

Retention, Promotion, & Tenure (RPT) Evaluation Guidelines Department of Communication Studies FAM 6521.538

Introduction

This document was written to complement the CSUSB Faculty Administrative Manual Procedures and Criteria for Performance Review and Periodic Evaluation, Volume 1: Instructional Faculty, FAM 652.4 (Revised 2013; appended to this document). For the most part, the document that follows specifies criteria that are to be applied at the point of application for tenure or tenure and promotion, although some criteria for the second and fourth year performance reviews are given for Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions. Per the FAM: to be given tenure, the faculty member must achieve a minimum rating of “Meets Expectations” in all three evaluation areas. To be promoted to associate professor, the faculty member must achieve a rating of Above Expectations in one area and ratings of at least Meets Expectations in the other two areas (see FAM 652.4, Chapter 2: Criteria for Performance Review, Section III: Evaluation Rating System and Section IV: Application of Criteria and Rating System.)

These guidelines assume a teaching load of three courses per term. Particularly in considering the applicant’s record in the area of Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions, evaluators should take into account any increase in teaching load during the period under review, for example if the nominal workload requirement increases to four courses per term after conversion to a semester system.

The faculty member may cross-list activities in the three FAR sections (Teaching; Service; Research, Scholarly and Creative Contributions). If an activity is cross-listed, then the faculty member should include a parenthetical note after the activity, such as “(also listed under Service: S-8),” and submit only one set of supporting document(s) placed under the primary category for that activity.

A. TEACHING

I. Preamble

The Department of Communication Studies believes that faculty should maintain a scholarly level of instruction, show commitment to high academic and pedagogic standards, be effective in instructing and advising students, guide and motivate students, and apply evaluative standards fairly and appropriately with respect to all students. Faculty are expected to demonstrate proficiency in the four aspects of teaching as specified in FAM 652.4, including 1. command of subject matter, 2. course design/preparation, instructional material, and organization, 3. effectiveness in instruction, and 4. academic assessment of students.

II. Factors to Consider

Evaluators should consider factors that may influence official student evaluation scores including class size, subject matter, teaching medium (e.g. online), whether the course is required, and number of new class preparations of the faculty member under review. For example, general education (GE) classes, departmental undergraduate and graduate core courses, most of which focus on theory and research methods, large lecture classes (40 and above), and courses dealing with sensitive topics may receive lower student evaluation scores. Evaluators should be aware that all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department contribute considerable time as academic advisors to students pursuing the B.A. in Communication Studies. Some faculty members also serve on committees for students completing the culminating requirement (comprehensive exam, thesis, or project) for the M.A. degree.

III. Faculty Member's Teaching Narrative

The faculty member should include with the FAR a succinct narrative that contextualizes his/her teaching for RPT reviewers. Most narratives will be under one page; however, if needed, the narrative can run up to 500 words. In this narrative, faculty may describe such elements as the relationships among his/her teaching goals, materials, approaches and assignments; and, where relevant, efforts made to improve his/her teaching, particularly if those efforts are in response to feedback from students or peers.

IV. Criteria for Proficiency in Teaching

Above expectations

A rating of Above Expectations at the point of application for tenure or tenure and promotion requires these achievements listed below.

1. Predominantly positive student evaluations as assessed by the official student evaluation instrument. As a general guideline, median scores of "very good" to "excellent" on the official student evaluation instrument along with predominantly positive student written comments suggest Above Expectations performance in teaching.
2. Qualitative student comments are commensurate with the aforementioned student evaluation scores and reflect evidence of the quality of instruction in all four areas specified by FAM 654.2.
3. Classroom visitation reports that are consistently positive with regard to the four areas of teaching proficiency described above.
4. Syllabus and other course materials should follow FAM 820.9.
5. Evidence that course expectations for student performance are appropriately current, rigorous and challenging.
6. Evidence of student advisement activities. This could include advisement of individual undergraduate and graduate students, and services to advisees (e.g., petitions, letters of support).
7. Any of the following additional forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness valued by the Department:

- a. Evidence of new course development, instructional innovations, and contributions to curricula or program change.
- b. Attendance of instructionally-related training activities such as workshops, seminars, and conferences.

Below Expectations

1. Mixed (positive-negative) student evaluations as assessed by the official student evaluation instrument. As a general guideline, median scores of “poor” to “good” on the official student evaluation instrument along with mixed student written comments suggest Below Expectations performance in teaching.
2. Qualitative student comments are commensurate with the aforementioned student evaluation scores and reflect evidence of the quality of instruction in only few of four areas specified by FAM 654.2.
3. Classroom visitation reports that are mixed with regard to the four areas of teaching proficiency described above.
4. Limited evidence of significant effort to address student and visiting faculty comments to improve teaching.

Well-below expectations

1. Predominantly negative student evaluations as assessed by the official student evaluation instrument. As a general guideline, median scores of “poor” on the official student evaluation instrument along with predominantly negative student written comments suggest Well-below Expectations performance in teaching.
2. Qualitative student comments are commensurate with the aforementioned student evaluation scores and reflect evidence of the lack of necessary quality of instruction in all four areas specified by FAM 654.2.
3. Classroom visitation reports that are mostly negative with regard to the four areas of teaching proficiency described above.
4. Lack of evidence of significant improvement in teaching and effort to address student and visiting faculty comments to improve teaching.

A. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY OR CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS

I. Preamble

The Department of Communication Studies strongly believes that scholarship complements and enriches teaching while contributing to the advancement of the discipline. Faculty members are expected to engage in an ongoing program of focused scholarship and/or creative work that demonstrates professional growth in communication studies, and results in scholarly achievements that contribute to the discipline and receive favorable review from their peers. To the extent possible this work shall be integrated into their teaching activities.

II. Faculty Member’s Narrative for Research, Scholarly, or Creative Contributions

The faculty member should include with the FAR a succinct narrative that contextualizes his/her professional work for RPT evaluators. Most narratives will be under one page; however, if needed, the narrative can run up to 500 words. The narrative should describe the foci of the professional activities, the faculty member’s interest in them, and the contributions that they make to the faculty member’s discipline and possibly other communities. Faculty may also discuss the value and significance of their work by including information on such elements as the following:

- Reviews or citations of the work
- The importance, quality, prestige, and/or selectivity (e.g., acceptance rates) of the venues where the work appears
- Reader reports for accepted manuscripts or manuscripts under review
- Impact of the work on the discipline and/or other communities
- The value of the methodologies, approaches, or processes involved in the work
- Awards or other recognition for the work
- Invitations to present or publish the work
- Invitations to review a book or article manuscript
- The scope of dissemination of the work
- Other testimony from experts about the work
- Other information that indicates the importance of the work and/or the faculty member’s reputation in the field
- Book contract and/or acceptance letters for journal articles or chapters in edited volumes. Such documentation should be provided for work accepted for publication but not yet published.

III. Evidence of Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions

The following are representative of scholarly, research, and creative activity upon which evaluation is based:

Category 1
Author of a peer-reviewed book
Author of a peer-reviewed journal article
Author of an invited journal article
Author of a peer-reviewed book chapter
Author of an original contribution to a scholarly handbook or yearbook
Author of a textbook
Editor of a book and/or journal special issue
Author of or contributor (PI or co-PI) to a research or creative project funded grant:
Director, writer, or creative producer of a peer-reviewed or juried documentary or other media production

Category 2
Author of an original contribution to a prominent encyclopedia
Author of a competitively selected paper presented at a regional/national/international conference
Author of an original contribution to a textbook
Author of or contributor to a funded grant: external, but not government or prestigious
Author of a non-refereed journal article
Creator and distributor of educational and/or professional materials (e.g., audiotape, videotape, computer software)

Category 3
Author of an invited presentation of scholarship
Author of a presentation at a state or local conference
Author of a book review or critical notes
Author of a communication publication in a non-scholarly venue (e.g. a non-academic press) York Review of Books, etc.)
Author of or contributor to a funded grant: internal, institutionally funded
Author of a non-funded grant proposal submitted to government or prestigious foundation
Author of a non-funded grant proposal submitted to an external entity that is not the government or an prestigious foundation
Participant in competitively selected scholarly activities, such as NEH or Cornell summer seminars and institutes
Author and presenter of creative work in a non-competitive venue
Author of accepted contributions to forums or newsletters
Author of material completed but not submitted and/or material submitted for publication but not accepted

I. Criteria for Rating Levels at Specific Performance Review Points

Point of Performance Review	Typical Criterion for Rating of “Above Expectations”	Typical Criterion for Rating of “Meets Expectations”	Typical Criterion for Rating of “Below Expectations”	Typical Criterion for Rating of “Well Below Expectations”
Year Two	At least one item in Category 1	Any achievement in any category	Any achievement in any category	No achievement in any category
Year Four	At least two items in Category 1	Typically, at least one item in Category 1	At least one item in Category 1	No achievement in Category 1
Application for Tenure	At least three items in Category 1	Typically, at least two items in Category 1	Fewer than two items in Category 1	Fewer than one item in Category 1
Application for Promotion	More than three items in Category 1	Typically, at least three items in Category 1	Typically, fewer than three items in Category 1	Typically fewer than two items in Category 1

Categories 1, 2, and 3 are listed in rough order of declining significance for evaluation. Accomplishment in Category 1 is essential to retention, tenure and promotion, and in Categories 2 and 3 important to the extent that it approximates, supports and/or supplements Category 1 work. For tenure, to receive a rating of Meets Expectations, the Department generally expects faculty to produce two works within Category 1 to which they can demonstrate a significant contribution. At least one of the two works expected for tenure should be a journal article or its equivalent in creative projects. The idea is not necessarily to count articles or other creative works, but rather to indicate a substantive expectation for the quality and significance of a body of work. The categories are not set in stone; for example, a short article may be a minor contribution, whereas a symposium presentation may be a significant contribution. Similarly, faculty members, who produce creative works for the media industry or commercial work for other communication studies fields such as PR, might not easily fit into the expectations criteria described above. As such, each faculty member is responsible for describing their scholarly or creative projects and accomplishments, and explain their focus and significance to the discipline.

For promotion, to receive a rating of Meets Expectations, the Department generally expects faculty to produce three works within category 1. Two of those should be as sole or a leading author. In addition, the faculty member is expected to show the significance of their research, scholarly or creative contributions by demonstrating an original and coherent program of research or artistic works and the quality of outlets for publication/exhibition.

- A. To be considered a publication, an item must have received final editorial acceptance for publication. Such acceptance must be clearly documented.
- B. Per FAM 652.4, Chapter 1, section II D 1b, “for probationary faculty being considered for retention or tenure, the FAR should be cumulative since appointment. For faculty applying for promotion, the FAR should be cumulative since initial appointment or the last promotion, which is most recent. (NOTE: The FAR should include activities since the FAR submission date for the last successful promotion.)”

C. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY SERVICE

I. Preamble

Faculty members must participate in professionally related service to the university, discipline, and/or community. Such service includes, as appropriate, contributions to the governance and well-functioning of the Department, college and/or campus communities, contribution to the discipline (for example in the form of active roles in professional organizations or reviewing for journals), as well as to the off-campus community. The term “community” may refer to local, regional, state, national, or international entities. During the probationary period, the Department expects faculty to assume increasingly significant service roles as they approach evaluation for tenure, in a consistent progression.

II. Faculty Member's Service Narrative

The faculty member should include with the FAR a succinct narrative that contextualizes his/her service for RPT reviewers. Most narratives will be under one page; however, if needed, the narrative can run up to 500 words. In this narrative, the faculty member should explain the contributions s/he has made through his/her service activities.

III. Criteria for Proficiency in Service

Above expectations (both required)

1. Demonstration of consistent, ongoing service contributions, such as consistent assumption of key roles in
2. the functioning of the Department and/or college and/or university
3. Consistent, ongoing active contribution to the discipline and/or community

Meets expectations (all required)

1. Occasional assumption of active roles in the well-functioning of the Department
2. Occasional participation in committees outside the Department
3. Some contribution to the discipline and/or community

Below expectations

1. Occasional assumption of active roles in the well-functioning of the Department, but little to no participation in committees outside the Department
2. Lack of contributions to the discipline and community

Well below expectations

1. Little to no participation in the well-functioning of the Department
2. Lack of participations in committees outside the Department
3. Lack of contributions to the discipline and community