

**University of North Texas Department of Media Arts**

**Evaluation of Media Arts Faculty: Procedures and Guidelines**

Section I - Standards for evaluating teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service

Section II - Procedure for reappointment, tenure, and promotion

Section III - Procedure for annual review and evaluating merit

Section IV - Post-Tenure Review

**FINAL DRAFT: Approved by a majority of the Media Arts Faculty on November 2, 2018**

**Appended February 2019 in accordance with Provost's suggestions**

## Contents

Introduction.....	3
Evaluation Classifications.....	3
A. Annual Evaluation .....	3
B. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.....	3
C. Reappointment and Promotion Evaluations of Lecturers and Professors of Practice.....	3
D. Special Considerations.....	4
Section I Standards for Evaluation Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service .....	4
I-A Teaching.....	4
I-B Scholarship/Creative Activities.....	5
I-B(a) Research Scholarship.....	6
I-B(b) Creative Activity .....	8
I-C Administration and Service.....	12
Section II Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.....	12
II-A Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure .....	12
II-B Reappointment Review.....	13
II-C Tenure/Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.....	13
II-D Promotion to the Rank of Professor.....	15
II-E External Reviewers.....	17
Section III Annual Reviews and Evaluating Merit .....	17
III-A Annual Review Procedure .....	17
III-B Annual Review Dossier.....	18
III-C Annual Evaluation Format .....	19
III-D Determining Annual Merit Raise Recommendations.....	21
Section IV: Post- Tenure Review .....	21

## **Introduction**

The University of North Texas policy requires several types of periodic evaluation of faculty performance. Each of these evaluations is performed by the Media Arts Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (RPTC). All recommendations coming from the RPTC are forwarded to the Media Arts Chair. The RPTC consists of all tenured faculty members, plus one lecturer representative who may participate in decisions and votes regarding lecturer evaluations, but not those pertaining to tenured or tenure-track professors, or professors of practice.

Section I of this document outlines standards for evaluating teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. These standards are applicable to reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations and to merit rankings/annual evaluations. Section II specifically addresses procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Section III specifies the RPTC's procedure for annual review and evaluating merit. Section IV discusses post-tenure review and defines the criteria for judging a faculty member unsatisfactory.

### **Evaluation Classifications**

#### **A. Annual Evaluation**

Every full-time faculty member will be evaluated annually based on his/her assigned workload, measured over the course of the three-preceding year's employment. Faculty members' workloads are defined each year in consultation with the Department Chair, and include the following categories: Teaching, Service and Research/Creative Activities (the Research/Creative category is not applicable to Lecturers). At the department level, the Annual Evaluation is a joint effort of the Media Arts RPTC and the Media Arts Chair in accordance with applicable department, college, and university policy. Annual Evaluations are one factor in determining the amount of faculty merit pay increases.

#### **B. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

Tenure-track faculty members are reviewed each year as the basis for a departmental recommendation for future reappointment and tenure. An expanded midterm review (usually the 3rd year) is intended to provide a thorough examination of the junior faculty member's progress toward tenure. Procedures for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor generally occur during the sixth year of the candidate's probationary period, and require external letters of support. Promotion to Full Professor is possible following the recommendation of the Media Arts RPTC and the Media Arts Chair. Promotion to Full Professor also requires external letters of support. At the department level, all tenure-track Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluations are a joint effort of the Media Arts RPTC and the Media Arts Chair in accordance with applicable department, college and university policy.

#### **C. Reappointment and Promotion Evaluations of Lecturers and Professors of Practice**

Lecturers and Professors of Practice are reviewed each year as the basis for a departmental recommendation for future reappointment and promotion. At the department level, Lecturer and Professor of Practice reappointment evaluations are a joint effort of the Media Arts RPTC and the Media Arts Chair in accordance with applicable department, college and university policy. Lecturers and Professors of Practice who wish to apply for promotion must adhere to the CLASS guidelines on promotion for Lecturers and Professors of Practice.

#### D. Special Considerations

The basic procedure for annual evaluation for all Media Arts faculty members shall be in accordance with the procedures outlined in this section with the following special considerations:

- A. Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty shall be subject to the same basic annual evaluation procedure as other Media Arts faculty members. The procedures for dealing with a shortened review period are discussed below.
- B. Department Chair. The Media Arts Department Chair shall be subject to the same basic annual evaluation procedure as other faculty members except that the department chair's evaluation will be transmitted by the RPTC directly to the CLASS Dean. Prior to the transmittal, the RPTC will furnish the Media Arts Chair with a copy of the evaluation. The Media Arts Chair may elect to attach comments that shall be forwarded to the dean with the evaluation. The Media Arts Chair's evaluation is not assigned numerical evaluations. The workload of the Media Arts Chair is negotiated with the CLASS Dean, but generally includes an assignment of at least 50% "administration." This assignment is in addition to the expectation of instructional activities, research or creative activities, and service the Chair carries in fulfillment of his/her duties as a faculty member.
- C. Tenured faculty. Tenured faculty shall be subject to the same basic annual evaluation procedure as untenured, tenure-track faculty members. However, a tenured faculty member who receives an "unsatisfactory" rating will be subject to the procedures outlined in the UNT Policy Manual.
- D. Faculty on leaves of absence. Unless specifically exempted by the CLASS Dean, faculty members who are on a leave of absence (paid or unpaid) for one of the years under review shall be subject to the same basic annual evaluation procedure as other faculty members and should arrange to submit appropriate documentation even if they are away from campus during the evaluation period. Faculty members anticipating leave will determine in collaboration with the Department Chair the expectations for their research, teaching, and service while on leave. The Chair will submit a letter to the RPTC outlining those expectations, and the RPTC will evaluate the faculty member's work during their time on leave based on the expectations outlined in the Chair's letter.
- E. Modified service faculty. Since faculty members on modified service continue to be eligible for annual salary adjustment, they shall be subject to the same basic annual evaluation procedure as other faculty members with the exception that they shall only be evaluated on those areas covered in their negotiated workload.
- F. Joint faculty appointments between one or more academic units. Faculty holding joint appointments should adhere to the college guidelines for evaluation and to their hiring letter for identification of their academic home department.

### Section I Standards for Evaluation Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service

#### I-A Teaching

Faculty must remain current in their areas of expertise and must demonstrate continuing effectiveness as teachers. Evidence considered in the evaluation of teaching for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion includes relevant information such as:

- i. **Student evaluations** including both qualitative and quantitative data from the UNT-selected teaching evaluation instrument utilized by students.

- ii. **Development of Instructional Materials**
  - a) Syllabi for all classes developed and taught and any other relevant instructional material (e.g. assignments, exams, etc.).
  - b) Substantive curriculum revisions beyond that routinely taken on an annual basis
  - c) Innovative and demonstrably useful application of technology to teaching
- iii. **Types of courses taught** (e.g. “meets with,” large enrollment, online, international, etc.)
- iv. **Participation in student advising including:**
  - a) direction of graduate theses
  - b) direction of Honor’s theses/membership on thesis/dissertation committees
  - c) supervision of special problems, practicum, and internships
  - d) supervision of teaching fellows and academic assistants
  - e) supervision of multi-section courses
  - f) mentoring and aiding students in graduate admissions or job searches, etc.
- v. **Teaching honors, university awards, and competitive grants** (nationally/internationally competitive teaching honors, awards and grants carry more weight than internal)
- vi. **Professional development related to teaching** (may include industry-related certifications, workshops, programs or activities outside of the university that benefit one’s pedagogy.)
- vii. **Peer evaluation by senior colleagues in the department (optional)**
- viii. **Responsiveness to departmental needs** (e.g. willingness, if needed, to teach required courses, development and teaching of online courses as appropriate to departmental needs, etc.)

### **I-B Scholarship/Creative Activities**

Given the diversity of research/creative activity in media arts, evaluation criteria are divided between research and creative activities. Although there are overlaps, tenure-track faculty are typically hired as either research faculty with a Ph.D. or production faculty with a M.F.A. The nature and contents of the candidate’s proposed research/creative trajectory will be outlined as an addendum at the time of hire and at the commencement of the tenure track probationary period. Since the goal of all tenured or tenure-track faculty is to establish a strong research or creative agenda leading to a national or international reputation, the department places the highest emphasis on the faculty member’s primary area of expertise for which they were hired. Scholarship or creative activities produced outside of the faculty’s main area(s) of emphasis may receive less credit than work published within one’s area(s) of emphasis. In other words, some weight may be given to a production faculty who publishes a scholarly article, but they will be evaluated most heavily on their creative activity, with an emphasis given to the impact of this work in its final, distribution/exhibition form. Likewise, a research faculty may produce a creative film as supplemental to their scholarship, but they will be evaluated most heavily on their research publications.

For both research and creative faculty, the department places the highest premium on peer-reviewed or juried/peer reviewed, published, and distributed work appearing in competitive venues that attract a substantial audience. However, as explained below, other kinds of scholarship are also valued.

Collaborative scholarship is often appropriate, and the department values it as a legitimate form of inquiry and creativity. Co-authored or co-edited research in any form (articles, monographs, anthologies, etc.) is evaluated in the same way as single-authored and single-edited work with respect to venue of publication. Faculty must specify the work for which they are responsible. Absent a compelling case for alternative measures, however, the individual authors/editors receive a percentage of credit according to the number of authors/editors involved in the project. In media production of creative work, collaboration is much more common. Faculty seeking

promotion, tenure and reappointment are expected to hold substantial roles in their creative scholarship, including traditional “above the line” creative/business roles. Directing, producing, writing, cinematography, production audio and postproduction activities are most heavily weighted, with the emphasis on original creative work coming out of the faculty member’s own creative/research agenda most important.

### **I-B(a) Research Scholarship**

Below are guidelines for determining what constitutes quality research. The RPTC will assess research based on quality of the venue/publisher, authorship, impact, and length. The nature of scholarship and publication is always evolving and thus the guidelines cannot be exhaustive; ultimately it is the responsibility of the faculty member to communicate the significance, impact, and quality of their research.

#### **a. Scholarly Books**

Books presented in support of tenure and promotion applications must be peer-reviewed (the proposal and full manuscript) and published with a well-regarded university or scholarly press (i.e. a member of the American Association of University Presses). Books published by “vanity presses” and “dissertation mills” will not be considered. As a recommendation, the department suggests authors’ book manuscripts be a minimum of 60,000 words. Because each book project is different and individual presses may have different word count contractual requirements, when an assistant professor applies for tenure on the basis of a book below this departmental recommended word count, the RPTC shall undertake a holistic review of the book and determine whether it meets the standard of “substantial” according to the department.

#### **b. Peer-reviewed Journal Periodical Publications**

The quantity of journal publications needed for consideration of tenure will vary depending on the length of the article, authorship (i.e. preference given to single/first authored pieces), and quality of publication (preference given to top-tier journals).

The department assesses articles based on quality indicators, such as acceptance rates and citation indices. Although acceptance and rank of journals may vary for an array of reasons, the department give more weight to articles with an acceptance rate of less than 20% and/or ranking in the top quartile of relevant subject area as measure by a citation index. Journals with acceptance rates between 20% and 40% and/or ranking in the second quartile of relevant subject area as measure by a citation index will be deemed *reputable*. A faculty member may petition the RPTC to award top-tier status to a specialized journal due to it addressing a small, highly specialized, influential audience. Such faculty members should provide a list of distinguished scholars who have also published in that journal.

In some cases, a book chapter in a peer-reviewed edited collection published by a major university press can be considered the equivalent of a journal article, if it clearly demonstrates the same level of scholarly merit. Peer-reviewed published abstracts and conference proceedings will not be given as much consideration as full-length peer-reviewed journal articles. Pay-to-publish articles will not be given any consideration unless the fees were directly used to make the publication open access.

#### **c. Essays/Chapters Contributed to Edited Collections or Special Journal Issues**

Essays contributed to edited collections are often solicited and reviewed by the editor of the

collection, and may or may not be peer-reviewed. The contribution of essays is weighted less than peer-reviewed journal periodical publications.

The RPTC considers publishing edited collections of essays and special issues of journals primarily for merit and less significantly in the case of tenure and promotion. However, once a candidate secures the professional indicators specified these activities may be worth pursuing, as they may make a significant impact on the field and add significantly to his or her inter/national reputation. Such accomplishments will be taken into account in the course of tenure and promotion review.

**d. Textbooks, Instructional Works, Anthologies, Companion Volumes, Introductory Studies, Classroom Editions, and Analogous Work**

Textbooks, instructional works, anthologies, companion volumes, introductory studies, classroom editions, and analogous work can also be very worthwhile; however, such projects will count to a lesser degree than original scholarship or creative work.

**e. Digital Scholarship**

Scholarship of the varieties described in items a, b, c, and d that appears in online publications will be considered the equivalent of printed publications of the same kind. Other forms of digital scholarship may also be considered evidence of scholarly achievement and will be evaluated based upon their degree of engagement with scholarly sources, originality, impact, length, review process, and contribution to the field. Faculty members who wish to have other forms of digital scholarship included in their dossier must provide an explanation of how their work meets these criteria; they should also offer evidence of peer-review, editorial critique, or other elements of professional scholarly evaluation.

**f. Grants and Fellowships**

The RPTC strongly encourages faculty to apply for external grants and fellowships and will appropriately recognize such activity. Grants and fellowships applied for but not received demonstrate progress toward establishing a research trajectory. External grants or fellowships of substantial size (at least \$100,000) received as Principal or Co-Principal Investigator can be weighted similarly as publication in a top-tier journal. Faculty receiving internal UNT grants or fellowships should not expect their merit evaluation/ranking to be significantly affected. Such internal grants or fellowships may, however, be used by probationary faculty to bolster a bid for reappointment at the time of midterm review or for tenure and promotion.

**g. Reprinted Publications / Translations / Awards / New Editions**

While reprinted, translated, or new editions of publications do not constitute evidence of fresh scholarly accomplishment, they do suggest that the work in question is recognized as important and influential. Faculty whose works are reprinted, translated, or updated as a new edition can expect favorable recognition but to a lesser degree than that accorded upon initial publication of such a work. Faculty whose published work wins a major award can also expect greater recognition, especially if the award is given by a nationally or internationally prominent organization (e.g., SCMS, ICA, etc.).

**h. Conference Presentations**

Faculty make presentations at conference as ways of gaining feedback on their works in progress

and networking with their peers. Such activities help faculty to prepare their works for publication and are thus less ends in themselves than means to achieving ends. Except in cases of a keynote address (i.e., an address to an entire convention) or a presentation given at a conference that can be demonstrated to be both peer-reviewed and highly selective, faculty will receive minimal recognition for conference presentations when being evaluated by the RPTC for purposes of merit evaluation/ranking or tenure and promotion. Such activities may be given more weight when probationary faculty are being considered for reappointment at the time of midterm review (i.e., they may constitute evidence that someone who has not yet had a chance to establish an extensive publication record is in fact pursuing an active program of scholarship/creative activity). Published conference proceedings will not be granted additional weight unless they are peer-reviewed.

**i. Editorships of Journals / General Editorships**

The RPTC weighs the following editorial tasks as scholarly achievements: work as the editor of a collection of essays or as a guest editor for special issue of a journal; work as an editor of a collection of primary materials; work as the editor of an edition of a primary work. The Committee counts as service to the profession (i.e., for computational purposes, service) the following tasks: work as an editor of a journal, work as a referee for a journal, work as a judge for a contest or an award, and other similar tasks. Probationary faculty should consult with the department chair and the RPTC before assuming editorial responsibilities.

**j. Publishing Outside of Academic Venues**

Original works that serve to advance the profession beyond academia – including media interviews or articles in popular magazines, trade publications, newspapers, etc. - can suggest the candidate's rising inter/national reputation as evidence for the impact of their work. While they are not weighted heavily for consideration for tenure/merit, they can be taken into consideration when evaluating the impact of a candidate's reputation and research trajectory.

**k. Submissions / Forthcoming Publications**

When making recommendations regarding merit rankings/evaluations, the RPTC does not give credit to articles submitted for publication or to forthcoming publications. Submissions may, however, count as evidence of progress toward tenure when the RPTC is conducting reappointment reviews of tenure-track faculty. In cases of tenure and/or promotion, forthcoming publications count the same as published work, provided that it has been officially documented they are fully accepted, with no contingencies or revisions required, and with the final draft having been submitted and awaiting publication at the journal or press that has accepted them (see Policies of the University of North Texas 06.004.V.D). Per the university tenure policy "when a scholarly/creative work submitted prior to the closing of the dossier has received final and unconditional acceptance" before the provost renders his or her own recommendation, "this material will be included in the dossier. All internal reviewers will reconsider any prior recommendation, based upon the new material."

**I-B(b) Creative Activity**

The RPTC will assess creative/production work based on the quality of the venue/publisher/distribution outlet, authorship, impact, and competitive nature of the juried/peer-reviewed outlets for the work. Assessment of creative activities will also take into account the scope and complexity of the work, as well as its originality, innovation, and complexity. The RPTC, while making best efforts to provide a quantifiable, tiered structure of evaluation for faculty, acknowledges that evolving media technologies



and distribution platforms may allow for some creative works to fall outside these distinct evaluation guidelines. As the media ecosystem evolves, the RPTC, made up of tenured faculty in the Media Arts department, will approach all cases with due diligence. The nature of creative/production work is always evolving and thus the guidelines cannot be exhaustive; ultimately it is the obligation of the faculty member to clearly communicate the significance, impact, and quality of their creative publications.

Active scholarship and/or creative activity is a fundamental endeavor of all members of the faculty. The appointment of a faculty member in creative media arts normally requires the primary concentration of his/her efforts remain in creative/production work, though more traditional scholarship may be included, as appropriate to the faculty member's appointment and stage of his/her career. For faculty members with creative media appointments, artistic accomplishment in such fields as narrative media, documentary media, experimental media, broadcast/webcast, screenwriting, audio production, promotional media, videogames, web platforms, mobile applications, and broadcasting is most often demonstrated by dissemination of the artist's work through performance, publication, or exhibition in professionally recognized settings, usually outside the university. Additional types of peer review and impact may include nationally/internationally competitive fellowships, competitive acceptance to media/entrepreneurial incubators in support of creative work, and similar outlets where the jury/peer review process can be documented.

Indicative Categories and Descriptions of Acceptable Creative Work for Media Arts faculty hired in Creative/Production faculty positions:

**a. Media in a variety of genres**

These may be in traditional time-based forms, or nonlinear visual/aural experiences. Faculty may work in traditional genres including narrative fiction, documentary, experimental, etc., but may also include advertising, audio productions, media installations, screenplays/scripts, videogames, web platforms/distribution, and photography, but should in all cases be original works with the faculty member as the head creator or in other lead creative roles. The faculty member is responsible for addressing and explaining their roles in all cases, and for explaining any deviations from work done outside of their creative role defined in the hiring addendum addressed above.

**b. Online juried or curated publications**

Scholarly publication may include sole or joint authorship. For pre-tenured faculty, such written scholarly output (other than that required as part of completed media production work such as screenplays, etc.) should be taken on only after consultation with the department chair. Emphasis should be placed on completed creative media works. See I-B(b) i for further clarification on other areas of traditional scholarly research.

**c. Grants/Investors/Financial Partners for original creative media works**

Evidence of earnest effort to seek and secure funding for creative activities is expected. Fellowships, grants and patrons/investors help faculty to develop and articulate a program of creative accomplishment with national and international impact. Opportunities for funding for research and creative/professional endeavors vary according to specialties. External funding carries greater weight than funding from within the university system. Criteria for evaluating the quality of the funding include

acceptance rate/competitive nature, the prestige of the funding source and the complexity of the entrepreneurial structure. In media fields, internationally/nationally competitive fellowships with top-rated institutions often offer no attached funding and are considered evidence of reputation and creative/scholarly impact. The faculty member should present evidence of acceptance rates indicating the competitive quality of such fellowships.

Examples of Ranked Venues for Dissemination of Creative Work:

**a. Annual Peer-Reviewed, Academic Association Competitive Exhibitions**

This category includes academic organizations such as the Broadcast Education Association's faculty competition, BEA On-Location faculty competition, and the University Film and Video (UFVA) faculty competitions. Competitive awards through academic associations typically earn Milestone Achievement within Tier I and Tier II. However, in all cases the candidate for promotion must indicate the jury/peer review process with data, including acceptance rate or similar quantifying and qualifying information adherent to the Tier structure outlines in this document. Out-of-competition screenings of creative work by academic associations are evaluated within the Tier III category.

**b. Film/Media Festivals**

The RPTC acknowledges the ongoing changes to the distribution system for media productions and understands that there are thousands of such festivals. The tier system and resulting point worth below considers reputation within the industry and academia, acceptance rates, impact and quality. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to provide data and other evidence of the level and rigor of festivals and other distribution outlets, based on the three-tier system. The department RPTC will take this information into account when determining the Tier within which to count creative point worth. The committee may also consider other variables when assessing the merit and impact of distribution modes (e.g. length of festival, industry reputation, live screenings, national/ international viewership, etc.). Productions that receive major competitive awards at Tier I and Tier II festivals shall receive additional Milestone Achievement equivalent to Tier III Milestone Achievement worth. Major competitive awards won at Tier III festivals shall receive the equivalent of 1/8 Milestone Achievement worth.

**c. Online/streaming Distribution and Emerging Distribution Modes**

Venues may include platforms such as Netflix®, Amazon®, and Hulu®. Additionally, non-juried and emerging distribution modes have merit and may earn Milestone Achievement. The faculty member must present quantified data as to acceptance rates and discrete human viewership (not bot hits) and impact in order for the RPTC committee to evaluate equivalent Milestone Achievement percentages.

**d. Industry Competitions**

These include major awards such the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences® ("Oscar®"), the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences® ("Emmy®"), the British Academy of Film and Television Awards® ("BAFTA®"), as well as regional awards (e.g. the Regional Emmy®) and local awards (e.g. the Austin Film Critics Association). Peer-review venues also include online industry competitions such as the Telly Awards ("Telly"®), the

Association of Marketing & Communication Professionals' AVA Digital Awards ("Ava®"). Milestone Point worth of these three tiers mimics those listed above, accommodating the same acceptance rate differences.

**e. Regional or National Broadcast**

A Regional broadcast of original creative work with the faculty member in a key role (Director, Producer, Cinematographer, Location Sound) falls within the Tier II Category (worth 5 Milestone Achievement points), and a National Broadcast falls within the Tier I category (worth 1 Milestone Achievement point).

**f. Exhibitions**

These are curated or juried exhibitions in museums, galleries, and venues that screen creative media works, and the faculty member must play a key role in the original creative work presented. Milestone Achievement worth of these three tiers mimics those listed above for film festivals, accommodating the same acceptance rate differences.

**g. Internet**

These should be original and substantial works presented on the Internet, with indication of jury/peer review and impact. Examples of these could be mobile applications accepted for dissemination by the major corporate markets. Given the evolving nature of such distribution, the level of Tier identification will be based on acceptance, rigor, impact and entrepreneurship equivalent to more traditional film/media festival venues.

**h. Other types of more traditional scholarship are listed above.**

These types of scholarship may be pursued by production/creative faculty in consultation with the department chair (for tenure-track faculty seeking promotion and tenure). The RTPC will evaluate these kinds of research and publication in a Tiered system similar to that listed above.

Tiered Evaluation Structure

**Tier I – Acceptance rates of 10% or less.** Typically, national and international major outlets and distribution modes. These have extremely low acceptance rates and are considered the most competitive, reputable, and rigorous outlets for creative media.

**Tier II – Acceptance rates of 11%-25%.** Typically, regional outlets and distribution modes. These are reputable and important outlets, yet have a generally higher acceptance rate than Tier I, and are not considered highest-level distribution outlets for creative media.

**Tier III – Acceptance rates in the range of 25%-50%.** Typically, online-only and smaller and/or niche outlets. These often have a much higher-acceptance rates. The RTPC notes that established streaming/online outlets with low acceptance guidelines and verifiable national/international impact would likely fall in a higher-level tier.

A faculty member may petition the RTPC to award top-tier status to a specialized media outlet due to it addressing a small, highly specialized, influential audience. Such faculty members should

provide a list of distinguished media producers whose work has also appeared via that outlet.

#### I-C Administration and Service

Faculty members must demonstrate a continuing commitment to high-quality service to the department, the college, and the university. The RPTC also recognizes professional service to constituencies external to UNT (e.g., professional organizations). The quantity of service performed is accounted for in the percentage of effort apportioned in faculty workload assignments. After tenure, expectations regarding service assignments and the assumption of leadership roles increase. Thus, the RPTC's evaluation of service may focus on the quality of service performed and on the faculty member's willingness to take on service assignments as needed by the department. In these instances, the RPTC will consult with the department chair. For service to the profession, the RPTC may solicit input from members of the academic community relevant to such service.

## Section II Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

### II-A Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

1. In September of each year, the RPTC and department chair will meet with probationary faculty as a group. The purpose of this meeting will be to ensure that all probationary faculty are in possession of and familiar with: 1) this document; 2) the CLASS "Guidelines for the Documentation of Reappointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure Cases"; 3) the university's "Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy and the Granting of Tenure and Promotion"; 4) all pertinent deadlines.
2. In keeping with university policy, all probationary faculty will be reviewed annually (see 06.004.II.B), the first year in the form of the annual evaluation. At the third year and each year thereafter all tenured faculty will vote on reappointment. Per university tenure policy, "the third-year reappointment review is a more extensive and intensive review that includes the unit, the college, and the Provost, but without external letters."
3. Candidates for midterm/reappointment review or tenure and/or promotion are responsible for submitting necessary materials to the RPTC in accordance with the deadlines it sets. After completing its review, the RPTC must notify the candidate if it is considering a negative recommendation. The candidate then has the right to meet with the RPTC to discuss the case but must do so within five business days of the notification. A faculty mentor or advocate, chosen by the candidate, may attend this meeting. Afterwards, the RPTC makes a written recommendation to the department chair in accordance with the schedule established in the CLASS calendar. This recommendation must specify the number of votes for and against a recommendation for reappointment or tenure and/or promotion. Those voting in the minority may submit a separate minority recommendation at their discretion.
4. After reviewing the candidate's dossier and the RPTC recommendation(s), the department chair makes an independent recommendation to the dean. If the chair is considering a negative recommendation, he or she must first notify the candidate, who has the right to meet with the chair to discuss the case within five business days of this notification. Both the RPTC's and the chair's written recommendations must be forwarded to the dean in accordance with the CLASS calendar.
5. In the case of a negative recommendation by either the RPTC or the chair, the chair must provide a written explanation to the candidate. In such cases, the candidate has the right to add to the tenure dossier, prior to its transmittal to the dean, a letter disputing the negative recommendation. This right must be exercised within three business days of being notified of the negative recommendation.
6. As per university tenure policy (06.004.I.B), "The sixth year will normally be the mandatory tenure-review year. In extraordinary circumstances, as reflected in disciplinary metrics and national comparisons and as

deemed appropriate by the chair and the dean, a candidate for tenure and promotion may be reviewed early in the probationary period, except in the third-year review. If the early review process is unsuccessful, the candidate may be reviewed again during the sixth year.”

## II-B Reappointment Review

University policy states that that all probationary faculty shall be reviewed for reappointment annually (see 06.0004.II.B). Although the self-evaluation narrative is only required for third- and six-year reviews, candidates for tenure are encouraged to submit these statements as part of their second-, fourth-, and fifth-year review documents (see 06.004.V.A).

In the Media Arts Department, at the time of the third-year review, the RPTC expects:

- i. At least one scholarly publication accepted by a reputable peer-reviewed periodical OR have received a substantial external grant or fellowship (e.g. at least \$20,000) OR have a book manuscript under contract with a reputable publisher OR One significant creative work with three milestone achievements. The expectation is that this work will have been produced during the faculty member’s probationary period.
- ii. Evidence of a significant quantity of additional scholarly or creative work in progress. The faculty member must show that his or her trajectory points toward tenure and promotion.
- iii. A developing record of high-quality teaching responsive both to the educational needs of students and to the curricular and scheduling needs of the department. If notable problems with any aspect of the faculty member’s teaching occur during the first two years, resolution of same must be under way if the RPTC is to recommend reappointment.
- iv. A developing record of high-quality service consistent in quantity with the faculty member’s workload assignment.

## II-C Tenure/Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Consideration for promotion to the rank of associate professor and a decision regarding tenure will be made concurrently. Therefore, the criteria for promotion to associate professor are the same as those for tenure.

The guidelines and indicators for progress toward tenure must not be considered in an inflexible, rule governed way. There is no specific number or pattern of activities that would necessarily constitute promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Context is important in considering an individual’s record. With the diverse nature of media arts, patterns of excellence between individuals will differ. For example, someone who conducted longitudinal research during the probationary period will likely have a gap in publications or creative activity that has a different implication than a gap for a program of research involving small, progressive outcomes. Longitudinal research may be higher in value but lower in number of outputs. *It is the responsibility of the candidate to communicate differences in the time and effort needed to fulfill their research or creative agenda.*

Several factors will be considered which include but are not limited to the aspects of research/creative activity described here. Specifically, the department considers the faculty member’s productivity during the probationary period and the significance and impact of such productivity.

To achieve tenure and promotion, an Assistant Professor must:

1. **Develop an independent and coherent research/creative trajectory.** Conducting and publishing research/collaborating on creative projects with past mentors can help bridge the gap while an individual is establishing him/herself here. However, a publication record/creative agenda should not give the impression the program being established is merely an extension of a mentor’s research or activities. Although interdisciplinary research/creative activity is encouraged, the publication/creative

record should provide evidence of a clear trajectory with an emphasis on the candidate's area of expertise. Collaborative research/creative activity is acceptable, and at times even encouraged, however, the publication record/creative activities must include independent research/projects. This can be evidenced by single/first authorship on original academic publications or a lead role as creative author of creative media work.

**2. Demonstrate productivity by developing a consistent record of high-quality peer-reviewed research or creative activity.**

- a. The quantity of publications/creative activity required to meet the minimum requirements will vary greatly based on the faculty's *research/creative agenda*, the *length* of the publications/productions, the *impact* of the work, and the *quality* of the work. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to communicate the value of their productivity, but especially in cases when the quantity of scholarly/creative output significantly deviates from the examples of minimum requirements listed below.*
- b. The following examples of productivity illustrate, but do not exhaust, what is minimally expected for consideration of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor based on research.
  - Publication of a substantial single/first authored book + one single/first authored peer-reviewed journal article
  - OR Publication of six to eight peer-reviewed journal articles; a minimum of three must be single/first author peer-reviewed articles published in top-tier journals
  - OR Publication of three single/first author peer-reviewed articles + two other articles + two book chapters or an edited book
  - OR Publication of three single/first author peer-reviewed articles + one other article, book chapter, or similar publication + one or more external research grant/fellowship of substantial size as P.I. or Co-P.I. (at least \$100,000)
  - OR Publication of three single/first author peer-reviewed journal articles + three other articles or similar publications + one or more external research grant/fellowship of a minimum size (at least \$20,000) as P.I. or Co-P.I.
- c. Creative/production faculty must demonstrate substantial achievements and distinction in their work, and will be evaluated in general by the following terms:
  - During the probationary period, Media Arts tenure-track faculty in the area of production must produce at least three (3) significant creative or professional works that result in no fewer than a total of six (6) Milestone Achievements.
    - Two (2) of the three (3) significant creative or professional works must be in the area of hire, outlined in the supplemental document provided by the Department Chair and attached to the hiring letter from the Dean.
    - Each significant creative or professional work should receive no less than 1 (one) Milestone Achievement. These Milestone Achievements require a rigorous peer-reviewed evaluation based on a three-tiered system of assessment, including Tier One (equivalent to 1 milestone achievement), Tier Two (equivalent to a .5 milestone achievement), and Tier Three (equivalent to a .25 milestone achievement).
    - This structure strives to find a parallel with the process of assessing scholarly achievement. For production faculty, one Milestone Achievement approximates the equivalent of one top-tier journal article.

- d. Manuscripts “in press” (i.e. have been accepted for publication) or work accepted for broadcast/webcast or other substantial, verifiable distribution contracts carry the same weight as those that have appeared in print.
- 3. Demonstrate the impact and significance of their work through evidence of an emerging national or international reputation.** A wide variety of accomplishments implies a candidate is developing a national or international reputation in his/her area of research expertise. Evidence that addresses scholarly reputation consists of activities for which the candidate has been chosen due to her/his expertise as a researcher in a specific area. These may include but are not limited to:
- a. Increasing citation of the faculty’s research, invited talks at national or international conferences, invited book chapters, editorial board membership, associate or editorship of a journal, membership on a committee of a national or international scholarly association, refereed presentations, invited workshops and symposia, media interviews based on expertise, acceptances to top-tier outlets and/or multiple other outlets, major awards, national and international demonstrated impact of creative works, strategic and innovated media entrepreneurship, etc.
  - b. Activities which facilitate the dissemination of knowledge give weight to the likelihood that a candidate has an emerging national reputation because faculty are chosen for the tasks due to their expertise in research and creative work.
  - c. External-reviewer letters. The value of external-reviewer letters lies primarily in a broader reputational approach to assessing visibility of scholars and production faculty in their primary fields of emphasis and expertise.
- 4. Develop a consistent record of high-quality teaching** responsive both to the educational needs of students and to the curricular and scheduling needs of the department. The candidate must excel in both graduate and undergraduate courses. Any deficiencies in the area of teaching noted at any point in the probationary period must be entirely and unambiguously resolved by the time of the tenure decision.
- 5. Develop a consistent record of high-quality service** consistent in quantity with the candidate’s workload assignments and attentive to departmental needs as determined by the chair and the RPTC. The candidate must show that he or she is a reliable departmental citizen, someone who will be willing and able to take on a greater share of service responsibilities after promotion to associate professor.
- 6. Demonstrate a continued ability and willingness to adapt** to changing production, distribution, and consumption trends relevant to research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

#### **II-D Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

The consideration for promotion to Full Professor will take into account the individual’s entire career, but with emphasis on productivity and leadership during the time since her/his last promotion. In the case of someone first hired as an Associate Professor, the emphasis will be on productivity and leadership at UNT.

The criteria for promotion from Associate to Full Professor go well beyond the high requirements for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. The faculty member is expected to show a consistent and continued pattern of high quality research/creative activity, teaching, and service with pronounced impact in each area. Generally, the excellence demanded for a promotion from Assistant to Associate continues and increases for candidates for Full Professor. The same types of indicators for quality of research/creative activity, teaching, service, and leadership are considered at this level, with both the quantity and quality of work continuing to improve, and an international reputation evident. Although most publications/creative activity are expected to be programmatic

and in the candidate's specific area of expertise, some breadth may be evident. Due to the increased departmental demands on tenured faculty, they may be called on to direct student research that is not within their own program of research. The excellence and dedication required of faculty in the department requires faculty to give equal effort and attention to all students they work with, whether the research directly advances their own program of research or not.

To achieve promotion, an Associate Professor must:

1. **Fulfill their promise of leadership.** A primary consideration in the evaluation of a candidate for Full Professor is whether the promise of leadership involved in promotion to Associate Professor has been fulfilled, will continue, and will strengthen. National and international leadership/impact is expected in research. Leadership in teaching must be evident locally and may be evident nationally. Evidence of leadership in the department, CLASS and/or more broadly at the university level is necessary and may be supplemented with professional leadership.
2. **Increase the academic and/or public impact of their research or creative agenda.** Contributions to increasing knowledge are important, but the type of contributions should be unique and, perhaps, advance the field in new directions. The quantity of publications/creative activities continues to be one consideration, at this stage of a career, but the reputation of the journals/venues and the impact of one's work is of equal or greater importance. External reviewers, impact ratings, citations, etc. can assess this impact. A subtler assessment of contributions might be evidence of being one of the first individuals to publish in a specific subarea that then becomes more visible in the general area. Although explained gaps can be acceptable (e.g., changing area of specialization), it is generally expected that candidates will have published or produced and presented creative works at a reasonably consistent rate since their last promotion. Having established expertise in their area(s) of emphasis, the outcomes of a faculty member's research/creative activities may directly benefit a broader public or community beyond traditional academic venues. For promotion to Full Professor, emphasis may be placed on research/creative activity that supports a faculty member's establishment and commitment as a public intellectual. For example, the development of games, websites or mobile apps; writing or revising industry or governmental policies, guidelines, or best practices; developing curriculum or educational materials; etc. can all be considered impactful and significant productivity.
3. **Establish a national and international reputation.** By this point in the career, the promise of a national reputation is expected to be realized. Increased leadership roles in scholarly societies and other professional organizations at the national level is expected. Fellow status in professional organizations, national or international awards for research, and other such indicators will also be assessed. This would be seen in accomplishments such as requests to review candidates from other institutions, grant proposal reviewing for federal agencies or agencies in other countries, editorships, editorial board membership, being awarded the title of Fellow in a learned society, etc. Candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor should indicate some level of international impact of their work.
4. **Demonstrate excellence in teaching and student advising.** A candidate's dedication to excellence in teaching must not end with the achievement of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The department requires everyone to show excellence in teaching and to be continually alert to improving their own teaching ability. This does not necessarily mean embracing every new idea, but it does mean vigilance to improve one's style, reach more and more diverse students, and to impart the most recent information so that the content of courses is current and cutting-edge knowledge is addressed.
5. **Demonstrate leadership in administration and service.** In addition to considerations addressed under promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, Associate Professors who strive to be promoted to Full Professor should have a significant record of frequent and high-quality service to the department, CLASS, the university, and the field. That is, the service activity of a candidate should be of



leadership quality within the department, CLASS, and university. Candidates should have sat on a variety of committees and shown leadership by chairing some committees. It is also a plus to have a record of service to the discipline (e.g., officer of an organization, editor of a journal, etc.).

6. **Demonstrate a continued ability and willingness to adapt** to changing production, distribution, and consumption trends of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

## **II-E External Reviewers**

The departmental RPTC assigns considerable weight to the letters provided by external reviewers. The reviewers, chosen according to the process described in section XII.A-D of the CLASS “Guidelines for the Documentation of Reappointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure Cases” (2017), are experts in the candidate’s field and are as such qualified to make more sophisticated qualitative judgments about the applicant’s scholarly or creative record than the RPTC is likely to be. The CLASS “Guidelines” describe the external reviewers’ purview thus: “The external review letters must address the candidate’s record as a scholar, the extent [that] his/her scholarly/creative record constitutes a significant contribution to the discipline, and his or her potential for continued productivity. The reviewers will also address the question of whether the reviewer thinks the candidate should be promoted based on the UNT department’s criteria for promotion and/or tenure” (XII.E). The RPTC expects claims about “continued productivity” to rest on clear evidentiary bases.

## **Section III Annual Reviews and Evaluating Merit**

### **III-A Annual Review Procedure**

1. All faculty members must upload an online dossier for annual evaluation by the deadline as set by the department (usually mid-January). The RPTC Chair shall review material for clarity, accuracy, and compliance. If revisions are necessary, the RPTC Chair will contact the faculty member with specific requests so that the annual evaluation can be completed in a timely manner.
2. Although the Annual Evaluation is carried out each year, it is intended to measure the performance of faculty members over the previous three calendar years (January-December). The three-year evaluation period takes into consideration the fact that in the academic world, teaching, service, research, creative activities, and other professional contributions may come to fruition only after extended periods of development and review. The three-year period is intended to provide a broad picture of the general pattern of a faculty member's performance. For this reason, a single year that is especially fruitful or barren should not unduly influence the annual evaluation. Instead, it is the duty of the RPTC and Chair to gauge the overall pattern and trends of a faculty member's work.
3. For faculty members with fewer than three calendar years of service at UNT, including visiting faculty, the evaluation will be based on all service since arriving at UNT. Faculty members who arrive at UNT with previous full-time service at other colleges or universities within the three-calendar year period may elect to submit information on those years for consideration; however, primary weight will be given to performance since arriving at UNT.
4. For faculty in their first year of service at UNT, annual evaluations will likewise be based on the time since arriving at UNT; however, salary recommendations for first year faculty must be in accordance with the minimum established in the UNT Policy Manual.
5. Lecturers shall be evaluated annually using a process that takes into consideration their differing workload. In Media Arts, lecturers are not generally assigned responsibility in the areas of scholarly and/or creative activities. However, they may be given the responsibility for certain departmental co-

curricular activities (e.g. oversight of NTTV or KNTU).

- a. **Professional Activities.** In an ongoing manner, the Media Arts Chair - in consultation with the lecturer affected – will create a Professional Activities document outlining the specific co-curricular responsibilities of the faculty member and the relative weights each of these responsibilities will have in evaluations, generally following the model of the staff UPO-31. This document will serve as a guideline for the Media Arts Chair in conducting all regular evaluations and reviews.
- b. **Co-Curricular Activities.** Lecturer performance in the areas of instructional activities and service will be evaluated in the same manner as that for other faculty. However, in the area of co-curricular activities, the Media Arts Chair will evaluate performance directly without RPTC participation. Lecturers without an assignment in co-curricular activities will simply be evaluated in the areas of teaching and service with the appropriate weightings modified to reflect their workload.
- c. For the Annual Evaluation, the Media Arts Chair will use the Professional Activities document, along with other information and documentation provided by the faculty member, to establish a numerical rating of from 0 to 10 following the departmental scale listed in Section [III] C1 and modified as appropriate to reflect the professional assignment. This number, appropriately weighted to reflect workload assignment, will be used in conjunction with those recommended by the RPTC for Areas I and III to determine the lecturer's overall annual evaluation number.

### III-B Annual Review Dossier

A complete dossier includes:

#### 1. Three Year Summary

Faculty should upload a 2-page document that summarizes what they feel to be their most outstanding accomplishments during the review period. Faculty may also communicate special situations or extenuating circumstances that he/she wishes to be considered in the evaluation.

#### 2. VPAA 160 Form

#### 3. Curriculum Vitae

Faculty should upload a current and complete CV that details their entire academic career (not just the three-year evaluation window).

#### 4. AREA I: Teaching

##### a) Instructional Material (40%)

- i. **Syllabi.** Faculty must submit a syllabus for each class taught during the review period.
- ii. Faculty may also submit additional instructional material they deem relevant (e.g. assignments, exams, etc.)

##### b) Student Evaluations (20%).

Faculty must submit SPOT evaluations for each class taught during the review period including both the narrative and numerical evaluations.

##### c) Self-Evaluation (40%).

Faculty must prepare a two-page statement describing their perceived successes and/or accomplishments in the classroom over the three-year window. This document should stress how the faculty member's teaching has varied over the three-year window. The summary should communicate the unique qualities and circumstances of the faculty member's teaching.

- d) See Section [I] 1D for teaching evaluation criteria and supplemental documentation that may be submitted.

**5. AREA II: Scholarly and Creative Work**

- i. Copies of all publications and creative work for the period under review should be included.
- ii. For large items (e.g. books) or non-digital material (e.g. DVDs) faculty should include a written abstract that summarizes the work. A copy of the original work must be available should the RPTC committee or Media Arts Chair request it.
- iii. Provide URLs to digitized creative productions when available.
- iv. Copies of conference papers and presentations need not be included.

**6. AREA III: Administration and Service**

Any documentation related to Administration and Service should be uploaded. This includes service to the department, college, university, and professional service to the field or community.

**III-C Annual Evaluation Format**

The RPTC committee will review each faculty member's dossier and prepare a numerical and narrative evaluation of each faculty member based on the criteria outlined below. The committee will forward the evaluation to the Media Arts Chair.

- i. Each tenured and tenure-track faculty member will receive a numerical and narrative evaluation for Areas I, II, and III (teaching, scholarship/creative, and service) as outlined on VPAA 160. Criteria for evaluation are outlined in Section II of this document.
- ii. Lecturers will receive numerical and narrative evaluations for Areas I and III (teaching and service), as outlined on VPAA 160. Criteria for teaching and service evaluation are outlined in Section II of this document, with special consideration of "professional activities" outlined in Section [III] A5 above.

**1. Numerical Evaluations**

The RPTC assigns a number to each member of the faculty (except himself or herself, his or her relatives and domestic partners, and the department chair) in each evaluated area on a scale of 1-10 detailed below. The numbers are weighted to factor in workload percentages, then combined to create an overall number for each faculty member in each of the three areas as well as a final composite number (rounded to the nearest 0.25).

At the end of the process, the Media Arts Chair distributes to each faculty member a "composite report" detailing the faculty member's numbers in each of the three areas as well as the final composite number.

**Numerical Scale**

**"Outstanding": [Numerical rating of 9.0 to 10]**

General Characteristics: Evidence indicates high productivity with outstanding results, very active, very high quality, very high achievement.

- Instructional Activities: Evidence indicates a generally superior level of classroom performance and evidence of superior performance in other instructional areas.
- Scholarly/Creative Activities: (tenured and tenure-track faculty only): Evidence indicates a vigorous and ongoing program of research and/or creative activities at a superior level of quality.
- Administration and Service: Evidence indicates a superior level of service to Department, College, University, Profession, or Community

**"Very Good": [Numerical rating of 8.0-8.9]**

General Characteristics: Evidence indicates productivity with good results, high quality, high achievement.

- Instructional Activities: Evidence indicates a generally good to very good level of classroom performance; evidence of good performance in other instructional areas.
- Scholarly/Creative Activities: (tenured and tenure-track only): Evidence indicates an active and ongoing program of research and/or creative activities at a high level of quality.
- Administration and Service: Evidence indicates a high level of service to Department, College, University, Profession, and/or Community

**"Acceptable": [Numerical rating of 7.0-7.9]**

General Characteristics: Evidence indicates acceptable productivity with generally good results; consistent achievement.

- Instructional Activities: Evidence indicates generally effective classroom performance; evidence of acceptable performance in other instructional areas.
- Scholarly/Creative Activities: (tenured and tenure-track only): Evidence indicates a sustained program of research and/or creative activities at an acceptable level of quality.
- Administration and Service: Evidence indicates an acceptable level of service to Department, College, University, Profession or Community

**"Needs Improvement": [Numerical rating of 6.0-6.9]**

General Characteristics: Evidence indicates less than acceptable productivity with marginal results; a low level of achievement.

- Instructional Activities: Evidence indicates a less than acceptable level of classroom performance; evidence of marginal performance in other instructional areas.
- Scholarly/Creative Activities: (tenured and tenure-track only): Evidence indicates a less than acceptable program of research and/or creative activities at a marginal level of quality.
- Administration and Service: Evidence indicates a low level of service to Department, College, University, Profession, or Community

**"Unsatisfactory": [Numerical rating of 0 to 5.9]**

General Characteristics: Evidence indicates sub-standard productivity with poor results; poor achievement.

- Instructional Activities: Evidence indicates a generally weak level of classroom performance; evidence of weak performance in other instructional areas.
- Scholarly/Creative Activities: (tenured and tenure-track only): Evidence indicates a weak or non-existent program of research and/or creative activities.
- Administration and Service: Evidence indicates a weak level of service to Department, College, University, Profession, or Community.

**2. Narrative Evaluation**

The RPTC will also compose a brief narrative statement concerning the candidate's performance in each of the areas being evaluated. The statement should briefly address the faculty's overall accomplishments and performance during the review period. The evaluation should reflect the rationale behind the numerical rating and offer suggestions for future improvement. The Media Arts Chair may contribute additional comments to the composite report if he or she has anything to add to the RPTC's evaluation.

### III-D Determining Annual Merit Raise Recommendations

The Annual Evaluation is the primary element used by the Chair in determining the amount of merit raise to be recommended to the CLASS Dean. CLASS normally provides specific guidelines to the Chair of each unit regarding the procedures to be used in the merit process. CLASS will also specify to the Chair the amount of money available for merit, and procedures used to award merit based on Department rankings of annual reviews.

Merit is not available every year, nor is merit guaranteed for every faculty member. For example, low annual evaluations could mean that no merit will be awarded.

Determination of the amount of recommendation for other raise money that may be available, such as market equity or excellence, shall be based on applicable CLASS and University guidelines provided to the Chair.

### Section IV: Post- Tenure Review

Applying the standards specified in this document, the RPTC rates every faculty member on a 10-point scale, with 10 being the highest rating. Any faculty member who receives a final composite score of 5.9 or below will be regarded as having been rated unsatisfactory by the RPTC and will be referred to the department chair for appropriate application of Policy 06.052, "Review of Tenured Faculty."

1. Per this policy, a faculty member who receives a single overall review of unsatisfactory may be placed on a Professional Development Plan (PDP) as decided by the RPTC committee and/or the department chair.
2. A faculty member who receives two (2) overall reviews of unsatisfactory must be placed on a PDP. At that time, a Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC) will be assembled along the lines specified in 06.052 and establish a plan of action, also as stipulated in the policy, with the faculty member involved. According to the policy, "A faculty member may be on a PDP for up to three (3) calendar years" (06.052.IV.) By or before that time, the FPDC may determine that the faculty member has addressed all issues and submit a report to the chair, dean, and provost recommending removal from the PDP.
3. If after three years, outcomes have not been achieved, the FPDC will again report to the chair. The chair then makes a recommendation to the dean and the dean to the provost, who will ultimately determine "whether to recommend revocation of tenure and termination of employment, taking into account the faculty member's record and all annual reviews" (06.052.IV.B).