

Promotion and Tenure Criteria

School of Arts Media and Engineering

Approved by the School Faculty on [9/16/2011].

Contents

1	STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.....	2
1.1	RESEARCH.....	3
1.2	TEACHING.....	4
1.3	COLLABORATION.....	4
1.4	SERVICE.....	5
2	RESEARCH PRODUCT DEFINITIONS	6
2.1	AUTHORING CONVENTIONS AT AME.....	6
2.2	ORGANIZATION OF CV ACCORDING TO PRODUCT CLASSIFICATION:	6
2.3	MENTORING ANNOTATION.....	6
2.4	CONNECTIVITY ANNOTATION	7
2.5	WHAT IS MEANT BY AN 'EMBEDDED' PRODUCT?.....	7
3	SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS	7

1 Statement of Principles

The School of Arts Media and Engineering is a leading institution in media, arts and sciences. It emphasizes collaborative, transdisciplinary scholarship with significant societal impact. Examples of scholarly endeavor include collaborative fusion of knowledge across disciplines, teaching and mentoring at the graduate and undergraduate levels, curricular and pedagogical innovation, and service to their professional and public communities.

The traditional basis of faculty evaluation is the triad of research, teaching and service. While this rubric serves many disciplines well, it fails to adequately support scholarship that crosses disciplinary boundaries. Our school, with its emphasis on transdisciplinary research, adds a key, fourth ingredient – collaboration. We emphasize the idea that scholarship which results in significant societal impact is significantly bolstered by successful collaboration across disciplines. In particular, the faculty should show evidence of successful collaboration in their research, teaching and mentoring outcomes.

The record of an AME faculty should show all of the following:

1. Significant and innovative contribution to transdisciplinary, integrative media research and development that results in applications of societal significance
2. High quality contributions to innovative curricula that prepare students for careers in integrated media research, development and education; consistent high quality instruction; recruiting and mentoring of students specializing in integrated media research and development
3. Support and promotion of the School's common research and education agenda; promoting and establishing the necessary interdisciplinary links and transdisciplinary integration
4. Service to the School, its large interdisciplinary community and related professional communities at large

Promotion and tenure decisions are decided by the appropriate ASU review bodies at each of the review levels (personnel committees at the School, College/Institute and University levels (chairs, deans, provost, president)). The significance of the record of an AME faculty member must also be recognized and validated by external reviewers who are leaders in the field.

1.1 Research

Research within a discipline is typically understood as either basic (discovery of new knowledge) or applied (the application, interpretation, and transfer of new knowledge to solve problems). Research at AME is understood to be integrative and on a continuum between basic and applied research. The research outcomes are the result of fusion of knowledge from different disciplines that seamlessly integrate basic and applied research. Furthermore, it is expected that the research outcomes impact the teaching /learning process and result in curricular innovations.

The evaluation of the performance is achieved through the consideration of the following measures. The following list is an approximate ranking of these measures. Individual faculty records need to include a number of these measures but need not include all of them to indicate success.

Measures of performance: research

1. Significant contributions to the development of integrative media systems of societal significance¹ that have been embedded in and accepted by the community.
2. Peer reviewed, archival, use-inspired, research products (archival publications, books, book chapters, media products, software)
3. Peer reviewed, use-inspired, conference publications, and performances
4. Significant adoption of software and interactive web artifacts by external community of peers.
5. Successful proposals for external support of research activity
6. Development of custom infrastructure to support research activities
7. National and international awards for research activity
8. Invitations to give talks to at national or international meetings

Income expectations

The school has faculty from multiple disciplines, and the income expectations below have been calibrated to reflect differing grant opportunities available to faculty from different disciplines, as well as the different roles that faculty from the arts and the sciences play in the school. The amounts below represent total income per person, over 12 months, from federal and state grants (NSF, NIH, NEA, NEH), private foundations and gifts and industry contracts and donations:

- Engineering junior faculty :\$125,000 per year
- Engineering senior faculty :\$175,000 per year
- Science junior faculty :\$100,000 per year
- Science senior faculty :\$150,000 per year
- Arts junior faculty :\$50,000 per year
- Arts senior faculty :\$75,000 per year

¹ Assessment of high quality, high impact shall follow the unit guidelines. Candidates should provide supporting evidence (e.g. referee reports and acceptance rates) that yield additional insight into the quality and significance of any work supported via research measure 1, or 2, or 3.

For satisfactory progress, junior faculty are expected reach at least 50% of their annual goal by their second year and 100% of their annual goal by the end of their fourth year, and maintain or exceed their goal in following years.

1.2 Teaching

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness must consider the performance of the faculty within a classroom (including co-taught scenarios, diversity of student backgrounds) and the content of specific courses (including integration of knowledge from different disciplines). The desirability and difficulty of introducing innovation in the classroom should be explicitly considered.

Measures of performance: teaching

1. Peer assessment of teaching activities and their effectiveness, including:
 - a. Effective course material, assignments, readings and exams
 - b. Diversity of class and class knowledge: Classes comprising students with diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Successful integration of knowledge from different disciplines, when the classes are co-taught
 - c. Successful integration of instructor research activities, in the preparation and teaching of class.
 - d. High Quality student outcomes (media products, papers etc.)
2. Student evaluations (scores and comments)
3. Successful recruitment and mentoring of graduate students, particularly graduate students pursuing the terminal degree offered by the unit / partner units offering the AME concentration, and whose work leads to contributions in research as measured by this criteria.
4. Mentoring of undergraduate students and contributions to undergraduate student recruitment and retention
5. Successful student mentoring that promotes workforce diversity (including methodology, practice, gender and ethnicity)

Other indicators of teaching performance may include:

1. Published textbooks, software, and media products
2. Awards for teaching

1.3 Collaboration

Collaboration across disciplines is the lynchpin of transdisciplinary scholarship at AME. The record should show tangible, collaborative outcomes within the context of research, teaching and service.

Measures of performance: collaboration

1. Significant cross-disciplinary collaborative contributions that support integrative media research
2. Significant cross-disciplinary collaborative contributions that support integrative media teaching.
3. Cross-disciplinary collaborative contributions towards national / international service.
4. Significant contributions to processes that support a connected community.

1.4 Service

The school expects and requires a certain level of involvement by all faculty members in service activities. These include committee memberships, and special assignments necessary to support some aspect of teaching or research at the school, university or profession.

The evaluation of performance is achieved through the consideration of the following measures. The following list is an approximate ranking of these measures. Individual faculty records need to include a number of these measures but need not include all of them to indicate success.

Measures of performance: service

1. Editor, or associate editor of a scholarly journal
2. Successful contributions as chair of a university or HIDA (or if a joint appointment, of peer school / department) committee
3. Organization of national or international professional meetings
4. Participation in graduate and undergraduate student committees
5. Referee for archival journal, conference, performance, or funding agency.
6. Officer in an national or international professional organization
7. Other important service activities for which substantial contributions can be demonstrated.

2 Research Product Definitions

We define the product categories, including processes to assess high impact, and authoring convention

2.1 Authoring conventions at AME

In the School of Arts, Media and Engineering, there are two conventions for classifying author contributions: group authorship and traditional author-order hierarchy. The idea of group authorship extends the concept of first and second authors traditionally found in academia, to groups. A primary group refers to a set of interdisciplinary researchers who played a significant and equally proportional role in developing the product. A publication can also have secondary and tertiary group authors who played a less significant role. Typically, primary group authors will have contributed to all facets of the research and implementation, in addition to writing portions of the manuscript itself. Secondary and tertiary authors will have played a lesser role and perhaps contributed directly to only one component of the research product. 'Contributing' authors can also be listed, but they are understood to have played a supervisory role in authoring the publication.

Primary group authors are listed with a cross in the CV. When traditional author-order hierarchy is applicable, the first author listed is understood to have made the major contribution. Remaining authors are listed according to conventions of publication/presentation venue. Traditional first authors are marked with an asterisk in the CV. For all collaborative products, the faculty member is expected to provide a short explanation of their role in the outcome in their CV

2.2 Organization of CV according to product classification:

Research and scholarship in integrative media systems can take multiple forms including conference and journal publications; interactive installations and performances; and hardware/software systems. These are termed as research products. The School of Arts, Media and Engineering has developed a set of metrics to classify the significance of a given research products regardless of form. Research products can be classified as *major*, *standard*, or *minor*. For example, a long paper in a high impact journal with a highly competitive acceptance rate and an interactive music performance in a major international cultural center are both regarded as *major* products. AME has published a set of guidelines for identifying high impact venues and publications in the context of interdisciplinary research (give web link). Research outcomes are organized in AME faculty CV's according to the product classification. AME certifies that the product classifications are aligned with the AME the classification metrics before a CV is released for review.

2.3 Mentoring annotation

In the School of Arts, Media and Engineering there is typically a co-advising structure to ensure that graduate students receive interdisciplinary breadth in their mentorship. The co-advising structure can take two forms. (1) Two faculty members can take equal roles as *primary co-advisors* with a 50/50% contribution from each, or (2) the faculty can assume *primary advisor* and *secondary advisor* roles with a 75/25% contribution respectively. A single faculty member can also serve as the *sole advisor* to a student. The CV denotes relationship to students mentored using the above conventions.

2.4 Connectivity annotation

Interdisciplinary connectivity constitutes 25% of faculty evaluations in the School of Arts, Media and Engineering's promotion and tenure criteria. Connectivity is determined through an analysis of research products (i.e., publications, exhibitions, and software systems) to extract three features: (1) the number of connections to collaborators, (2) the average number of authors per product, and (3) the average number of represented disciplines per product. For example, if a faculty co-authors a publication with four colleagues, two from Education, one from Design, and one from Music, this would yield four *connections*, five *authors*, and three *disciplines*. Connectivity is evaluated on an annual basis. More weight is given to *unique* connections (e.g., co-authoring a research product with a colleague with whom the faculty has not previously collaborated) per year rather than *repeat* connections (e.g., co-authoring multiple papers with the same limited set of authors). The intent of this weighting is to promote both breadth and depth of collaborative research. Visual representations of the above measures are provided with every CV.

2.5 What is meant by an 'embedded' product?

In the School of Arts, Media and Engineering, software systems are considered to be community-embedded when they are in sustained use by a significant user-base to serve real-life practical applications. The significance of the user-base is defined through two dimensions: (1) the number of people who use the software system and (2) the depth of their interaction. For example, a large number of people who briefly engage a software system can be considered roughly equivalent to a smaller number of people who have a sustained and impactful interaction. The relevance of the user base to the product is also considered (i.e. teachers using an education product is considered more significant than casual users).

3 Summary of the Evaluation Process

The AME personnel committee is comprised of associate or full professors from any track (tenured, research, clinical, practice). However, only tenured faculty can vote on personnel actions for tenure-track/tenured faculty. The committee is appointed annually by the director in consultation with the AME faculty assembly. AME is represented at the Institute level committee by at least one tenured faculty member. Faculty serving on the unit level committee cannot serve on the Institute level committee as well. If an AME tenured faculty member is not available to serve on the Institute level committee for a particular year, the unit can appoint a representative from a partner unit that has expertise related to AME areas of research and education. That representative is appointed by the director in consultation with the AME faculty assembly.

The school faculty appointed solely with AME are reviewed annually by the AME personnel committee that provides input to the AME director who prepares the annual evaluation. Probationary reviews follow the following order of evaluations: AME personnel committee, AME director, HIDA institute level committee, HIDA dean, provost. Promotion and tenure evaluations include all levels of review of probationary evaluations as well as review by the university committee and president.

AME Faculty that hold joint appointment and have their tenure home with AME go through the same evaluation procedures as faculty appointed solely with AME. However at each level of review, the corresponding review body (personnel committee, director/chair, college committee, dean) at the collaborating units are asked to provide input that is integrated in the review of the corresponding AME/HIDA review body. AME Faculty that hold joint appointments and have their tenure home with a collaborating unit go through the review process of their tenure home unit. At every level of evaluation, the corresponding AME/HIDA review bodies (personnel committee, director/chair, college committee, dean) are asked to provide input that is integrated in the evaluation of the corresponding partner unit review body.

The information on the AME online database system is consider the formal record of faculty and student activity and is used for Annual Evaluations. The on-line system includes agreed upon formats for documenting the types of activities characteristic of a faculty and students involved in transdisciplinary media research and education at AME. Probationary and Promotion and Tenure reviews are based on the Curriculum Vitae and Supporting Material provided by the faculty member. The School administration compares the CV to the internal system for accuracy ahead of submitting to reviewers. The CV and Supporting Material compilation and annotation follows procedures and formats established by the School that also integrate Provost office guidelines. The agreed upon conventions for recording and annotating each type of activity are presented at the beginning of each section of the CV through the use of standardized language approved by the School.