, to be critical thinkers, effective writers and speakers, and creative problem solvers. Effective teaching and learning are dependent upon faculty utilizing a variety of teaching techniques and designing and revising curriculum to produce student-learning outcomes. Included within teaching/learning are the professional development processes of attending workshops and conferences and efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies. Also included are the teaching-related activities of independent study and thesis supervision, field supervision, mentoring of students, and student involvement in research.

The Department of Communication values the following characteristics of good teaching:

Practices that enhance:

1. Student satisfaction
2. Rigor and high expectations
3. "Student-centered" teaching and mentoring
4. Knowledge of subject matter and use of effective methodologies and materials
5. Evidence of student learning and success
6. Quality student advisement

Teaching Portfolio Criteria

Candidates for review are responsible for submitting a teaching portfolio that must include original copies of student evaluations of their teaching and should include evidence of the above six aspects of teaching, such as:

1. Student satisfaction is indicated by Instructional Assessment System (IAS) scores, and, if desired, written student evaluations of courses and teaching methods, for all classes taught during the review period. Candidates are also strongly encouraged to solicit peer observation of their teaching at least once per academic year to create a record of faculty peer evaluation.

2. Rigorous standards and high expectations reflected in course objectives, course content, course assignments, grading patterns, and IAS scores.

3. "Student-centered" teaching and mentoring, including level of involvement with students outside of scheduled classes. Examples of this involvement include tutoring, review sessions, independent and directed studies, thesis work, electronic means of interaction, IAS scores, and similar evidence.

4. Knowledge of subject matter and use of effective teaching methodologies and instructional materials reflected in use of innovative instructional approaches, use of classroom technologies, the use of and/or development of current course materials, and IAS scores.

5. Student learning and/or success reflected in performance on examinations and standardized tests, student pass rates, comparisons of student pre- and post-test performance, student self-appraisals, student awards or presentations that are a direct result of a teacher's class, and similar evidence.

6. Quality student advisement evidenced by written testimonials from advisees, either unsolicited or solicited by a third party such as the Department Chair or APT Committee Chair, advisee satisfaction surveys and similar evidence.

A detailed list of recommended teaching portfolio content and supporting materials for scholarship and service is provided on pages 30-32.

Reappointment

In order to meet the teaching requirements for **reappointment**, a candidate must *at a minimum* demonstrate that their teaching performance is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for Assistant Professor:

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.49-2.25 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for **reappointment** in the area of teaching performance:

Excellent **(5)**

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 0.00-1.00 range.

- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Above Rank (4)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 0.99-1.50 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

At Rank (3)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.49-2.25 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Below Rank (2)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 2.26-3.00 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 3.00 or below range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Associate Professor with Continuing Appointment

In order to meet the teaching requirements for promotion to **Associate Professor with Continuing Appointment** a candidate must *at **a minimum*** demonstrate that their teaching performance is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for associate professor:

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.26-2.00 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for promotion to **Associate Professor/Continuing Appointment** in the area of teaching performance:

Excellent (5)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 0.00-0.75 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Above Rank (4)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 0.75-1.25 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

At Rank (3)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.26-2.00 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Below Rank (2)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 2.01-2.75 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 2.76 and below range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Full Professor

In order to meet the teaching requirements for promotion to **Professor** a candidate must *at a minimum* demonstrate that their teaching performance is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for professor:

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.01-1.50 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for promotion to **<u>Professor</u>** in the area of teaching performance:

<u>Excellent</u> (5)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 0.00-0.50 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

<u>Above Rank</u> (4)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 0.51-1.00 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

<u>At Rank</u> (3)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.01-1.50 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

<u>Below Rank</u> (2)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 1.51-2.00 range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

<u>Unsatisfactory</u> (1)

- IAS student evaluation means that generally average in the 2.01 and below range.
- Evidence of the remaining five teaching portfolio criteria. The substance and quantity of this evidence will indicate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses qualitatively by placing the IAS means average in context.

Evaluation of Scholarship/Creative Activity

The academic interests of the Department of Communication are diverse. Accordingly, the Department values a wide range of scholarly/creative work, including, but not limited to, books, scholarly articles, documentaries, innovative uses of media, curated exhibitions, experimental/emerging media, news and feature journalism, and public-relations consulting or campaigns.

However, in the process of evaluating personnel actions, the Department favors peer-evaluated and peer-adjudicated works, both of which are presented to experts in one's field, over invited works and works presented to the public and/or students without peer review or adjudication.

- A scholarly/creative work is categorized as **peer-reviewed** when it is evaluated by independent experts within the academic and/or professional community of the author/creator and when the work is subject to a process of critique and revision of its quality. The decision of whether or not to publish/broadcast it resides in the evaluation made by the independent experts.

- A scholarly/creative work is categorized as **peer-adjudicated** when it is evaluated by independent experts within the academic and/or professional community of the author/creator to receive an award or honor. Unlike peer-reviewed works, peer-adjudicated works are not subject to revision in the process of evaluation.

- A scholarly/creative work is categorized as **invited** when it is solicited by a peer from the academic and/or professional community for publication or presentation. Although not subject to a review process as described above for peer-review/adjudication, invited works do indicate that one is recognized as an expert in one's field. Also, invited works involving "outside employment" or "consulting" must be completed according to relevant College policies, including those noted on pages 36-37 of this document.

Given such distinctions, candidates should select their scholarly/creative projects carefully. For example, an Assistant Professor should not expect promotion to Associate with a record of only invited works.

When submitting applications for personnel actions, candidates are responsible for providing evidence of peer evaluation or peer adjudication. For example, a candidate may include reviews of his or her work and/or document the acceptance rate for a given published work.

Scholarly/creative work submitted as evidence in APT processes should identify The College at Brockport as the author's institutional affiliation. Thus, scholarly/creative work should be associated with and directly enhance the prestige of the College and of the Department of Communication.

The Department of Communication values the following characteristics of good scholarship:

- A combination of quality, which is assessed and determined by external and internal review processes, and quantity, which is indicated by a record of multiple products.

- Significance as evidenced by scholarly products' professional impact, contribution to a body of knowledge, or advancement of instruction.

- Scholarly activities resulting in the acquisition of funding by external agencies and which can be used to support research, training or direct services under the supervision of a faculty member or faculty team. The acquisition of external funding

may also directly and significantly benefit the college and the Department of Communication by, for example, buying out a candidate's teaching time, purchasing equipment or providing unique learning opportunities for students.

Levels of Scholarly/Creative Work

The level of expected performance in the area of scholarly/creative work differs among the ranks of Assistant, Associate and Full Professor. At the highest ranks, sustained and increasingly advanced development should be demonstrated over a period of years. Each scholarly/creative work may be credited just once at its highest level of recognition at the time of application. The re-publication/re-broadcast of a particular work as well as the citation of one's work by others are not recognized as multiple scholarly products, but rather indicators of achieving prominence in one's field. The following levels of scholarly/creative work identify the approximate degree of significance of a candidate's accomplishments:

LEVEL 1

- Published/broadcast/electronically distributed peer-reviewed or adjudicated scholarly books, textbooks, monographs, or electronic equivalents (including feature-length film, video, audio, internet, and new media). Distinctions should be made among international, national, regional, local, university, academic, commercial and vanity presses or sources.

LEVEL 2

- Articles, reviews, and proceedings published/broadcast/electronically distributed in refereed scholarly/creative venues (written and electronic). Distinctions should be made among international, national, regional, local, university, academic, commercial and vanity presses or sources.
- Grants submitted and funded. Levels of funding should be documented. Distinctions should be made among international, national, regional, state, and local funding agencies.
- Audio and video productions, if contracted or entered in competitive situations, and evaluated by credentialed third parties. Distinctions should be made among international, national, regional, local, university, academic, commercial, and vanity productions or presses.
- Journalistic articles or features that are multi-layered, multi-sourced, and in-depth explorations of significant topics. Distinctions should be made between works published in locally, regionally, nationally, and/or internationally recognized newspapers, magazines, or their on-line or other equivalent. In this category, approximately three journalistic works constitute a single, Level-2 work.

LEVEL 3

- Published/broadcast/electronically distributed scholarly book chapters, textbook ancillaries, non-refereed proceedings, or electronic equivalents. Distinctions should be made among international, national, regional, local, university, academic, commercial and vanity presses or sources.

- Unpublished papers and presentations that receive peer-adjudicated recognition or awards.
- Journalistic works about breaking- or routine news events.
- Invited scholarly/creative works, like training seminars, consulting, or media production.

LEVEL 4

- Papers and panels (or electronic equivalents) submitted, accepted and presented. Distinctions should be made between competitively selected and non-competitively selected presentations. Distinctions should be made among international, national, regional, state and local venues for presentations.
- Preliminary research projects, grant proposals, or audio and video projects that are actively under way but not yet selected for presentation, publication or funding.

Indicators of Active Scholarly/Creative Activity

Faculty members should strive to establish a record of scholarly/creative works over the period of time leading up to a review. Remaining active in scholarly/creative work is not only important for reappointment/continuing appointment evaluations, but also in the negotiation of annual workload agreements described previously on pages 9-10.

After a faculty member earns continuing appointment and promotion, he or she is expected to continue an active research agenda. If a faculty member fails or chooses not to do so, he or she will be required to work a 4-4 teaching load. In some cases, the faculty member may assume significant service obligations to compensate for their lack of scholarly/creative activity.

"Active scholarship" is defined as:

- Delivering an average of <u>three</u> presentations at professional or scholarly conferences during a three-year span, <u>and</u>
- Producing at least <u>one</u> level-two work during the same three-year span.

<u>The following are additional indicators that a faculty member is actively engaged in scholarly/creative work:</u>

- Maintaining a consistent record of published/broadcast/electronically distributed works during the course of one's professional career.
- Presenting and/or attending professional conferences or exhibitions related to scholarly/creative projects on a regular basis
- Generating tangible materials in preparation for scholarly/creative publication (literature reviews, survey instruments, video footage, web site development, etc.)
- Developing grants that relates directly to an activity resulting in a scholarly/creative product
- Other activities that advance knowledge or creative expression, and are part of the process of creating a scholarly/creative product(s)

A detailed list of recommended supporting materials for scholarship as well as teaching and service is provided on pages 30-31.

Reappointment

The Department of Communication recognizes different genres of reappointment. Typically, the appointment pattern is "3-3-1," with reviews occurring in the second, fifth, and sixth years. The review during the sixth year involves application for promotion to Associate Professor / Continuing Appointment. In cases that vary from the 3-3-1 appointment pattern, criteria for reappointment should be negotiated by the candidate, Department Chair, and Dean during the candidate's first year of employment at The College at Brockport.

In some cases, variations from the 3-3-1 appointment pattern occur. Guidelines for these variations are detailed on pages 34-35.

Candidates for reappointment abide by the following standards.

Second Year Reappointment

Because just one year of employment is scrutinized in this first review, a candidate may have little scholarly/creative work completed. In this situation, a candidate is granted the rating of "3," at rank. For a candidate with at least one level-three work completed, he or she is granted the rating of "4," above rank. For a candidate with at least one level-two or one level-one work completed, he or she is granted the rating of "5," excellent.

At this point in the reappointment process, candidates must recognize the importance of creating an agenda for scholarship/creative activity that eventually leads to the consistent production of level-two and level-one works.

Fifth Year Reappointment

In order to meet the scholarship requirements for **reappointment**, a candidate must *at a minimum* demonstrate that their scholarly/creative work is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for assistant professor:

- Authored/created one level-two work and
- Authored/created at least four level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for **reappointment** in the area of scholarly/creative work:

Excellent (5)
- Authored/created one or more level-one works and multiple level-two works.
- Authored/created at least four level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

Above Rank (4)
- Authored/created two or more level-two works.
- Authored/created at least four level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

At Rank (3)
- Authored/created one level-two work.
- Authored/created at least four level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

Below Rank (2)
- Authored/created no level-two or level-one works.
- Authored/created one to three level-three or level-four works.

Unsatisfactory (1)
- Authored/created no level-two or level-one works.
- Authored/created no level-three or level-four works.

Associate Professor/Continuing Appointment

In order to meet the scholarship requirements for promotion to **Associate Professor with Continuing Appointment**, a candidate must *at **a minimum*** demonstrate that their scholarly/creative work is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for Associate Professor:

- Authored/created four level-two works or their level-one equivalents in the five years prior to application and
- Authored/created approximately five level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

A candidate with previous experience at other institutions may include works published there. However, for these works to count at The College at Brockport, they must be no more than six years old from the time of original publication at the time of application for promotion to Associate Professor/Continuing Appointment.

The ability to demonstrate peer-review or adjudication of a candidate's work is the hallmark of performance at the Associate Professor level. For those being considered for tenure and promotion in their sixth year, the expectation is that they have a record of at least four peer-reviewed or adjudicated published works or their equivalent.

The Department of Communication recognizes that each candidate may tread a unique path in publishing at least four level-two works. Therefore, the candidate bears the burden of proof for establishing the value of their scholarly/creative work. In addition to the record of published works generated by the candidate, valuable scholarly/creative work includes:

- Delivered competitively selected presentations at international, national, and/or regional professional conferences or symposiums, or equivalent;

- Presented keynote address at professional or scholarly association conference or symposium, or equivalent.

- Similar evidence that demonstrates expert status within the field and mastery of subject matter.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for promotion to **Associate Professor/Continuing Appointment**, in the area of scholarly/creative work:

Excellent (5)

- Authored/created six or more level-two works or multiple level-one works in the five-six years prior to application.
- Authored/created approximately five level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

Above Rank (4)

- Authored/created five level-two works or their level-one equivalents in the five-six years prior to application.
- Authored/created approximately five level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

At Rank (3)

- Authored/created four level-two works or their level-one equivalents in the six years prior to application.
- Authored approximately five level-three or level-four works that may lead to production at levels two or one.

Below Rank (2)

- Authored/created two or three level-two works in the five-six years prior to application.
- Authored/created fewer than five level-three or level-four works.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- Authored/created one or no level-two equivalents in the five-six years prior to application.
- Authored/created fewer than five level-three or level-four works.

Full Professor

In order to meet the scholarship requirements for promotion to **Full Professor**, a candidate must *at **a minimum*** demonstrate that their scholarly/creative work is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for professor:

- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created a continuous stream of level-two works (approximately one every two years) and
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created a continuous stream of level-three and/or level-four works (approximately one every two years).

A candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate a sustained and exemplary scholarly/creative record and agenda. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence that he or she holds a distinguished reputation in his or her field of study. This evidence may include (but is not limited to):

- Serving as an editor or associate editor of professional journals or periodicals, or, as an executive producer, or other electronic equivalents,
- Presenting keynote addresses at international or national scholarly or professional conferences,
- Producing scholarly/creative works that have demonstrably influenced the candidate's field of study or
- Receiving international, national, or regional awards for scholarly/creative excellence.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for promotion to **Professor**, in the area of scholarly/creative work:

Excellent (5)

- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created (a) multiple level-one works and (b) a continuous stream of level-two works (approximately one every two years).
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created a continuous stream of level-two works (approximately one every two years).

Above Rank (4)

- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created (a) one level-one work and (b) a continuous stream of level-two works (approximately one every two years).
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created a continuous stream of level-two works (approximately one every two years).

At Rank (3)

- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created a continuous stream of level-three and/or level-four works (approximately one every two years).
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created a continuous stream of level-two works (approximately one every two years).

Below Rank (2)

- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created an occasional level-two work.
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created an occasional level-three and/or level-four work.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created no level-one or level-two works.
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, authored/created no or very few level-three and/or level-four works.

Evaluation of Service

Service contributions are important in maintaining the vitality of an academic community. The *Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report* describes service as follows:

> Encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission oriented contributions to the community that are not included in Scholarship. Examples of governance include but are not limited to:
>
> **Department** – department meetings and committees, advisement, registration, Saturday Information Sessions, and peer review.
> **School** – grade appeals, Deans' committees.
> **College** – Faculty Senate, college-wide committees, college-wide student organizations.
> **University** – University Faculty Senate, SUNY Ad Hoc Committees.
> **Profession** – leadership and other service in discipline-based organizations at local, state, national, or international levels.
> **Community** – work related to faculty member's area of professional expertise or to the mission of the college. This includes outreach, or community activities that enhance the college's reputation, support the school's efforts in advancement, admissions, and student success, and which relate to the faculty member's area(s) of professional expertise.

Service can therefore be demonstrated at multiple levels; however, Departmental service is considered a priority. Departmental service is essential to maintaining quality curriculum, programs, assessment, advisement, recruitment, and collegial relations.

Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the service needs of the Department by accepting a proportionate share of service-related responsibilities. The service needs of the Department will invariably ebb and flow from year to year; however, each faculty member should strive to be a good Department citizen by contributing to accomplishing the collective tasks required of the Department as a whole.

Minimum Departmental Service Activities

The basic minimum requirements of service for each academic year are:

- Maintaining a minimum of four regularly scheduled hours per week of office hours,
- Attending department and area meetings on a regular basis,
- Advising students,
- Participating in important Department functions (for example, Open Houses, paid and unpaid SOAR sessions, *Lambda Pi Eta* Honor Society Induction Ceremonies, etc.); and,
- Attending significant university functions (for example, Fall Convocation, Commencement, Spring Honors & Awards Ceremony, *Alpha Chi* Honor Society Induction Ceremonies, etc.).

Although the requirements above are labeled "minimum," they are important in the maintenance of a vibrant academic environment and in the evaluation of personnel actions, including applications for Discretionary Salary Increases.

Further Expectations For Service

In addition to the above minimum service activities, the Department of Communication recognizes the following characteristics of good service:

- Leadership is valued over active participation which is valued over membership: Leadership behaviors include chairing or co-chairing a committee, serving as a director or coordinator of a Departmental area, initiating or leading service projects in collaboration with peers, and preparing essential department reports or documents. Active participation behaviors include making tangible contributions towards the completion of service products and collaborating with peers in problem solving. Membership refers to one's status as an official member of a committee and regular attendance at meetings.

- Involvement with the Department's and the School's governance, curricular, and ad hoc committees and groups.

- Involvement with Department's, School's, and College's events, activities and, programs.

- Quality student advisement, with student satisfaction an essential component of the service portfolio: Advisement is an inevitable corollary of student-centered teaching in that it entails mentoring students outside the classroom setting to discuss academic, career and other post-graduation goals. It is also an essential part of Department service insofar as all full-time tenure-track faculty are required to advise students in academic planning and registration.

- Involvement in service activities at multiple levels – Department, College, University, community, and professional. (Community service must be linked to the faculty member's professional expertise.)

- Quality/impact/significance: Valuable products/outcomes generated (e.g., searches successfully completed, objectives or goals attained, policy or programmatic statements developed, or reports completed). Fewer high quality contributions are more highly valued than a larger number of contributions of lesser impact or quality.

Faculty with joint appointments in other Departments or administrative units may request to have their Departmental service responsibilities adjusted.

First year tenure-track faculty will have a reduced service load as needed; however, they are obligated to maintain minimum office hours and attendance at department and area meetings. Limited contributions to advisement, registration and open house activities may be introduced during the first year. Adjustments to service responsibilities for all faculty may be made in the process of negotiating workloads (see pages 9-10).

Evaluation of the quality and quantity of service is based on the supporting materials provided by the candidate. A detailed list of recommended supporting materials for service as well as teaching and scholarship is provided on pages 31-32.

Reappointment

In order to meet the service requirements for **reappointment**, a candidate must *at a minimum* demonstrate that their service performance is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for Assistant Professor. *Because there are multiple ways in which a faculty member can pursue a record of service, these criteria are meant to provide a base line for interpreting a service dossier rather than a rigid template*:

- Meets minimum expected Departmental service activities.
- Actively engaged in at least one additional service activity at the Department level with evidence of effectiveness and/or leadership.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load consistent with the Department average.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for **reappointment** in the area of service performance:

Excellent (5)

- Exceeds minimum expected Department service activities.
- Evidence of effectiveness as a leader in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities with at least <u>one</u> at the <u>Department</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load at or above the Department average.

Above Rank (4)

- Exceeds minimum expected Department service activities.
- Actively engaged in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities (including <u>one</u> at the <u>Department</u> level) with evidence of effectiveness in <u>both</u> and leadership in <u>one</u>.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load at or above the Department average.

At Rank (3)

- Meets minimum expected Departmental service activities.
- Actively engaged in at least <u>one</u> additional service activity at the <u>Department</u> level with evidence of effectiveness and/or leadership.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load consistent with the Department average.

Below Rank (2)

- Fails to meet one of the "at rank" requirements for reappointment.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- Fails to meet two or more of the "at rank" requirements for reappointment.

Associate Professor / Continuing Appointment

In order to meet the service requirements for promotion to **Associate Professor with Continuing Appointment**, a candidate must *at a minimum* demonstrate that their service performance is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for Associate Professor. *Because there are multiple ways in which a faculty member can pursue a record of service, these criteria are meant to provide a base line for interpreting a service dossier rather than a rigid template:*

- Meets minimum expected Department service activities.
- Actively engaged in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities with evidence of effectiveness in <u>each</u> and leadership in <u>one</u>. At least <u>one</u> of these activities must be at the <u>Department</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee consistent with the Department average.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for promotion to **Associate Professor/ Continuing Appointment** in the area of service performance:

Excellent (5)

- Exceeds minimum expected Department service activities.
- Actively engaged in at least <u>three</u> additional service activities at <u>two</u> levels with evidence of effectiveness in <u>each</u> and leadership in <u>two</u>. At least <u>one</u> of these activities must be at the <u>Department</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load at or above the Department average.

Above Rank (4)

- Exceeds minimum expected Department service activities
- Actively engaged in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities at <u>two</u> different levels with evidence of effectiveness and leadership in <u>both</u>. At least <u>one</u> of these activities must be at the <u>Department</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load at or above the Department average.

At Rank (3)

- Meets minimum expected Department service activities.
- Actively engaged in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities with evidence of effectiveness in <u>each</u> and leadership in <u>one</u>. At least <u>one</u> of these activities must be at the <u>Department</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee consistent with the Department average.

Below Rank (2)

- Fails to meet one of the "at rank" requirements for Associate Professor.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- Fails to meet two or more of the "at rank" requirements for Associate Professor.

Full Professor

In order to meet the service requirements for promotion to **Full Professor**, a candidate must *at a minimum* demonstrate that their service performance is "at rank" in accordance with the following criteria for Professor. *Because there are multiple ways in which a faculty member*

can pursue a record of service, these criteria are meant to provide a base line for interpreting a service dossier rather than a rigid template:

- Meets minimum expected Department service activities.
- Evidence of effectiveness as a leader in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities at <u>two</u> different levels. At least <u>one</u> of the service activities must be at the <u>Departmental</u> level.
- Evidence of active participation or leadership at the <u>discipline</u> or <u>professional</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load consistent with the Department average.

The following is the paradigm used for ranking candidates for promotion to **<u>Full Professor</u>** in the area of service performance:

<u>Excellent</u> **(5)**

- Exceeds minimum expected Department service activities.
- Evidence of effectiveness as a leader in at least <u>three</u> additional service activities at <u>two</u> different levels. At least <u>one</u> of the service activities must be at the <u>Departmental</u> level.
- Evidence of leadership at the <u>discipline</u> or <u>professional</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load at or above the Department average.

<u>Above Rank</u> **(4)**

- Exceeds minimum expected Department service activities.
- Evidence of effectiveness as a leader in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities at <u>two</u> different levels. At least <u>one</u> of the service activities must be at the <u>Departmental</u> level.
- Evidence of leadership at the <u>discipline</u> or <u>professional</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load at or above the Department average.

<u>At Rank</u> **(3)**

- Meets minimum expected Department service activities.
- Evidence of effectiveness as a leader in at least <u>two</u> additional service activities at <u>two</u> different levels. At least <u>one</u> of the service activities must be at the <u>Departmental</u> level.
- Evidence of active participation or leadership at the <u>discipline</u> or <u>professional</u> level.
- Provides evidence of quality student advisement with an advisee load consistent with the Department average.

Below Rank (2)

- Fails to meet one of the "at rank" requirements for Full Professor.

Unsatisfactory (1)

- Fails to meet two or more of the "at rank" requirements for Full Professor.

Continuing Expectations for Tenured Faculty

Once tenured, faculty are expected to continue to meet at least "At Rank" requirements in all areas: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. In fact, they are encouraged to perform above "At Rank" in all areas.

Portfolio Development

Candidates preparing portfolios for APT Committee review and evaluation should consult the APT Manual carefully and select documentation and materials that demonstrate those criteria. They are also encouraged to seek additional guidance from the APT Committee and senior faculty members in learning some best practices of portfolio construction. Candidates may wish to organize their teaching, scholarship and service portfolios using the values described as major headings. Identified below are some suggested examples for documentation of performance.

Characteristics of a good portfolio and supplementary materials recognized by the School include:

- Thoughtful and reflective content
- Clear organization
- Professional presentation
- Clear labeling to aid navigation (use of table of contents, organizational tabs, headings, labels, arrow markers, etc.)
- Clear font such as Times New Roman or Garamond
- Professional binders, folders, organizers, etc.
- Appropriate and secure holders for CD-ROMS, videos and media materials
- Labeled, written and cued, and, cued and labeled electronic material
- Avoid superfluous materials like notes of thanks, posters, and promotional or advertising samples unless they contain an evaluation or provide context

Identified below are some suggested for documentation and supporting materials in constructing portfolios for teaching, scholarship and service. The list is neither inclusive nor exhaustive, and faculty should not feel compelled to provide all of the suggested documentation or materials. Remember that candidates bear the burden of proof in demonstrating levels of performance. Supplemental material should provide evidence of productivity, offer a context for reviewers, and include evaluative comments on the candidate's work.

Teaching

- Reflective statement on teaching performance (including advisement) during period of review
- Original copies of IAS summaries for representative courses
- Other forms of student satisfaction/reaction feedback
- Course grade distributions
- Representative course syllabi
- Representative course tests or other evaluative measures
- Representative graded student papers (with authors' names deleted or obscured)
- Representative course handouts and distributed materials
- Descriptions of teaching and evaluation methodologies employed
- Description of involvement with independent student projects (including independent studies, directed studies and theses)
- Description of tutoring or mentoring efforts or their equivalent
- Description of new course development(s)
- Description of major course revision(s)
- Description of academic advisement activity (including numbers of advisees, advisement office hours and time spent in academic advisement)
- Other material as recommended by the department
- Peer review of teaching activity (both from within and outside the department)

Scholarship

- Reflective statement on scholarship or creative activity during period of review
- Copies of all published scholarly papers or creative work (galleys may be submitted for those "in press")
- Copies of all papers or creative work "in review." "in process," or "in development" (include a statement describing current status of such papers and what was accomplished on the paper during period of review)
- Copies of conference programs reflecting presentations, panels chaired, panel participation, poster session activity, etc.)
- Peer review of scholarly work in unsolicited letters or reviews
- Documentation of degree of selectivity or acceptance rates for materials submitted
- Other material as recommended by the department

Service

- Reflective statement on service in each of the six areas of service: Department, School, College, University, discipline or profession, and community (to the extent such community is related to professional expertise)
- Description of activities undertaken and/or completed in each of the six areas of service

- Letters of commendation, appreciation, or support from relevant authorities or individuals attesting to service activities described
- Descriptions of service activity products and/or outcomes
- Signed copies of advisement registration forms
- When available and appropriate, copies or samples of service activity products
- Evidence of quality student academic advisement (for example, unsolicited letters from students, anonymous ANGEL surveys of advisees, and data on student achievements that were the direct result of mentoring, including conference presentations, graduate school admission, and employment in a communication-related field).
- Peer review of service
- Other materials as recommended by the Department

Discretionary Salary Increase Evaluation

The availability of Discretionary Salary Increases is determined through a negotiation process between SUNY and United University Professions – the official union representing SUNY faculty. The procedures and criteria for determining DSI awards are a local campus decision. DSI awards are exclusively based on the review period since the last DSI determination (usually, the performance during the previous academic year).

The faculty member's Annual Report is considered the fundamental document on which DSI decisions are based. In this document, a candidate should provide evidence of his or her performance in teaching (for instance, references to student satisfaction, grade distributions), scholarship (for instance, citations for publications), and service (for instance, remarks about work on committees, attendance at important campus ceremonies). If necessary, additional supporting materials may be provided to the APT Committee to establish the quality of performance (for example, evidence of peer-review for scholarly-creative work, IAS student evaluation scores, etc.). However, only the Annual Report will be forwarded to the Dean.

Faculty members may nominate themselves for DSI by submitting a cover letter, copy of the previous year's annual report, and supporting documentation organized in a professional manner or faculty members may be nominated by a colleague with the appropriate documentation submitted for APT Committee review.

The Review Process

The DSI nomination deliberation procedures proceed in the following order:

- Each committee member will rate each candidate on a five-point scale for each of the three performance areas. These individual ratings will be used as a basis for discussion of the candidate's performance.

- The committee will collectively review and discuss the ratings while referencing the content of each candidate's annual report and supporting materials. Individual members may make changes to ratings in light of the discussion.

- Candidates must be "above rank" in at least one category of performance (teaching, scholarship, or service). If a candidate less than "at rank" in any one category, (s)he is ineligible for DSI.

- A Yes-No secret ballot will be taken for each candidate by the committee to arrive at a decision on a candidate's performance.

- In the event of unusual circumstances, the Committee may vote to reconsider a candidate at any time, provided that a majority of the Committee agrees to do so.

- Once the Committee has identified those candidates worthy of receiving DSI they will rank order them according to level of performance achieved. The rank ordered list of recommendations and supporting statement from the APT Committee is forwarded to the Department Chair for consideration. The Chair makes his/her own independent evaluation and forwards it to the Dean's office for consideration by the Chairs of the School.

Standards for Evaluation

When assessing a DSI application for the period under review in terms of *teaching and service*, the Committee first considers the candidate's status as an Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor. Then, it applies the relevant guidelines for promotion and tenure detailed in this document.

For example, an Assistant Professor who is pursuing reappointment requests a DSI. The Committee may deem the applicant's teaching "at rank" if his or her IAS scores "generally average in the 1.49-2.25 range" (p. 12). Similarly, the Committee may deem the applicant's service "at rank" if he or she meets "minimum expected departmental service activities," provides evidence of "quality student advisement," and so forth (p. 26). Again, a complete list of guidelines is contained within this manual.

For the assessment of *scholarship* for the period under review, the Department recognizes that faculty members—including Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors—may be remarkably active. However, they may not necessarily produce a level-three work or more each year. Therefore, *for adjudicating DSI applications only,* the Committee uses the following ratings to assess scholarly/creative productivity. This rating system is designed to guide the Committee's deliberations. It does not provide a complete and inflexible list of requirements.

Superior (5)

- Authored/created at least one level-one work (peer-reviewed book, documentary, or equivalent), or multiple level-two works (peer-reviewed journal articles, referred video productions, or equivalent), AND
- Evidence of level-four work (conference presentations or ongoing scholarly activity)

Excellent (4)

- Authored/created at least two level-two works (peer-reviewed journal articles, referred video productions, or equivalent), or some combination of level-two and level-three works, AND
- Evidence of level-four work (conference presentations or ongoing scholarly activity)

Above Rank (3)

- Authored/created at least one level-two work (peer-reviewed journal articles, referred video productions, or equivalent), or multiple level-three works (non-refereed video productions, book chapters, or equivalent), AND
- Evidence of level-four work (conference presentations or ongoing scholarly activity)

At Rank (2)

- Authored/created one or more level-three or level-four works

Below Rank (1)

- Inactive in scholarship

Variations From The 3-3-1 Reappointment Pattern

The Department of Communication understands the benefits of the college's recommended 3-3-1 reappointment pattern. For junior faculty, who are not applying previous work experience toward tenure, the pattern provides helpful guideposts for promotion and continuing appointment. Also, it provides the Department with a way to structure its expectations for a candidate's progress in all three areas of evaluation: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Simultaneously, the Department recognizes that unique situations may require flexibility. Therefore, it allows for variations from the 3-3-1 pattern when candidates' applications meet minimal expectations but warrant additional scrutiny before the next regularly scheduled evaluation.

For example, a junior faculty member applies for a three-year contract during his or her second year review. At this time, the faculty member "may have little or no scholarly/creative work completed." This is allowable, according to the standards expressed in this APT document. Nevertheless, his or her application demonstrates insufficient progress towards the creation of "an agenda for scholarship/creative activity that leads to the consistent production of level-two and level-one works" (p. 19).

Technically, in light of such evidence, the APT Committee could recommend against reappointment. Effectively, this is a recommendation for termination of employment. However, to allow for the gathering of more data, the committee may favor providing the candidate with a reprieve.

Guidelines For Variation From The 3-3-1 Pattern

Variations from the 3-3-1 pattern may only emerge from the second-year review for reappointment. It is assumed that, by the fifth-year review, sufficient evidence is available to speculate about the candidate's potential to earn tenure.

When variations occur, the APT Committee is responsible for recommending a new reappointment pattern. To accomplish this task, the following four directives must be followed.

First, any new pattern must end with a one-year period to allow for fair notice of termination, if applicable.

Second, any new pattern cannot exceed a total of seven years. Therefore, if a candidate ultimately earns tenure, the entirety of his or her pattern will be:

- 3-1-1-1-1,
- 3-1-2-1, or
- 3-2-1-1.

Third, a new pattern unfolds on a contract-to-contract basis. Put differently, the balance of an appointment pattern after the second-year review does not need to be detailed beyond the suggested term. For example, at a second year review, the Committee may propose either a one- or a two-year contract.

- If the former is selected, the Committee plans to review a candidate's materials again in 12 months. At that time, the Committee may recommend reappointment with another one-year contract or with a two-year contract.
- If the latter is selected, the Committee plans to review a candidate's materials again in 24 months. At that time, given the first two directives above, the Committee may recommend reappointment only with a one-year contract.

Fourth, the APT Committee is responsible for clarifying specific measures of evaluation in relation to established guidelines for teaching, scholarship, and service. Put simply, the Committee must prorate expectations. For a candidate, these provide standards for future reappointment recommendations by the Committee and by all other involved parties (e.g., the Chair, the Dean).

Departmental Votes On Altered Reappointment Patterns

When the APT Committee proposes an *initial* variation (i.e., at the two-year review) from the 3-3-1 appointment pattern, the Department of Communication has two voting options.

First, it may vote to support the recommendation.

Second, it may vote to not support the recommendation. In this case, an additional vote is required. The Department must vote to:

- Recommend the candidate for reappointment with a full, three-year contract. Thus, the candidate's reappointment pattern remains 3-3-1.
- Recommend against reappointment for the candidate.

Following a candidate's initial variation from the 3-3-1 pattern (i.e., in reviews after the second-year evaluation), the Department votes on subsequent recommendations for reappointment with one- and two-year contracts.

- The consequences of voting in favor of these reappointments are evident.
- However, if the Department votes to not recommend reappointment with a one- or two-year contract, the candidate faces the possibility of termination of employment.

Regarding Outside Employment and Consulting

In accordance with the College's "Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies" (2007-2008), Department of Communication recognizes the value of "work related to [a] faculty member's area of professional expertise" and of "consultant work in the public or private sector based on the faculty member's discipline-based knowledge and expertise" (p. 16).

Such work is "scholarship" if it leads to the creation of new knowledge, the synthesizing of existing knowledge, or the application of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems and if it goes through a process of peer review or adjudication (p. 16)

Such work is "service" if it enhances the governance of the Department of Communication, the School, The College at Brockport, SUNY, a professional organization, or a community group (p. 16).

In either case, outside employment and consulting must conform to all rules established by the College and by SUNY. Many of these rules are detailed clearly on the "Human Relations" section of the College's website and are summarized below. Also, when applying for personnel decisions, including Discretionary Salary Increases, candidates engaged in outside employment and consulting are required by the Department to include copies of completed and approved "Proposal Forms" / "Consulting Applications" noted below.

Outside Employment

- No employee of the College may "engage in other employment which interferes with the performance of the employee's professional obligation" to the College. Moreover, "Conflicts of interest as well as time are implied in this proposition."

- Ultimately, the President of the College determines the professional obligations College employees.

- Requests for outside employment must be made using the College's "Outside Employment Proposal Form."

<u>Consulting</u>

- Before engaging in consulting work, faculty members must obtain prior written permission from the College's Administration, beginning with the Department Chair, about the "nature and extent" of the consulting activity.

- Ordinarily, consulting is limited to "one day per week or a maximum of four days per month."

- When questions are raised about a faculty member's ability to maintain both employment at the College and consulting work, "further clarification and discussion of both the nature and extent of the outside employment obligation" should occur "between all concerned parties." In some cases, a faculty member may be required to cease consulting activities.

- Requests for consulting work must be made in writing using the College's "Consulting Application."

Grievance Procedures

If a faculty member wishes to issue a formal complaint regarding the APT process or any other action by a member or committee of the Department of Communication, the faculty member must follow the College's procedures for expressing grievances. A grievance should concern a matter within the power of the Department to remedy. It must state the nature of the complaint and the relief sought. Grievances covered by any contract between the State, University and the collective bargaining agent shall be pursued following the procedures in that contract. See grievance procedures section of *The College at Brockport Faculty Handbook* and the Affirmative Action Office for guidelines on the grievance process.