The school’s original annual review policy was adopted on June 24, 1997. A yearlong process to revise the policies resulted in a more detailed version adopted Dec. 7, 2016. On Jan. 25, 2017, the faculty amended the policy by adding invitations to testify before government agencies as a potential element of service.
PREAMBLE AND INTENT

The purpose of this document is to outline the process and criteria used by the School of Journalism during the annual review for permanent faculty. This document follows the guidelines set forth in the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Policy Manual, the University of Arizona for Appointed Personnel (UHAP), and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Annual performance reviews may be taken into account in the promotion and tenure process, as well as for contract renewal for professors of practice, but are not determinative on these issues.

The intent of the annual review process is for faculty members to receive a narrative evaluation of performance annually with special attention to remarkable achievements, outstanding products, great teaching, and otherwise unsung contributions. The narrative is used as a way to discuss and recognize the diverse contributions to the life of the program in all aspects. Simultaneously, in areas where performance is lower than expected, the committee and director are charged to specify exactly what evidence of problems exists and to provide constructive suggestions about methods to improve performance. The process also:

- Provides transparent guidance for those seeking tenure, promotion, or renewal.
- Fosters goal-setting for individual growth and development.
- Rewards excellent performance when merit-based raises are allocated at the university.
- Holds faculty members accountable to each other and provides a mechanism to address deficiencies so everyone contributes to the success of the school and students.
- Lays out clear standards to ensure academic freedom and protect faculty against arbitrary and capricious evaluations.

Faculty members possess the ability to evaluate their colleagues’ teaching, research/creative activity, and service/outreach. Others, too, such as administrators and students, have some insights as to faculty performance. To a greater or lesser degree, this knowledge can be articulated in terms of criteria. It is unclear, though, whether ratings criteria could be exhaustively written out in advance so as to remove any human judgment. The typical tasks that faculty members take on as duties are many and varied. Journalism is rapidly changing in the modern world. It seems utopian to expect a semi-algorithmic instrument to evaluate all faculty duties fairly, consistently, and accurately. However, considerable articulation of criteria can and should be made. New faculty, and faculty members coming up for tenure, promotion, or renewal, need guidance with some detail as to what they should be doing and how their work will be evaluated by internal and external reviewers. Evaluators and the school director need to be able to explain and justify their decisions. The balance that the school has settled upon acknowledges that the criteria are not exhaustive and that the process requires good faith and will be revised as needed.
PROCEDURES

Each faculty member in the school – including full-time and part-time faculty, and those undergoing promotion, three-year renewal, or tenure evaluation, but not including adjunct faculty – are reviewed every spring by the school review committee and school director, evaluating performance for the previous five calendar years, with substantial emphasis on the immediate past calendar year. The review committee is comprised of all permanent faculty.

Faculty members provide dossier information showing evidence of their teaching, service, and, if relevant, research/publication/creative professional activity. Dossier information shall address the peer-review criteria below that were developed by the director and faculty, and approved by the college and provost. Dossiers include highlights from the preceding year, a curriculum vitae for the previous five calendar years, all teacher course evaluation ratings for the previous five calendar years, and any supplemental materials faculty wish to provide or requested by the committee or director. Faculty members may include qualitative TCE comments as long as they include all of them. Faculty members who do not provide dossiers for evaluation receive an unsatisfactory rating for service and are not eligible for merit raises in the calendar year for which the reviews are being conducted.

Based on these materials and the school criteria, the committee provides an evaluation on each dimension for each faculty member’s work, taking into account the workload distribution of each faculty member. Typical workload distribution for tenured or tenure-track faculty is 40 percent teaching, 40 percent research, and 20 percent service. Typical workload distribution for professors of practice is 60 percent teaching and 40 percent service. Different weights and workloads may be negotiated between individual faculty members and the director. In the case of the director, the committee evaluates his or her work in the areas of research, teaching, and non-administrative service, which total 50 percent of effort, and sends the evaluation directly to the dean’s office. The committee does not evaluate the director’s performance in administration (the other 50 percent of workload).

For each area of evaluation – teaching, service, and/or research/publication/creative professional activity – the committee awards each faculty member one of five ratings: Truly Exceptional (5), Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Needs Improvement (2), and Unsatisfactory (1). An overall weighted average score is calculated, accounting for workload distribution percentages.

Committee evaluations are provided to the director, who takes them into account as advisory for the final review. The director also may review written comments from student evaluations. The director provides a written evaluation for each faculty member, and then meets with each faculty member to discuss accomplishments, areas of improvement, and goals. A faculty member may add written comments to the director’s written evaluation before signing it, provided within 15 calendar days of the faculty-director meeting. Faculty may appeal their reviews to the college dean, as per UHAP 3.2. Final overall scores for each faculty member, including the committee’s scores and director’s scores, are forwarded to the dean’s office and copies of the final written evaluations are filed with the school and Human Resources.
TIMELINE

The review process will be conducted according to the following schedule:

Feb. 1
Faculty members provide their dossier information to the school for distribution to members of the review committee. They also separately provide their goals for the coming calendar year.

Feb. 7-14
Committee as a whole conducts reviews and submits to director.

Feb. 15-March 1
Director conducts evaluation of each faculty member based on the dossier information and committee assessments, and provides a draft review to each faculty member. Faculty members do not see the recommendations or scores of the committee. However, the director will provide the faculty member with a summary of the peer evaluation upon request. The director also will provide additional feedback for relevant faculty members regarding progress toward tenure or promotion.

March 2-31
Director meets with individual faculty members to discuss review and goals. A faculty member has 10 days after the meeting to sign the review, acknowledging the meeting, and may attach additional written comments to the review if he or she wishes. Faculty also may appeal the review to the college dean. Final scores of the director are forwarded to the dean’s office and copies of the written evaluations are provided to the faculty member, the school’s personnel files, Human Resources, and to the dean upon request. A three-member Faculty Affairs Committee, elected by the faculty, will oversee the review process and advise the director on individual reviews that require remediation or other action.

RATINGS CRITERIA

Below are the criteria for assessing teaching, service/outreach, and research/creative activity/professional publication. Faculty members have high expectations of themselves and the school, and therefore a ranking of “meets expectations” should be interpreted as good performance rather than mediocre performance. In other words, it is considered noteworthy to meet the expectations of earning tenure or contract renewal at a large research-intensive public university like the University of Arizona.
TEACHING

Teaching is considered a primary purpose of the school, and under this philosophy many kinds of evidence are examined in assessing faculty effectiveness in the classroom or in one-on-one teaching.

Elements of Effective Teaching Might Include:
- Expectations clearly communicated to students through syllabuses, assignments (e.g., rubrics), and in class.
- Timely and thorough student feedback.
- Treats students with respect.
- Use of new technologies to aid teaching.
- Willingness to teach required classes, and high-enrollment classes.
- Continued improvement of teaching methods through development, training, and teaching-oriented grants.
- Mentoring students to publish classwork and enter contests.
- Developing new curriculum and programs for the school.

Indicators of Effective Teaching Might Include:
- Solicited and unsolicited student letters.
- Peer observations.
- Teaching assignments and syllabuses.
- Graded work and rubrics.
- Awards, honors, and similar recognition of excellence.
- Development of new classes and activities that improve student learning.
- Grants acquired to directly assist classroom teaching or development.
- One-on-one mentoring of students enrolled in one’s classes.
- Teacher course evaluation scores.
- Student work produced in professional publications as a direct result of classroom mentoring.
- Participation on master’s committees, honors committees, independent study, or doctoral committees, as a member or chair.
- Mentoring and assisting colleagues and adjunct instructors, including providing feedback for others, guest lecturing, and offering workshops for peers.
- Publication of textbooks, peer-reviewed research regarding pedagogy, and other teaching-focused publications.
Teaching Rating Criteria
The school considers the breadth of each person’s contributions to teaching, and below are just some criteria that can help delineate one score from another. For example, one significant strength can raise a score for an instructor who would otherwise meet expectations, and likewise, a serious deficiency that requires attention can lower a score. Faculty should use reason in their assessment of peers, accounting for such factors as new class preps and experience.

5 Truly Exceptional
- A leader within the UA and nation in teaching and pedagogy.
- Initiates innovative teaching methods in class and throughout the school.
- In addition to advising and open contact hours, mentoring above and beyond, with significant impact shown through student success.
- Generally excellent TCE scores.

4 Exceeds Expectations
- Initiates innovative teaching methods in classes.
- Active in campus teaching efforts (e.g., OIA, college teaching efforts).
- Consistently strong advising, mentoring and open-office student contact hours.
- Generally above average TCE scores.

3 Meets Expectations
- Adapts and updates classes for changing media world and teaching trends.
- Holds required office hours.
- Treats students with respect.
- Returns graded work in a timely and thorough manner.
- Clearly communicates expectations to students.
- Average TCE scores.

2 Needs Improvement
- Leaves classes unchanged and provides no effort to update or improve.
- Fails to hold consistent office hours; relatively inaccessible to students.
- Occasional complaints regarding inappropriate classroom behavior.
- Below average TCE scores.

1 Unsatisfactory
- Classes do not teach to school learning objectives and lack impact or learning.
- Lack of office hours or availability for students as required.
- Consistent founded complaints from students regarding inappropriate behavior in violation of university and school policy.
- Consistently low TCE scores.
SERVICE AND OUTREACH

Service and outreach are considered to be the offering and sharing of expertise and knowledge of the individual faculty member in assisting the school, the university, the academy, the profession, and the community. Assessment of service should be based on the quality and impact of the activities in which the faculty member is engaged. The list of meritorious service activities below is not intended to be exhaustive. Faculty will participate in a broad range of contributions. In light of the diversity of talents and strengths among faculty, and the needs for the school in a variety of areas, service covers a range of contributions.

Elements of Effective Service and Outreach Might Include:

- Shares the workload in school activities and faculty governance to better the school and one’s colleagues. Completes tasks as assigned effectively, on time, and in a manner that fosters a collegial and effective workplace.
- Contributes to student engaged learning, going beyond the classroom to ensure students receive value in their university experience.
- Contributes to university governance and the campus community, ensuring the school is an active contributor in interdisciplinary partnerships.
- Provides service to the journalism profession or the academy.
- Helps the community – in Arizona or beyond – better understand the role of journalism in a democracy, and contributes to the betterment of the field and the study of it.

Indicators of Effective Service and Outreach Might Include:

- School service, such as participating on committees, aiding student recruitment and retention efforts, enhancing diversity initiatives, coordinating review of transfer courses, and other tasks.
- Advising student clubs or participation in other extra-curricular student activities.
- Participation in university governance, such as serving on committees and serving in leadership positions.
- Speaking in classes or other venues at the university, for journalists, community members, or professional organizations.
- Publication of articles in trade journals, newsletters, mainstream media, or other venues on teaching, research, or journalism topics of the day.
- Aiding the academy, such as reviewing journal manuscripts, writing outside letters for tenure candidates, and participating in academic or professional organizations through national committees or leadership appointments.
- Contribution of professional services to individuals and agencies in the profession, such as individual support, advisory role to organizations, or news contest judging.
- Consultation with alumni and professionals working in the field, by sharing expertise.
- Helping governments, the courts, legislatures, Congress, and other institutions make more informed decisions and create better public policy by providing expert testimony and applicable research.
- Publisher of a blog, website, or other online forum of service to journalism.
Service and Outreach Rating Criteria
The school considers the breadth of each person’s contributions to service and outreach, and below are just some criteria that can help delineate one score from another. One significant strength can raise a score for an instructor who would otherwise meet expectations, and likewise, a serious deficiency that requires attention can lower a score.

5 Truly Exceptional
- Significant school service that leads to tangible improvements.
- Service at the campus level that aids in faculty governance and represents the school in university-level decisions.
- Community outreach and extension that promote and improve journalism in Tucson and/or beyond.
- National or international service of distinction.
- Superior school citizenship that fosters a collegial atmosphere that improves school productivity and collaboration.

4 Exceeds Expectations
- Chairing school committees, conducting other school service, and effecting change and productive faculty governance.
- Campus service that represents the school in university faculty governance.
- Community service and outreach that promotes and improves journalism in Tucson and/or beyond.
- Excellent school citizenship that improves the workplace.

3 Meets Expectations
- Active service on school committees and participation in faculty governance, such as attending faculty meetings.
- Service for the college or university community.
- Some community service and outreach, such as speaking to community groups, or writing op-ed pieces for newspapers.

2 Needs Improvement
- Little engagement in school faculty governance or committees, including lack of follow-through and effort; not pulling his or her full load.
- Little service to the campus, community, or profession.
- Poor school citizenship, including creating an atmosphere that hinders school productivity and collaborations.

1 Unsatisfactory
- Little or no participation in school faculty governance.
- Little or no service for the campus, community, or profession.
- Behavior that fosters a non-collegial atmosphere and materially damages school productivity and poorly represents the school and university, including consistently missing faculty meetings and engaging in communications or actions that impede working relationships with colleagues.
RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The School of Journalism expects faculty to be engaged in advancing the theory and practice of journalism and the role of a free press in democracy. Our faculty comprise a diverse group that boast a broad range of knowledge, experience, skills, and interdisciplinary interests related to journalism. We acknowledge the diversity of their contributions by recognizing not only significant scholarly research but also the production of creative and professional work in all media related to the field and profession. Research faculty, however, are specifically expected to maintain an ongoing research program that results in publications by scholarly journals and presses.

Elements of Effective Research/Creative Activity

- Consistent publication and presentation of research in national and international venues that has an impact on the field and improves the understanding and practice of journalism.
- Consistent publication of creative activity and journalistic work that enlightens the public and advances our understanding of the field.
- Success in acquiring grants and other outside support for research and creative activity.
- National and/or international recognition as an expert in a particular area of the field.

Indicators of Effective Research/Creative Activity

- Publication of scholarly books and book chapters by a refereed press, textbooks by a refereed press, edited books, refereed monographs, translation of scholarly materials, encyclopedia entries, articles in refereed academic journals, and review essays in scholarly journals.
- Significant journalistic works in all media: periodicals, film, radio and television, scriptwriting, sound production, photojournalism, graphic design, data visualization, multimedia presentations, web sites, smart-phone apps, or other products of emerging technologies.
- Presentation of scholarly papers or professional work related to the field and profession presented at regional, national, and international scholarly or professional conferences.
- Participation on panels related to the field and profession presented at state, regional, national and international conferences.
- Obtaining external research grants or fellowships tied directly to funding of research or creative activity.
- Recipient of research or professional awards, top national or international convention papers, book awards, best journal article of the year.
- Invited lectures or presentations related to the field and profession at universities or think tanks or other events that denote academic recognition.
- Invitations by government agencies, the courts, legislatures, Congress, and other institutions to provide informational testimony and insights based on research expertise.
- Professional or academic work disseminated via alternative channels, such as blogs.
Research Rating Criteria
The school considers the breadth of each person’s contributions to research, and below are just some criteria that can help delineate one score from another. One significant strength can raise a score for an instructor who would otherwise meet expectations, and likewise, a serious deficiency that requires attention can lower a score. Research is to be rated on work that has been published, in press, or accepted for publication, during the previous five years, with emphasis on the preceding calendar year, accounting for significant long-term research or creative projects. Work in progress can be noted, but ultimate performance rests on actual dissemination of information.

5 Truly Exceptional
- Truly exceptional quality and quantity of research or creative activity.
- Noted as a top scholar or expert in the field, nationally and internationally.

4 Exceeds Expectations
- Exceptional venues of publication, or a significant national periodical or news outlet, which advances the field and public understanding of journalism and the world
- Above-average productivity.
- Occasional research awards, such as top-paper awards at conferences.

3 Meets Expectations
- A sustained cohesive research trajectory within expectations of the discipline/area.
- Publication in venues of relative prominence.
- Conference paper presentation.

2 Needs Improvement
- Substandard research productivity and/or quality.

1 Unsatisfactory
- Little to no published research.