

II.D. TENURE AND PROMOTION RULES AND PROCEDURES¹
School of Arts, Media and Communication
Departments of Art and Design, Communication & Media, Music, and Theatre & Dance
(Revised April 2016; November 10, 2017; September 8, 2020; April 5, 2022; April 19, 2024;
May 2, 2025)

Every new faculty member will be given a copy of these personnel rules and procedures, together with the relevant University Rules and Procedures during their first regular semester of employment by the appropriate Department Chair, who will explain and discuss them. Tenure and/or promotion are granted only by the affirmative action of the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the President.

Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in an appointed academic position unless dismissed for good cause (See University Procedure *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*). System Policy *12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure* identifies the conditions or circumstances that will constitute cause for dismissal of a faculty member.

A faculty member with tenure may request a half- or three-quarter-time appointment for a fixed period of time. If such request is approved, the faculty member's tenure status will not be forfeited.

II.D.1. Eligibility

II.D.1.1. Eligibility for Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Academic Preparation
Holds the earned doctorate or the equivalent terminal degree; or holds an advanced degree in combination with appropriate certification and professional work experience.
2. Experience
Has at least five years' experience in full-time university teaching, which includes three years in the rank of Assistant Professor. Related professional experience may in rare cases substitute.

II.D.1.2. Eligibility for Promotion to Professor

1. Academic Preparation
Holds the earned doctorate or equivalent terminal degree appropriate to the teaching area.
2. Experience
Has at least ten years in full-time university teaching including four years in the rank of Associate Professor. Related professional experience may in rare cases substitute.

¹ When a deadline specified in this section falls on a weekend or holiday, the due date shall be the first business day thereafter. In the event of a conflict with these rules and procedures, University Rules take precedence.

II.D.1.3. Eligibility for Tenure

To be eligible to receive tenure, a faculty member must be an employee of Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, must have the terminal degree in their academic discipline or a related discipline, and should hold the academic rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor. Members of the faculty whose appointments are temporary, part-time or clearly short-term, e.g., Lecturers, Visiting Professors of any rank or Graduate Students serving as Teaching Assistants, are not entitled to tenure and consequently will not be subject to the provisions of this document. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time Assistant Professor or a higher rank, the probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed seven years of full-time service at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Up to three years of appropriate full-time service at other institutions may be included as a portion of the probationary period if agreed to in writing at the time of initial appointment.

Normally, a faculty member comes under tenure consideration during the sixth year of service at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Faculty members who believe their teaching, scholarship, and service record merits early tenure may apply during the fifth year of service at the University. See section 2.4 of University Procedure *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*.

II.D.2. Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

1. Faculty members will request that they be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the academic year in which they believe the appropriate education, experience, teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service standards will be met. Those seeking promotion to Professor should be aware of University Procedure *33.99.04.C0.02, Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members*, which requires unsuccessful applicants for promotion to this rank to wait one year before applying once again (see II.D.8.2).
2. By March 15, the Director shall notify candidates of their status. To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate must send a letter to the Director by April 1 of the academic year in which the faculty member desires consideration. The Director must certify that the appropriate education and experience standards have been met and must respond to the faculty member in writing within two weeks. Should the Director fail to certify that appropriate education and experience standards have been met, the faculty member has the right to appeal the case to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall respond to the faculty member in writing within two weeks. By May 1, a case will be created in the electronic faculty review system for candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure, and the Director will also hold a meeting to review timelines, processes, and portfolio expectations. Inadvertent omissions from eligibility lists may be corrected without appeal. Promotion and tenure shall be consistent with provisions for equal employment opportunity. Candidates must submit their supplemental files to the Director's office by September 1. The appropriate Department Chair shall then be responsible for making these files available to reviewing faculty.
3. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure will organize materials into an evaluative portfolio by the established deadline, as outlined in section 6 of University Procedure *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*. Portfolios should consist of no more than 750 electronic standard letter-size pages. In assembling their evaluative portfolio, candidates should focus on demonstrating quality. It must include, in the following order:

Section I. A letter from the Department Chair, noting the nature of the appointment (percent teaching, research, scholarship, and/or creative activity, service – including semi-administrative and administrative duties) and any changes in those duties over time.

Section II. An executive summary (2 pages maximum) that clearly illustrates how the candidate's qualifications meet each of the requirements described in University Procedure 12.01.01.C1, *Tenure* and Faculty Handbook Section II.E.1 ("Annual Review of Faculty" [University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.04, *Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, and Service*]): teaching, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service. Candidates are reminded that quality, impact, and significance of accomplishments are of primary importance.

Section III. A current *curriculum vitae*.

Section IV. Evidence of excellence in teaching.

1. A statement of teaching philosophy and growth (2 pages maximum) discussing improvements, innovations, and changes initiated during the period under review.
2. An account of teaching assignments and teaching loads, by semester, during the period under review.
3. Student evaluations, peer review of teaching effectiveness, sample course syllabi, and other documentation regarding teaching, such as summaries of teaching innovations, handouts, new course development, samples of student work, and other activities relating to teaching effectiveness and teaching quality. Please note that the tab for student evaluations should be created by the faculty member and the student evaluations will be inserted by the director's office.

Section V. Evidence of excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA), if applicable.

1. A statement explaining contributions and success in these areas (2 pages maximum).
2. Documentation demonstrating excellence and contributions to RSCA.
3. A minimum of two and a maximum of four external letters of evaluation; see below for specific procedure.

Section VI. Evidence of excellence in service.

1. A statement explaining leadership and service contributions (2 pages maximum).
2. Documentation demonstrating excellence and leadership in service.

Section VII. Other documentation as required by department or disciplinary criteria, as well as that which the candidate wishes to provide.

4. The Director's office shall be responsible for reconciling differences between school practices and university rules and procedures concerning placement of course evaluations in the candidate's evaluative portfolio.

5. The Director's office will upload copies of annual or other evaluations (e.g., pre-tenure reviews) from the department chair, the Director, and Provost along with student course evaluations for the period under review and any faculty responses to those evaluations.
6. Each department, in consultation with the SAMC Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, shall be responsible for formulating and distributing guidelines that assist faculty members in documenting their activities in their evaluative portfolios. Understanding that the tenure and/or promotion process provides for review by individuals outside of the candidate's field of expertise, candidates should make every effort to provide context and explanations relating to their documentation and evidence of excellence suitable for non-specialists.

6.1 External Review

- a. Independent external review is a critical source of supplemental evaluation, allowing an assessment of the prominence of a candidate's RSCA as viewed by their professional peers. The promotion and tenure portfolios of all tenured/tenure-track faculty must include external review letters.
- b. External reviewers must be established scholars or artists in the candidate's field of study or a closely related area at peer or aspirational institutions. The reviewers must have an appointment at the rank to which the candidate is applying or higher or hold significant stature in the profession. External reviewers will be asked to specifically comment on the candidate's RSCA and the significance of the contributions to the discipline, as guided by the External Reviewer Request template (provided on the school website). A minimum of two external review letters must be included in the portfolio; at least one should come from the list provided by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and one from the list provided by the candidate.
- c. External reviewers will be selected by the Department Chair, with half coming from the list nominated by the candidate and half from the list of four potential reviewers nominated by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Director must approve the final list of reviewers. The candidate may submit a list of external reviewers who should be excluded from the selection.

6.2 Timeline and Process

- a. Once a faculty candidate has submitted to the Director the candidate's letter of intent to pursue promotion and/or tenure, this process can begin. The deadlines listed below are the latest dates for this process to ensure adequate time for review of the candidate's materials. To facilitate external review, the candidate provides a list of four suggested external reviewers to the Department Chair by April 20 preceding the fall when the portfolio is due. The list of suggested external reviewers must include the reviewers' names, institutional affiliations, and contact information. Candidates may also include RSCA material the candidate judges as indispensable to the assessment of their case.
- b. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee identified in the fall of the academic year in which external review selection is taking place (see II.D.3.1 below) will be reassembled following the declaration of any departmental candidates pursuing promotion and/or tenure. The committee may request the participation of any

tenured departmental faculty who had not participated earlier in that academic year due to their appointment to the School or University Promotion and Tenure Committees. The Departmental Committee may choose to continue with the Committee Chair chosen earlier in the year or elect a new one.

- c. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair will gather and submit a list of four suggested external reviewers to the Department Chair by April 20 preceding the fall when the portfolio is due. As with the candidate's list, the committee's list of suggested external reviewers must include the reviewers' names, institutional affiliations, and contact information. Within five business days, the Department Chair will review the list from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee with the candidate to ensure that they do not object to any names on the list. If the candidate objects to any names, additional names will be requested from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. These names must be provided no later than April 30 (6-8 business days after the original lists are provided). The Department Chair sends the final list of external reviewers to be approved by the Director no later than May 20. None of the external reviewers will be people objected to by the candidate.
- d. External review letters will be requested by the Department Chair using the External Review Request template on the school's website. To ensure that adequate time is allowed for external reviewers to review the candidate's materials and respond, the faculty candidate will submit a curriculum vitae and documentation for at least three examples of the candidate's RSCA by May 31, and the Department Chair will send out four requests (two from the candidate's list and two from the departmental P&T committee list) for review on June 1. One letter from each list is required for the file to be considered complete. External review letters are due on August 15. Within 5 business days after August 15, the Department Chair will notify the candidate regarding how many external review letters have been received. All external review letters that are received by the August 15 deadline will be included in the file. Redacted copies of these external review letters will be shared with the candidate.
- e. As external reviews are a common practice, the University does not anticipate that obtaining the minimum required number of letters from external reviewers will be a common problem. However, there are timelines to advance the process if external reviewers are not responsive. If no acknowledgement is received by the 7th business day following the department chair having sent the initial requests, the department chair should reach out a second time. If no response is received within a further 7 business days, the chair should note that the reviewer provided no response and move on to the next set of names on the external reviewer list.
- f. External reviewers are instructed to evaluate the candidate's dossier based on the criteria listed in the P&T guidelines provided to them. External reviewers are explicitly told that they should not evaluate the candidate by criteria used at their own university. All external review letters received from accepted reviewers, and the reviewers' curriculum vitae will be advanced with the portfolio.
- g. The candidate may submit a response to external reviewers' letters of their RSCA by September 1. If submitted, the candidate's response letter will be included with the portfolio.

II. D.3. Department Review Process

1. As per University Procedure *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*, for the purposes of tenure and promotion the School of Arts, Media, and Communication shall consist of the following departmental promotion and tenure review units: Art and Graphic Design, Communication & Media, Music, and Theatre & Dance.
 - a) For tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, each of these units shall consist of all tenured and fixed-term faculty members in the department that are not currently seeking promotion or tenure and are at or above the associate faculty rank, with the exception of any tenured faculty who are serving on the School or University promotion and tenure review committees in that academic year. For the purposes of promotion to Full Professor, each unit shall consist of all tenured and fixed-term Full Professors in the department. Tenured faculty members will review and vote on all fixed-term promotion candidates. They will also review and vote on all tenured/tenure-track promotion candidates if they are at or above the rank at which promotion is being requested. Fixed-term faculty members will only review and vote on fixed-term promotion candidates if they are at or above the rank at which promotion is being requested. Only tenured faculty members will review and vote on tenure candidates. Members ineligible to vote on a candidate will not participate in the review or discussion of that candidate's case.
 - b) In every case, each departmental unit shall have at least three members eligible to vote on the cases being reviewed. In the event there are fewer than three members, additional members shall be nominated by the tenured and tenure-track department faculty and approved by the Director.
2. Within the first week of each fall semester, the Director (or designee) shall convene a meeting of each departmental promotion and tenure review unit, at which time the Director shall review SAMC and university tenure and promotion policies. The faculty will also elect a Chair for this committee.
3. The Chair of each Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall call subsequent meetings, allowing for at least five (5) working days of written notice. The Director (or designee) and Department Chair may not be present during any of these subsequent meetings.
4. Before October 1, each Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall hold a final meeting to hold tenure and/or promotion votes. Voting for each candidate shall be done by secret ballot; representatives to the School or University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall not vote but may attend meetings. By a simple majority of those voting, the committee shall recommend to grant or to deny promotion and/or tenure. Decisions must be based upon the written measures of the discipline and department (if applicable), the School, and the university. Eligible faculty members who cannot attend this meeting may send their sealed absentee vote to the committee chair. All members of the committee shall sign this report, which shall be submitted to the Department Chair by October 1.
5. After receiving this report, the Department Chair is encouraged to consult with the committee regarding its recommendation. The Department Chair shall develop a written recommendation to grant or deny promotion and/or tenure. Decisions must be based upon the written measures of the discipline and department (if applicable), the School, and the university.
6. By October 15, the Department Chair will meet with the candidate and review the recommendations (written and numerical) of the Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the Chair.

7. Within two business days of this meeting, the candidate will submit a response of no more than two (2) pages to the recommendations of the Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the Department Chair. This response shall indicate concurrence or non-concurrence with the recommendations.
8. The recommendations of the Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and the Department Chair, along with the candidate's written response, shall be added to the evaluative portfolio and forwarded to the Director. This process must be completed by October 20.

II. D.4. School Review Process

1. By October 20, the Director shall call a meeting of the School Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (for the composition and formation of this committee, see School Rule I.B. Standing Committee Structure). At this meeting, the Director shall review School and university tenure policies and procedures and the committee shall elect a chair. All faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure shall be reviewed. The Director shall make available to all committee members the evaluative portfolios submitted by candidates for promotion and/or tenure.
2. The School Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall hold subsequent meetings, allowing for at least five (5) working days of written notice. The Director (or designee) and Department Chair may not be present during any of these subsequent meetings.
3. No later than November 10, the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall hold a final meeting to hold tenure and/or promotion votes. Voting for each tenure and/or promotion candidate shall be done by secret ballot; by a simple majority of those voting, the committee shall recommend to grant or to deny promotion and/or tenure. Only tenured faculty will review and vote on tenure-track and tenured candidates. Decisions must be based upon the written measures of the discipline and department (if applicable), the School, and the university. In no more than 250 words, the committee shall document the vote count and explain the results of the review to the Director. All members of the committee shall sign this report.
4. After receiving the recommendations from the Department Committee, the Chair, and the School Committee, the Director shall write an individual recommendation for each candidate to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion. The Director is encouraged to consult with the Committees, the Department Chair, and the Candidate regarding the recommendations. The recommendation to approve or deny tenure and/or promotion must be based upon the written measures of the discipline and department (if applicable), the School, and the university.
5. The Director will meet with the faculty member to review with the candidate the results of each level of recommendation (including the Director's). The Committee's letter and the Director's recommendation shall be added to the evaluative portfolio and forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs by December 1.

II.D. 5. Candidate Withdrawal from Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration

As per University Procedure *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*, a candidate may withdraw from consideration at any time prior to the forwarding of the recommendations to the Provost for review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. This request must be made in writing, signed, and dated to the Director. In the event a candidate requests withdrawal from the tenure review process, the faculty member will be offered a contract for one additional year following the term or semester in which the notice is received and will not be subsequently renewed.

II.D.6. Recommendation to the University and the A&M System Board of Regents

The completed evaluative portfolios for all candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall be forwarded to the Provost. Following section 9 of University Procedure *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*, the candidates will then be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost, and the President, who shall submit their recommendation to the Board of Regents. No faculty member shall be promoted and/or tenured without the approval of the A&M System Board of Regents.

II.D.7. Standards for Promotion and Tenure

For tenured/tenure-track faculty, promotion and/or tenure shall be based upon demonstration of progressive effectiveness in teaching, RSCA, and service as these activities relate to the candidate's overall effectiveness as a university professor. For fixed-term faculty, promotion shall be based upon demonstration of progressive effectiveness in teaching and service, without expectations for RSCA. Faculty members are to take the initiative in promoting their own growth in each of these areas. Faculty members progressing from one rank to the next are expected to demonstrate levels of achievement consistent with the increased expectations of their new rank. Faculty must also fulfill faculty responsibilities, as described in University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Faculty Members*. Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committees, Department Chairs, the School Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, and the Director will place heaviest emphasis on achievements accomplished between the promotion sought and the last received.

Those reviewing applications for promotion and/or tenure shall apply the following standards and requirements for evidence in a manner consistent with those widely accepted for the development of faculty in the candidate's discipline. For university definitions, see University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.04, Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service*. Weight will be given to the below areas of responsibility according to the percentage of distribution of workload during each candidate's review period.

II.D.7.1. Teaching

Teaching includes Knowledge in the Teaching Field, Quality in Teaching, and Academic Advisement and Career Counseling. Teaching encompasses instructional activity as well as those professional development activities aimed at making one a better teacher or at enhancing one's expertise in a teaching subject area. Examples of teaching include classroom and laboratory instruction, development of new courses, and other examples listed in the University Procedure *33.99.04.C0.02, Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members* and *12.01.01.C1, Tenure*. In SAMC, teaching also includes individual practice sessions, rehearsals, and workshops.

Examples of professional development include engaging in the peer review process (discussions with fellow faculty, mentoring, videotaping classes, mid-semester assessments, syllabi swaps, classroom visits, etc.), preparing teaching and/or course portfolios, attending conferences, institutes, and/or workshops directed toward teaching or toward maintaining one's professional accreditation, and undertaking reading programs or creative activities to stay current in one's field. The goal of these activities is to improve teaching by gathering information and providing feedback on teaching and by increasing knowledge in one's field. Recognizing that no single instrument can reliably measure teaching effectiveness, those reviewing the candidacy will conscientiously examine a teacher's content and pedagogy from various perspectives such as student evaluation, peer evaluation, and self-evaluation. Candidates are responsible for supplying sufficient materials for that examination. If the materials are not sufficient, the reviewing body may request that candidates provide further information or documentation. The following statements represent some, but not necessarily all, of the indices used to measure these three perspectives.

a. Self-evaluation

In a written statement of no more than two pages, candidates shall assess their teaching effectiveness, addressing any considerations they think relevant. Candidates are invited to comment on any evidence related to their teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations and peer comments. Additional material evidence to support the self-evaluation of teaching should accompany this statement. These items may include, but are not restricted to, syllabi, handouts, development of instructional websites, examples of student work, videotapes of classroom teaching, student scores on standardized achievement tests, any record of student accomplishments outside the University in areas related to instruction, and any evidence of activities to improve knowledge in the discipline or skills as a teacher (conferences, classes, peer assistance, or special reading programs).

b. Student Evaluation

Student evaluation forms, comprised of a section for numerical ratings and a section for written comments, are to be administered to every class. The General Information section of the student ratings becomes part of the teacher's permanent file and is to be carefully interpreted by all those involved in the promotion and/or tenure process. In assessing student input, those reviewing the candidate will take into account circumstances that might influence student opinion, such as the difficulty of course materials and assignments, grade distribution, level of course, whether the course is part of the core curriculum or required by the School, and class sizes. The breadth of academic non-teaching responsibilities will also be taken into account when reviewing and assessing student evaluations.

c. Peer Review

Peer review allows a supplementary way of providing support for establishing a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, as well as the depth and currency of their knowledge. As such, candidates for promotion and/or tenure are required to secure written peer review(s) of their teaching and must submit evidence of such review(s) as part of their evaluative portfolio. They may accomplish this through team-teaching, by soliciting classroom visits, and by providing course materials to colleagues for their review. Candidates are expected to take the initiative in making colleagues' input as educated as possible, and should consult with their department chair, members of the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, or fellow disciplinary faculty in selecting appropriate reviewers.

d. Additional Disciplinary/Departmental Requirements

In addition to the items described and encouraged above, Departments may specify other artifacts of teaching that need to be shared as part of the evaluative portfolio during the tenure and/or promotion process.

II.D.7.2. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA)

In a written statement of no more than two pages, candidates shall describe their scholarship, addressing any considerations they think relevant. Candidates are responsible for providing documented evidence that the products of any RSCA have met the standards below, and must ensure that those reviewing the file can clearly discern a pattern of engagement in such activity during the period under consideration. Candidates should take particular care to demonstrate the quality of their RSCA.

RSCA consists of academic work (productivity which can be documented in the form of research, writing, speaking, artistic production or performance or in some other appropriate form) that results in expanding the body of knowledge and understanding of the candidate's academic field. Candidates must demonstrate why any such RSCA that falls outside their discipline should merit consideration. Lists of examples of RSCA have been published by all the SAMC disciplines. RSCA may be achieved singly or in collaboration with others. Such work must result in some clear, externally peer reviewed or peer selected product, and must have involved work that is non-routine, novel, creative, imaginative, ingenious, or original (though not necessarily all of these). It should occur in addition to one's normal teaching assignment.

RSCA includes academic work (as defined above) in any of three separate, yet interconnected forms: Discovery and Creation, Integration and Teaching, and Application.

a. Discovery and Creation

The scholarship of discovery and creation involves the search for new knowledge in the discipline and for a richer understanding of the academic field. Products of the scholarship of discovery and creation must be externally peer reviewed or selected, and candidates are reminded that the quality of such activities must be demonstrated. A non-exhaustive list of activities includes the following:

1. publications;
2. manuscripts submitted for publication;
3. work in progress;
4. oral convention presentations (e.g. panelist, respondent -- a substantive presentation, not just moderator of panel);
5. art exhibitions;
6. music compositions, performances, and conducting;
7. theatrical performance, direction, design, scripts, and script adaptations;
8. public exhibition of films, tapes directed or produced or otherwise created.

b. Integration and Teaching

The scholarship of integration and teaching emphasizes fitting one's own research or creative activities, or the similar work of others, into larger intellectual patterns for an external audience. It involves making connections across the disciplines, placing the discipline in a larger context, illuminating data or concepts in a revealing way, and evaluating new pedagogical approaches.

Such materials must be externally reviewed or selected, and candidates are reminded that the quality of such activities must be demonstrated. In addition to the more traditional forums for scholarship, such as academic writing, a non-exhaustive list of productivity includes the following:

1. textbooks or parts of textbooks;
2. published writing that makes one's field accessible to a wider audience, e.g. editorials or articles in popular press;
3. interdisciplinary achievements that advance pedagogy in a manner appropriate to the institutional mission;
4. other instructional materials that advance pedagogy in a manner appropriate to one's discipline and/or the institutional mission.

c. Application

The scholarship of application brings learning and knowledge to bear upon the solution of practical problems. Such scholarship, which must be externally reviewed or selected, flows directly from one's professional expertise and would result in a publication, presentation, or other tangible product amenable to peer review. Typically, such work should be for groups outside the institution or beyond normal classroom responsibilities. Candidates are reminded that the quality of such activities must be demonstrated. A non-exhaustive list of activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the faculty member includes the following:

1. consultation;
2. technical assistance;
3. policy analysis;
4. external program evaluation;
5. applied or clinical research and assessment and treatment of clinical cases;
6. grant writing;
7. clinics or workshops (presentations, master classes, etc.).

The quality of RSCA must be demonstrable in the judgment of the reviewing body. Types of documentation appropriate to substantiating quality in RSCA include, but are not limited to:

1. recorded recognition by colleagues and professional peers;
2. publishing in refereed and recognized professional journals and presses;
3. invited publications, performances, or exhibitions;
4. reviews of performances, books, exhibitions, compositions, applied research;
5. successful grant applications which clearly relate to RSCA (as described above);
6. awards based on professional expertise.

If sufficient documentation is not available to assist the reviewing body in assessing the quality of RSCA, then outside experts in the candidate's field may be consulted. A typical manifestation of this is that excellence in site-specific creative work can be assessed by peer or external review. These outside experts will be selected only after previous consultation with the candidate and appropriate disciplinary faculty.

Faculty who rely upon such site-specific creative and collaborative work for their portfolio (e.g. theatre and dance productions) may request financial support from their department and/or school to fund visits by peer or external reviewers to document the outcomes from their efforts. Such requests should be made a minimum of two months prior to the desired visit. The review documents that result from such visits will be shared with all relevant faculty, who may then

include these documents as evidence in their portfolios.

II.D.7.3. Service

In a written statement of no more than two pages, candidates shall describe their service, addressing any considerations they think relevant. Service encompasses a variety of professionally related activities through which members of the faculty employ their academic expertise for the benefit of the University, the community, and the profession. Candidates should also take note of University definitions of service, reflected in Section 5 (“Service”) of University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.04, Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service*.

A. University and School Service

In the area of service, the School and University place primary emphasis on service to the University and its mission. A faculty member provides service to the University through active participation and leadership in Department/Discipline, School, and University activities. Examples of these activities include, but are not limited to:

1. service as an elected Senator or appointment to a University council or committee;
2. service as an elected or appointed member of a School or Department/Discipline committee;
3. internal program evaluation;
4. completion of a special project for the University, School, or Department/Discipline;
5. lead author/editor of a major curriculum addition or revision;
6. service on a board, council or committee outside the University by appointment as the University's or School's representative;
7. completion of an institutional research project;
8. grant writing for institutional development;
9. student recruitment;
10. maintenance and upkeep of studio/classroom spaces and equipment;
11. other service to the Department/Discipline.

B. Professional Service

The University and the School encourage professional service in support of the institution's mission. These activities must relate to one's academic field or else be clearly approved by the University. Examples of these activities include, but are not limited to:

1. officer or board member of a professional organization;
2. conference organizer;
3. editor of journal or newsletter;
4. moderator of panel at academic conference;
5. committee membership for a professional association;
6. peer review of professional papers, manuscripts, performances, exhibitions, and presentations.

C. Community Service

The University and the School also encourage community service in support of the institution's mission. These activities must relate to one's academic field or else be clearly approved by the University. Examples of these activities include, but are not limited to:

1. serving as an officer or board member of a community organization;
2. giving volunteer assistance to a community organization or project through provision of advice, grant writing, or other application of one's professional expertise;
3. conducting workshops, giving talks or demonstrations locally (may be creative or even expand knowledge, but usually there is no academic peer review to substantiate it);
4. serving on a committee for a local professional association or community organization;
5. judging local competitions;
6. visiting local schools in some professional capacity.

The above definitions and measures will be used in interpreting expectations for each faculty rank as described in the sections on promotion from one rank to another.

II.D.8. Criteria for Promotion

II.D.8.1. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

In presenting the list of eligible candidates for promotion to Associate Professor, the Director certifies compliance with the standards of Academic Preparation and Experience (see II.D.1.1). Reviewing bodies will assess tenured/tenure-track candidates in the three primary areas of Teaching, RSCA, and Service, using the definitions, explanations, and examples described in II.D.7.1 (Teaching), II.D.7.2 (RSCA), and II.D.7.3 (Service). For fixed-term faculty, reviewing bodies will assess candidates in only the two areas of Teaching and Service.

1. Teaching [see also II.D.7.1]

A. Knowledge in the Teaching Field

Has a broad knowledge of the field and an in-depth knowledge in one or more parts of the field.

B. Quality in Teaching

Must be shown to be a teacher of proven quality. The faculty member has, in the judgment of those reviewing the candidacy, the ability, experience, and expertise to teach undergraduate courses and, if applicable to the discipline at this University, graduate courses. The candidate must: a) through self-evaluation demonstrate the development and application of effective instructional strategies and techniques; b) show high levels of student satisfaction with average course ratings consistently at or above the “good” (4.0) standard; and c) provide written peer input that addresses teaching quality and effectiveness.

C. Academic Advisement and Career Counseling

Is thoroughly familiar with degree requirements in the discipline and is experienced in academic advisement and career counseling. Serves as a mentor for students desiring advanced degrees and career entry.

2. RSCA [see also II.D.7.2]

The candidate will have demonstrated a pattern of engagement and productivity in RSCA. A pattern assumes a consistent, on-going set of acts, behaviors, or other observable evidence of RSCA. The School places greater value on quality than quantity; thus, the number of completed, peer-evaluated products will vary according to the nature of projects undertaken and the candidate's discipline. However, a well-defined pattern of productivity must be clearly documented in the faculty member's annual activity reports, vita, and evaluative portfolio. Such documentation must include several activities consistent with those described in II.D.6.2. It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the quality of this record. The University considers RSCA to be particularly necessary for those teaching at the graduate level.

3. Service [see also II.D.7.3]

Has demonstrated a record of responsible and effective service to the School and the University by serving on committees/and or engaging in special projects. Should also have participated in professional and/or community service through activities related to the candidate's discipline or by serving the University mission.

II.D.8.2. Associate Professor to Professor

Candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor are reminded of University Procedure 33.99.04.C0.02, *Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members*, which states that unsuccessful applicants for promotion to this rank cannot reapply until after one additional year of full-time service has passed beginning in the academic year that follows the issuance of the denial of promotion.

In presenting the list of eligible candidates for promotion to Professor, the Director certifies compliance with the standards of Academic Preparation and Experience (see II.D.1.2). Reviewing bodies will assess each candidate in the three primary areas of Teaching, RSCA, and Service, using the definitions, explanations, and examples described in II.D.7.1 (Teaching), II.D.7.2 (RSCA), and II.D.7.3 (Service). For fixed-term faculty, reviewing bodies will assess candidates in only the two areas of Teaching and Service.

1. Teaching [see also II.D.7.1]

A. Knowledge in the Teaching Field

Has a broad knowledge of the teaching field and has developed expertise in one or more parts of that field. Has continued demonstration of interest in improving pedagogical skills.

B. Quality in Teaching

Must have demonstrated, in the judgment of those reviewing candidate's application, maturity and skill in teaching and a proven record of teaching excellence. Will also have assumed leadership in curricular development and issues related to teaching improvement in the discipline. The candidate must: a) through self-evaluation demonstrate the effectiveness of instructional strategies and techniques as well as any role in curricular development and teaching improvement in the discipline; b) show high levels of student satisfaction with average course ratings consistently at or above the "good" (4.0) standard; and c) provide written peer input that addresses teaching quality and effectiveness and the quality of their leadership in curricular development and disciplinary teaching improvements.

C. Academic Advisement and Career Counseling

Is thoroughly familiar with University and School degree requirements and other matters

related to academic advisement, career development and opportunities, and placement, and is a recognized and accepted teacher and adviser to colleagues in this area.

2. RSCA [see also II.D.7.2]

The candidate will have a continued pattern of recognized achievements in RSCA by professional peers. A pattern assumes a consistent, on- going set of acts, behaviors, or other observable evidence of RSCA productivity. The School places greater value on quality than quantity; thus, the number of completed, peer-evaluated products will vary according to the nature of projects undertaken and the candidate's discipline. These achievements, and the continued pattern of productivity and engagement that have made them possible, must be clearly demonstrated and documented in the faculty member's annual activity reports, vita, and supplemental files. Such documentation must include several matters consistent with the activities listed in II.D.7.2. It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the quality of this record. The University considers RSCA to be particularly necessary for those teaching at the graduate level.

3. Service [see also II.D.7.3]

Candidates to Professor must demonstrate their leadership in service to the University, the profession, or, when appropriate to the field or the University's mission, the community. Examples of such leadership include, but are not limited to:

- a. recorded recognition of colleagues and professional peers;
- b. election to posts of leadership by colleagues or professional peers;
- c. selection to serve on significant community, state or national boards and commissions;
- d. recorded recognition of significant professional achievement;
- e. public recognition of professionally related community leadership;
- f. leadership resulting in the successful implementation of curriculum development.

II.D.9. Criteria for Tenure

The criteria for tenure are equivalent to those listed for promotion to Associate Professor (II.D.8.1, above), except that to be considered for the award of tenure one must hold the terminal degree.