

Department of Journalism & Digital Communication

Governance document

Forward

The Department of Journalism and Digital Communication operates under the principle of collegiality. We practice shared governance and engage in civil, respectful discourse among colleagues with shared goals.

The Department is not currently a multi-campus unit. If departmental faculty are hired at other campuses, we will modify our governance and Tenure and Promotion documents to ensure those faculty have a voice in departmental issues. We recognize the principle of equity of assignments, resources, and opportunities for faculty across a multi-campus university.

Our mission

The Department of Journalism and Digital Communication strives for teaching excellence, supports faculty and student research, promotes community and professional service, and embraces multicultural understanding. We work untiringly to graduate accomplished students who can make valuable contributions to their chosen fields and become informed, active citizens.

We endeavor to provide our students with an education rich in practical experience and theory; collaborate with one another and the campus community; promote respect for others and their views; develop innovative and creative expression and the unfettered pursuit of truth; nurture deliberative dialogue and shared governance; promote ethical behavior imbued with honesty, integrity, and

- promote cultural understanding and broaden perspectives;
-

Department Chair

The Chair of the Department of Journalism and Communication provides administrative leadership and fulfills the following duties:

- oversees curricular development and internal review;
- sets academic schedules and teaching assignments;
- establishes short and long term strategic priorities;
- administers the unit budget;
- ensures the Department maintains its professional accreditation;
- assists faculty in professional development, tenure, and promotion;
- determines faculty hiring needs and coordinates recruitment and hiring;
- represents the Department and its interests to administrative and academic officers;
- represents the Department within our local communities and across the profession;
- represents the Department at orientation sessions, open houses, and other events for prospective students;
- seeks external support and funding;

Categories are weighted differently for each faculty member and set by the Department chair, in consultation with the faculty member, ahead of the academic year, as part of the workload assignment.

Scores in each category range from 1 to 5, with higher scores representing better performance. Partial scores (for instance, 3.5) may be given when reviewers deem performance falls between levels.

” A score of 1 is considered unacceptable, signifying expectations have not been met in a pattern

- interactive and data-driven journalistic projects
-

These examples can be adapted to other types of scholarship to provide credit for work in progress.

A faculty member could earn credit for a work that ultimately is rejected for publication and, accordingly, doesn't contribute to their tenure or promotion application. However, this disadvantage is offset by the need to recognize work in progress and the potential to bring unpublished efforts to fruition by finding alternative publications, combining studies, or building on efforts in other ways.

Criteria

1. Unacceptable
 - a. no evidence of published scholarship and limited evidence of works in progress
2. Weak
 - a.

Teaching

Journalism and Digital Communication faculty are expected to be ~~well~~ rounded educators who bridge theory and practice; stimulate student interest; provide support, coaching, and mentorship; and uphold high standards of academic performance.

Faculty earn credit toward their teaching score across four categories:

1. contributing to student learning and growth
2. supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession
3. engaging in curriculum development
4. exploring innovative approaches to instruction

Evidence of teaching excellence across these categories can take many forms. The sections provide examples but are not exhaustive.

Contributing to student learning and growth

Examples of evidence of contributing to student learning and growth can include:

- student publications emanating from a class the faculty member taught
-

B

- Response rates have been low for many years and seldom offer a representative sample (extremely satisfied and dissatisfied students are overrepresented).
- Overrelying on student evaluations can also discourage innovation in the classroom, as experimenting with new teaching methods and materials can result in a short hit to quality while approaches are ironed out.

Criteria

1. Unacceptable
 - a. no evidence of contributions to any category of teaching
2. Weak
 - a. some evidence of contributions to student learning and growth, but no evidence of additional instructional accomplishments
3. Satisfactory
 - a. evidence of contributions to student learning and growth in ~~some~~ courses taught, and documented accomplishments in at least one of the following additional categories: 1) supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession; 2) engaging in curriculum development; 3) exploring innovative ~~approa~~ approaches to instruction
4. Strong
 - a. evidence of contributions to student learning and growth in ~~most~~ courses taught, and documented accomplishments in at least one of the following additional categories: 1) supporting students in their academic pursuits and transition to the profession; 2) engaging in curriculum development; 3) exploring innovative ~~approa~~ approaches to instruction
5. Outstanding
 - a. evidence of contributions to student learning and growth and documented accomplishments

Internal service (College, Campus & University)

- participation and leadership in College, and Campus, and University committees
- participation and leadership in College, and Campus, and University events

External service (professional)

- participation or leadership in professional associations or activities
- editorial support for publications and journals in the field
- participation in conferences and workshops related to the practice or teaching of journalism or other subject matters
- professional consulting
- peer evaluations of outside individuals, such as external reviews for tenure and promotion candidates

External service (community)

- volunteer activities to help educate the public about journalism
- judging professional competitions
- providing expert information for media interviews and public presentations

Criteria

1. Unacceptable
 - a. no evidence of service-related contributions
2. Weak
 - a. no evidence of substantive service-related contributions, but some evidence of other service-related contributions
3. Satisfactory
 - a. evidence of at least one substantive service-related contribution, but no evidence of other service-related contributions
4. Strong
 - a. evidence of at least one substantive service-related contribution in the review year and one or more additional contributions
5. Outstanding
 - a. evidence of at least two substantive service-related contributions in the review year and one or more additional contributions

The Department Chair will review the Committee's assessments and add their own evaluations and scores to each faculty member's report.

In cases where a score in any area falls below satisfactory (2.5 or lower), the Chair and the faculty member will work together to develop a plan to improve performance in the coming year.

Faculty members who wish to dispute Committee or Chair evaluations may do so by contacting both the Committee and the Chair. In outlining the concern, the faculty member may submit additional material for consideration and request a re-evaluation.

The Chair and Committee will report back their decision and, if the evaluation results in material changes to the faculty member's report, update the University's review system accordingly.

Branch campus faculty members should be aware that the Regional Chancellor or their designee can provide formal written input on the evaluation prior to completion of the performance appraisal.

Faculty hiring

When the Department has the opportunity to conduct a faculty search, the Committee of the Whole will assemble a search committee composed of at least three of its members and one graduate student. The resulting Search Committee will:

- select a Committee Chair from its members;
- oversee the search process and engage in initial vetting and phone interviews;
- write the job description, in consultation with the Committee of the Whole;
- develop a plan to conduct the search, in accordance with College and University policies;
- review applications and select a short list of candidates to interview via video conference;
- organize and make available to the Committee of the Whole application materials;
- recommend to the Department Chair a smaller group of candidates to be invited for campus visits or, when such visits are not possible, additional video conference interviews;
- organize the second round interviews; and
- hold a meeting, open to the Committee of the Whole along with the Regional Chancellor or their designee, to discuss candidates.

The Committee of the Whole and the Regional Chancellor will use ranked voting, via secret ballot, to construct a list of the top three candidates. The Department Chair will present that list, along with a hiring proposal, to the College and Campus and the Regional Chancellor. When agreement is reached about the selections, the Department Chair will contact the preferred candidate to make an offer. If the offer cannot be negotiated successfully, the Chair will contact the second person on the list.

Regional Chancellors or their designees will serve as a voting member on all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses.

Faculty Senate seat

The Depa(s)-1.3c-3-3 3 (,)- toopto sopene (a(2.3 (o)7.3 ta)1n)0.7 F(o)4.3aoiynDeirpa ty(2.3eh (to))a3.8 (u w(c

