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The Department of Communication considers the continued intellectual growth and development of its faculty as vital to the academic process. Recognizing the diversity of its faculty, the department acknowledges the importance of various factors for assessing candidates for tenure and/or promotion as well as annual review and selective salary adjustment. The department will review the productivity of faculty members based on their contributions in three general categories:

- Teaching
- Scholarly and/or creative and/or professional achievement
- Service to the department, college, university, profession and/or community

The following factor statement is divided into two sections. The first section outlines the process and standards for evaluation and recommendation of faculty for promotion and/or tenure. The second section outlines the process and standards for the annual review and selective salary adjustment.

I. PROCESS AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF FACULTY FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Process for Evaluation
Evaluation of candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall be based on their past performance and future promise for contributions in teaching, research/creative activity, and service, according to the factor guidelines listed below.

Evaluation of candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with continuing tenure:
The contract allows tenure-track faculty to apply for promotion and tenure after three years in rank (or two years with three years of “credited prior service”). Normally, these two processes occur together, and candidates for tenure and promotion to associate submit materials for consideration at the beginning of their sixth year in rank.

In evaluating applications for promotion to Associate, the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will not only draw upon the candidate's professional record, personal statement, and teaching portfolio, but it will also consider letters from people outside the University who will assess the candidate. The University Promotion and Tenure factors require that at least four letters be submitted from external evaluators selected by administrators and committees for their standing in the field and for their detachment from the candidate. Any relationship to the candidate must be disclosed. It is not appropriate to include close collaborators or co-authors, graduate or postdoctoral advisors, individuals who have provided
references for the candidate or reviewed the candidate’s package before, or Wayne State faculty. In the case of creative work in film/video, digital media, or other emerging forms, letters from media professionals/creative artists who have the expertise to evaluate such work may be included. A list of external reviewers will be created by the department chair in consultation with members of the committee. The chair may consult with related departments inside or outside the university in developing an appropriate list if the committee lacks the appropriate expertise. The candidates may also submit one or two suggested names for consideration by the chair and committee. According to the WSU Factors, “After the unit administrator and committee have assembled the final list of possible external evaluators, candidates must be allowed to review the final list and strike one or two names of possible evaluators. After review by the candidate, the unit administrator and committee will choose the evaluators without further consultation with the candidate.”

**Evaluation of candidates for promotion to Professor:** Generally speaking, candidates for promotion to Professor can put themselves forward as early as their fourth year in rank. The process of promotion from Associate to Full Professor resembles promotion from Assistant to Associate, but greater depth and breadth are expected of the candidate in all three areas: teaching, research/creative activity, and service. Selected considerations for promotion to Professor appear after the standards for promotion to Associate, but it should be understood that these considerations can change as the department evolves.

The current contract (XXIII A3 c) specifies that the chair can carry out the P&T Committee’s functions if that committee has fewer than three members who can vote on a promotion case. When the department has too few members at the rank of professor, the chair may also seek additional members from related departments in the College or University.

**Standards for Evaluation**
The standards for evaluation are those set forth for promotion and tenure in the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the AAUP:

The assessments of a faculty candidate’s qualifications shall be based upon excellence in teaching and in scholarly achievement or, for a faculty candidate in the creative or performing arts, in creative professional achievement. The assessments of an academic-staff member who is eligible for tenure consideration shall be based upon excellence in job performance and in appropriate scholarly or professional achievement. Consideration shall also be given to non-instructional service to the department, School/College, and/or University and/or public and/or professional service which benefits the University. At all levels of this procedure assessments shall take into consideration such unit, School/College, and University factors as are in force. Assessments of a candidate’s qualifications must take into consideration both performance to date and prospects for continued excellence based on that performance (XXII, C).

The P&T Committee will assess each candidate as *exceeding expectations*, *meeting expectations*, or *failing to meet expectations* based on the factors outlined below:
TEACHING: The department recognizes the importance of teaching and advising students. It is a major responsibility of our faculty to provide strong classroom teaching and to encourage student development at both graduate and undergraduate levels. Therefore, successful candidates must demonstrate excellence regarding: (1) classroom instruction and student learning and (2) sustained contribution and commitment to intellectual and professional development of students.

Quality of classroom instruction: Faculty members are expected to teach a variety of courses within the Department of Communication in accordance with departmental needs. Therefore, indicators of quality of classroom instruction may include: preparation of course syllabi, activities, lectures, and discussion topics, preparation and evaluation of exams/assignments/papers/projects, development of special instructional materials or curriculum advancement (e.g., handouts, video or digital presentations, examples, activities), demonstration of continuous development, refinement, and innovation within established classes, the development of classes within existing curricula or in support of new curricula, a philosophy of teaching statement, student evaluations of teaching (SETs), evidence of awards or nominations for teaching excellence at Department, College, University, and/or professional-association levels, and indicators of learning outcome achievement, such as exit interviews with graduating students. Candidates are not expected to address all of the indicators above but are encouraged to see them as ways to create a broad perspective on their teaching performance.

When reviewing SETs, the Committee will assess the specific factors designated by the Faculty Union (e.g., Q1, Q2, Q24) at face value, with the understanding that the significance of departmental SET mean scores may vary across semester and class types of classes. Within the teaching portfolio, candidates are also encouraged to use other parts of the teaching evaluation, including open-ended and quantitative questions, to explain the importance of such factors as: the total number of students (undergraduate and graduate) in classes taught during the evaluation period, percentage of students who complete the SET, the nature of the class (e.g., required, elective, special topics, etc.), the format of the class (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, online), and the size of these classes.

Intellectual and professional development of students: Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should demonstrate a commitment to the intellectual development of their students, both in and out of the classroom. Indicators of commitment to intellectual development may include: supervision of student-led research projects, directed studies, and honors options, quality and quantity of graduate degree projects (e.g., MA essays/theses/creative projects; PhD dissertations), contributions as readers and committee members on MA and PhD committees, and supervision of students in research, scholarship, and creative activity (such as presentation at professional conferences, events, and screenings). Candidates are encouraged to consider frequent service on graduate committees as a form of service as well as evidence of teaching growth; service on committees in other departments should be highlighted. Similarly, joint publication or presentation with graduate students can be considered evidence of teaching excellence as well as of scholarship. Activities that involve graduate or undergraduate students in research or creative projects outside the classroom in general are indications of commitment to intellectual development.
Other markers of student development include advising beyond expected meetings with students enrolled in faculty member’s courses, or with advisees assigned by the department. Specifically, a faculty member's role as a unit undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, pre-professional advisor, or advisor to a student professional society or academic honorary society should be considered in assessing his/her contributions to the instructional program.

In making the case for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member may also address additional factors, such as: number of new preparations within the evaluation period, amount of course revisions within the evaluation period, time of day/date of classes taught (e.g., weekday/weekend; morning, afternoon, evening and student preference), student expectations and interest level in class subject matter/material/topic, peer evaluations of teaching, and pedagogical workshops, classes, or events focused on teaching excellence (e.g., Wayne State OTL workshop series, etc.). In addition, the candidate’s narrative should demonstrate growth over the course of their teaching at WSU, as this is a measure of teaching excellence.

**Promotion to Full Professor:** As faculty members advance in rank, the balance of factors making up teaching excellence can change. Candidates for promotion to Professor can demonstrate their professional growth in this area by deeper involvement in graduate teaching and mentoring, particularly (for graduate faculty) the successful advising of doctoral students. Involvement in the scholarship of pedagogy can also be an important measure of broader growth as a teacher. Academic or professional instruction with national scope or impact would also be evidence of growth as a teacher, as would recognition and adoption of a candidate’s innovative approaches to teaching or widespread use of the candidate’s prepared instructional materials.

**RESEARCH AND CREATIVE/PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY:** Another mark of the continued growth and development of tenured/tenure track faculty is the production of scholarly works and creative/professional activities. According to the WSU factors, “Excellence consists in making contributions to knowledge and to creativity that reach at least the same levels of magnitude, quantity, and importance as is expected of faculty at other national research universities” (p. 4). Given the diversity present in the department with faculty representing the social scientific and humanistic study of communication as well as the creative and professional arts, a number of criteria will be considered in evaluating their research and/or creative activity as appropriate to the candidate’s specialty.

**Social Scientific and Humanistic Studies:** In general, the recommended standard will depend upon the nature of the research, publication form, and authorship. Appropriate rates and venues of publication can also vary within both subfields. It is acknowledged that book projects, time in the field, grant writing, and the ebb and flow of the research process may alter the number of publications for any given year. However, a retrospective look back from the time of the last reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion should reveal a continuing rate of scholarly activity and productivity that signals an active research agenda and visibility at national and/or international levels.

Publication is the most important means for evaluating scholarship. For candidates in either the social scientific or humanistic study of communication, a coherent and programmatic body of articles published in reputable refereed journals is a standard indicator of scholarly activity. For
candidates from both fields, an original, scholarly book that contributes to the scholarship of the discipline, combined with a smaller set of refereed articles and book chapters, can also represent scholarly activity. Publication of book chapters in volumes edited by scholars of known reputation and published by respected sources is also evidence of scholarship. In appropriate disciplines, translation may be an accepted form of scholarship. Frequent citation of a faculty member's work, favorable reviews of that work including awards, and similar evaluative evidence from peers outside the University should be considered.

A number of other indicators of excellence will be considered as the body of scholarship is examined. Sole or lead authorship is considered an important indicator of developing an individual scholarly voice. For multi-authored pieces, which are also indicative of scholarly growth, narrative paragraphs describing the candidate’s contribution are strongly encouraged. Interdisciplinary works are also valued forms of scholarship in that they strengthen the integration of communication with other disciplines; candidates should make a clear case that the interdisciplinary work connects to their core program of scholarship. Publication in international and national journals is typically more highly valued than regional venues, though the reputation of a journal, as indicated by reach, acceptance rate, or impact factor, also denotes quality of scholarship. Candidates and committee members should also understand that impact factors by their nature favor some forms of scholarship over others.

**Creative and Professional Arts:** The variety of professional, creative, scholarly activities and interests among the faculty reflects a broad and evolving scope of film, media and emerging media fields. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion is expected to have a body of work of that has achieved national and/or international attention. For faculty members whose scholarship includes creative activities, films (features and/or shorts), TV series, screenplays, performances, video or new media exhibitions, and similar creative activities are evidence of scholarship. Creative achievement includes authorship of media work in its most encompassing parameters: film, television broadcasts, DVD, video installations at galleries or museums, web media and other emerging platforms.

It is acknowledged that media and creative work is quite often produced in a team context. Thus, the faculty member’s creative authorship will be evaluated according to the key production positions s/he undertakes within this context. These positions may include Director, Director of Photography, Editor, Production Designer, Composer, Producer, Executive Producer, Screenwriter, Sound Designer, etc. For professional and creative work in such areas, the candidate must demonstrate that his/her contribution to the field is innovative or pioneering and the candidate has been recognized as a contributor to the field by criteria that include prizes, awards, invitations to festivals, honors, serving on juries at festivals, and gaining other peer recognitions.

As with scholarship, evaluation of quality of work in the creative and professional arts is through peer review. Thus, the standing and selectivity of the forum in which the event occurs is very important. Other factors considered in evaluating the quality of the work include the subsequent formal peer reviews, the reviews elicited as a part of an objective program of the exhibition venue for judging success, evaluation by professional peers and academics of comparable standing; the nature and size of the audience, as well as other, similar methods as appropriate.
Just as in scholarly activities, other factors to be taken into consideration include: whether the venue/screening(s) is regional, national or international, whether the work is invited and/or juried for exhibition or publication, whether the work in internally or externally funded or commissioned, prizes and awards, and whether the work is (in general) consonant with the creative expectations for specialization.

Self-distribution or niche marketing can be significant ways to reach various publics or audiences as well as valuable forms of mentoring for students, but they typically lack the crucial element of peer recognition. If arguments for reach and impact are made for self-distribution or niche marketing, then reach and impact measurements must be made and peer recognition that reflects the criteria listed should be demonstrated.

For faculty whose teaching or scholarly/creative work touches on professional practice, publication of books on news events and public affairs as well as publications of newspaper commentaries and feature or news stories and magazine articles, or production of materials for broadcast or digital distribution, or the creation of public relations or advertising campaigns, may be considered as evidence of scholarship. Professional practice work should be evaluated by its quality, by the reputation or standing of the media outlet, by whether the work was invited, and by whether the material reached a national or regional audience. If available, comments of appropriate reviewers are useful in assessing the quality of such work.

**Other Forms of Evidence for Excellence in Research or Creative Activities:** Prizes, prestigious fellowships, and special recognitions for scholarly and creative work awarded by reputable institutions, academies, etc., outside the University should carry substantial weight in evaluating scholarly and creative work. University and College recognitions reflect peer judgment that a faculty member's scholarship or creative work is of very high quality.

In evaluating a faculty member's research or creative work, attention should also be given to conference papers delivered (especially those that are invited and those that are refereed as a condition of presentation), invited articles, book reviews, published abstracts, and delivery of invited lectures at societies, academies, or other institutions or groups recognized as important or distinguished forums. The prominence, scope and selectivity of presentation venues are indicators of the value of presentations. Successful competition for grants and fellowships is evidence of favorable peer review in many fields and is expected in some; hence, the award of grants and fellowships to support scholarship should be regarded as evidence of a faculty member’s scholarly credentials. These activities are, however, supplemental to publication or performance/exhibition and do not alone constitute excellence in research or creative activities.

**Promotion to Full Professor:** Candidates for promotion to Professor can demonstrate their sustained intellectual growth in several ways. First is through an increased production of articles and conference papers. Growth can also be reflected by the presentation of material before wider audiences, particularly in international venues, and by more frequent citations and wider participation in such venues. It could also be demonstrated by the production of books or other long forms of scholarship. Indications that other scholars are building on the candidate’s work, and the mentoring of graduate students whose original scholarship reflects the candidate’s contributions, are also marks of sustained intellectual growth.
SERVICE: Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate and/or Professor ranks are expected to play a collegial role with others in the department and the university. In general, service falls into three categories. What constitutes service in each category is determined by the standards of each professional or academic field. Some service activities also count as teaching and/or research, depending on the nature of the position. In all cases, consideration will be given to the depth and quality of service activities as well as their quantity.

Service to the University. This includes principally service on departmental, school/college, and university committees or other bodies. A substantial level of committee service is expected of all faculty members and does not by itself constitute meritorious service. Weight should be given to service on especially demanding committees, such as P&T committees, curriculum committees, committees that evaluate faculty for prizes, awards, and grants, oversight boards, and other bodies that require extensive commitments of time and a high level of responsibility. The effectiveness and quality of a faculty member’s committee service should be carefully evaluated; joining committees or seeking election to various consultative bodies does not by itself constitute meritorious performance.

Service to the profession or discipline. Service to the profession covers many activities, including but not limited to participating in the peer review process, holding office in disciplinary professional associations, and acting as a consultant to such associations. Service to significant scholarly or professional associations that contribute to the department’s profile and the candidate’s reputation will be valued higher than service that lacks either or both of these qualities. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should be regular, and increasingly sought-after, participants in the peer review process as they become familiar with the administrative functions of the academy. This will often include membership on editorial boards, service as a manuscript reviewer for journals or conferences, membership on professional review panels, and/or service as a judge or referee for creative performances and artistic exhibitions.

Service to the community. This includes membership on community boards or commissions related to a faculty member’s academic discipline, consultancies and/or public discussions/commentary which bring academic knowledge to bear on behalf of the community, testimony or studies to help community organizations obtain knowledge and information pertinent to their activities, or professional work that facilitates such groups’ communication. “Community” here encompasses groups, agencies, and institutions in both the public and private sectors and is not limited to the Detroit area.

Promotion to Full Professor: Candidates for promotion to Professor will have a higher profile at the university and in the academy at large, and sometimes in the community as well. In addition to the venues mentioned above, a candidate’s record reflect other forms of service such as editorship of journals or books, service as a tenure reviewer for faculty at other institutions, and service on important committees or as an officer of significant scholarly or professional organizations. In the department and university, important administrative roles can reflect professional growth as well. The quality of service bears particular weight.
CONCLUSION

For a faculty member to be recommended for either tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Communication, he/she should have demonstrated continued professional growth during his or her years at Wayne State University. Further, the candidate’s record should meet expectations in all three factor areas: teaching, scholarly and/or creative achievement, and service. Weakness in either teaching or scholarly and/or creative achievement is sufficient reason to not recommend tenure and/or promotion.

II. PROCESS AND STANDARDS OF EVALUATION FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND SELECTIVE SALARY ADJUSTMENT

Process for Annual Review
Every year, the Department Chair, in consultation with the P&T Committee, will conduct an annual written review of all term and untenured faculty based on their annual report. The information contained in the annual report is outlined in the collective bargaining agreement:

**ANNUAL REPORT**: Each faculty member’s annual report should consist of (a) an updated professional record; (b) a summary of the teaching evaluations for the previous year; (c) a summary of the last three (3) years of the faculty member’s activities, a presentation of current activities, and what results are expected from these activities. All faculty members are required to submit an annual report and to participate in this process. Failure to participate in the annual process shall result in no selective-salary increase, no travel support, and no credit toward sabbatical leaves. Failure to participate in the annual review process two (2) times or more in any five (5)-year period shall also result in the forfeiture of any across-the-board raise. The salary committee’s recommendation may form a basis for an adjustment in workload (XXIV, C).

The faculty members to be reviewed must be given at least 2 weeks’ notice prior to the annual review. In addition, the written review shall be given to the faculty member at least 5 days prior to the discussion with the chair. The written reviews shall be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file along with any supporting or dissenting materials provided by the member.

Standards for Evaluation for Annual Review

The standards for evaluation for annual review are set forth in the collective bargaining agreement:

For faculty on the tenure track, the annual review shall be based upon excellence in teaching and in scholarly achievement or, for a faculty member in the creative or performing arts, in creative professional achievement, and shall take into account such unit, School/College, and University tenure factors as are in force. Consideration shall also be given to non-instructional service to the department, School/College, and/or
University and/or public and/or professional service which benefit the University. The annual review shall identify areas of growth and strength and areas of concern in teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service. For faculty not on the tenure track, the annual review shall be in relation to his/her professional performance and as it relates to appropriate unit, School/College and University factors as are in force except that lecturers and senior lecturers shall be reviewed primarily for teaching with secondary consideration for excellence in scholarly work and/or service if the letter of appointment has identified scholarly work and/or service as part of the bargaining-unit member’s responsibility (XX, C 2).

Process for Selective Salary Adjustment
Every year, the Chair and the Personnel & Salary Committee will evaluate all faculty for selective salary adjustment based on their annual report. The procedures for evaluation are set forth in the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the AAUP:

COMPOSITION OF THE SALARY COMMITTEE: The faculty salary committees shall consist of not fewer than three (3) tenured members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee of that unit elected by its faculty, and such other faculty from the unit as the faculty may elect. A majority of the committee membership shall consist of tenured members. The chair or administrator of equal function or dean/director or his/her designee shall chair the salary committee with vote (XII, B 5 a).

SELECTIVE SALARY:
In recommending selective salary increases, the committee shall be guided by unit factors and general University criteria and factors for tenure and promotion for faculty. It shall also consider equity when appropriate. For persons not holding tenure-track classifications, consideration shall be given to those portions of the unit factors and general University criteria that apply to their assignments (XII, B 5 a).

In the case of faculty, the pool shall be distributed such that three-sevenths (3/7) of the pool is awarded to recognize accomplishments in scholarship, three-sevenths (3/7) to recognize accomplishments in teaching, and one-seventh (1/7) to recognize accomplishments in service. In recommending selective-salary increases for faculty, the committee and the dean/director/vice president shall be guided by unit factors and general University criteria and factors for tenure and promotion for faculty. These factors include teaching, scholarly productivity, and service and may consider equity when appropriate (XII, C 4).

Standards for Evaluation for Selective Salary Adjustment
After reviewing each faculty member’s annual report, the Personnel & Salary Committee shall place the faculty member in one of four groups based on their performance in teaching, research/creative activities, and/or service, depending on their contractual language: Group I, Group II, Group III, Group IV. These groupings are used as a guide and do not necessarily correspond directly to rankings used in selective salary adjustment.
Teaching

**GROUP I:** A faculty member placed in Group I should have a record of outstanding teaching at the undergraduate and, when appropriate, graduate levels. Outstanding teaching should be evidenced by very high levels of performance on teaching criteria pertinent to rank and appointment (see factors above for examples). Group I faculty should demonstrate high levels of student learning and wherever possible past recognition from faculty colleagues and/or professional groups. In general, "outstanding teaching" identifies faculty members who would be in the top quarter of those in the department in instructional effectiveness.

**GROUP II.** Faculty members placed in Group II should have demonstrated high levels of performance on teaching criteria pertinent to rank and appointment. There should be concrete evidence of favorable student evaluation and of high levels of student learning. The standard for placing a faculty member in Group II is that he/she must be engaged in teaching that, while not among the very highest group in the school or college, would clearly qualify him/her to meet the current standard for promotion to his/her present professional rank.

**GROUP III.** Faculty members placed in Group III should have demonstrated satisfactory performance on teaching criteria pertinent to rank and appointment. Generally, such faculty members will receive somewhat mixed reviews of teaching from students and from faculty colleagues, and/or evidence of student learning will be mixed. In general, a faculty member placed in Group III is engaged in satisfactory teaching, but his/her teaching would not be sufficient to gain promotion to his/her present rank using current promotion standards.

**GROUP IV.** A faculty member placed in Group IV generally demonstrates less than satisfactory performance on teaching criteria pertinent to rank and appointment, less favorable student and peer evaluations of teaching as compared to faculty peers in the same school/college, and/or the evidence of student learning is mixed. The quality of teaching for faculty members in Group IV is below that which would be expected to gain promotion to his/her present rank and would not be sufficient to gain appointment to the University in any rank.

Research and Creative/Professional Activity

**GROUP I:** For Full Professors, placement in Group I should indicate a record of scholarly/creative activity that has gained very extensive national recognition for its scope and quality. Scholarship in the forefront of the field is generally required for recognition in Group I. Professors in this group should compare favorably with leading faculty members in the same disciplines at other national research universities.

For Associate Professors, the same high quality of work is required. The scope of the work will be somewhat less because he/she has not been active for as long a period as outstanding Professors in the same field. There should be national recognition that the faculty member's work is very important; it should be favorably and regularly cited. Associate Professors in the group should compare favorably with leading faculty members in the same rank and discipline at other national research universities.
For Assistant Professors, there should be evidence of very high quality work that promises to be in the forefront of his/her field. Consideration of the quality of a doctoral dissertation, and of papers delivered but not yet published (or accepted for publication), as well as creative works in progress, is appropriate for assistant professors in the first two years of appointment, though as time in rank increases, these projects should show signs of development and advancement. Thereafter, there should be some evidence of high quality work published in selective journals, distributed through selective media outlets, or in other reputable publications or media outlets.

An Assistant Professor should be placed in Group I if the quality of his/her work is high enough to promise that, with continued work of the same quality and with substantially broader record of such work, he/she would have high prospects for becoming a leading scholar in the field among his/her contemporaries.

**GROUP II.** Professors and Associate Professors should be placed in Group II if their scholarly/creative activity does not warrant placing them in Group I, but it would plainly qualify them for promotion to their present rank using current promotion and tenure standards in the University.

An Assistant Professor should be placed in Group II if he/she is engaging in good quality work which means the expectations on which he/she was hired but which does not yet show such promise that, if continued at the current level of quality and substantially broadened in amount and scope, it would promise that he/she would become a leading scholar/artist in the field among his/her contemporaries. Special consideration may be given to assistant professors in their first two years of service, as indicated above.

**GROUP III.** Associate and Professors should be placed in Group III if they are maintaining a regular and continuing program of scholarly/creative activity, but it is not high enough in quality and/or not large enough in amount to warrant promotion to their present rank under current promotion standards at Wayne State University.

Assistant Professors should be placed in Group III if their scholarly/creative activity has not yet produced work of sufficient quantity and quality to build a reputation that holds promise for placing them among the leading scholars/artists in the discipline among their contemporaries. Exceptions may be made for assistant professors in their first two years of service in that rank; the quality of papers they have in draft or of revisions in their dissertation made in expectation of publication of articles or a book may be examined, as well as creative works in progress. The judgment of the chair (and, if he/she wishes to seek their advice, of senior faculty members in the same or cognate sub-disciplines) about the potential for publication of such papers and placement in appropriate venues, if completed, is an appropriate basis for placing an Assistant Professor in Group III.

**GROUP IV.** Associate and Professors should be placed in Group IV if they have only an episodic record of scholarly/creative activity or none at all, or if the work is generally of weak quality. An Assistant Professor shall be placed in Group IV if he/she does not meet the
standards of Group III.

**Service**

**GROUP I.** A faculty member should be placed in Group I if he/she has engaged in substantial high quality service to his/her profession and/or the community and has, in addition, rendered a minimum, consistent, high quality service in a responsible role to the university.

**GROUP II.** A faculty member should be placed in Group II if he/she has engaged in substantial high university and has record of some responsible contributions to his/her profession and/or the community.

**GROUP III.** A faculty member should be placed in Group III if he/she has given only modest service in quantity or quality to his/her profession, the community, or the university.

**GROUP IV.** A faculty member should be placed in Group IV if he/she has failed to give service to his/her profession, the community, or the university. Alternatively, a faculty member should be placed in Group IV if the service they did provide is of poor quality.