

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND FACTORS
FOR FACULTY

Introduction

The collective bargaining agreement between Wayne State University and the American Association of University Professors-American Federation of Teachers provides procedures and criteria for tenure (Article XXII) and promotion (Article XXIII). The provisions allow academic units to recommend and deans to approve statements of "those factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications with respect to the criteria" set forth in the contract for tenure and promotion respectively. (Articles XXII.D.1.a and XXIII.A.3.)

The same provisions of the collective bargaining contract provide that: "The dean/director may also attach appropriate college/school/University factors to the unit factors statements." This document constitutes the University factors statement for faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion. This statement of procedures and factors does not apply to faculty members being considered for initial appointment.

Purposes

The procedures and factors set forth in this document have several different purposes. First, they should assist candidates for tenure and promotion to understand the scope and the process of review to which their credentials are subject. They should help describe to candidates for tenure and promotion some of the activities that may constitute evidence of scholarship, teaching, and service--the criteria for tenure and promotion set for by the collective bargaining contract. (For a fuller statement of the criteria see Articles XXII.C and XXIII.A.2, and the descriptive materials later in this document.) As the contract makes clear, however, factors statements are neither inclusive nor exclusive with respect to the evidence that may be considered. "However, . . . factors are not to be interpreted as standards. Applicants may submit evidence of scholarly achievement, teaching excellence, and service that has not been specifically listed under the factors. Similarly, promotion and tenure committees and administrators may also consider evidence of scholarly achievement, teaching and service which has not been specifically listed under the factors." (Articles XXII.D.1.a and XXIII.A.3.a) The factors should be helpful, but are not determinative in suggesting to candidates the kinds of information they should provide to those engaged in reviewing their candidacies for tenure/and or promotion. Moreover, such factors should initially assist candidates to determine whether their credentials are sufficient to warrant the action (tenure and/or promotion) for which they are applying.

Second, the factors should assist faculty committees and their chairs in collecting and evaluating evidence of performance by each candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The factors and procedures help define the scope and quality of the evaluation that should be conducted at each level of review, both to alert committees to their responsibilities and also to help elaborate the basis on which judgments are to be made.

Third, the factors are intended to assist administrators by spelling out the process, responsibilities, and decision to be made in a timely manner at each level of review.

Fourth, these factors should assist the candidate and the University to achieve a reasonable degree of consistency in the decision-making process and in the assembling of materials on which judgments are made.

Applicability and Weighting of Criteria

The collective bargaining contract sets forth the basis for tenure and promotion decisions.

The assessment of a faculty candidate's qualifications [for tenure or promotion] 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. . . . Consideration shall also be given to non-instructional service to the department, college, and/or University and/or public and/or professional service which benefits the University. (Articles XXII.C and XXIII.A.2)

For tenure, "assessment of a candidate's qualifications must take into consideration both performance to date and prospects for continued excellence based on that performance." (Article XXII.C.)

For promotion, "assessment of a candidate's qualifications must take into consideration proven abilities, professional experience, and potential for continued professional growth as appropriate to the candidate's current and contemplated ranks . . ." (Article XXIII.A.2)

The Candidate's Application

The candidate should submit a complete and detailed Wayne State University Professional Record, signed and dated to certify that it is accurate and up to date.

The candidate's submission should also include the evidence he/she wishes to have considered as meeting the standard of excellence in teaching, scholarship (or creative professional achievement), and service. This should include evidence that addresses the factors listed in the factors statements adopted by the academic unit, the school or college, and the University. Additional evidence of professional achievement in scholarship (or creative work), teaching, and service related to the profession may also be considered.

The candidate should also submit a list of the names, affiliations, and addresses of four or more experts in his/her field from outside the University who might serve as evaluators of his/her performance. These evaluators should be important persons in the field, generally holding the rank of full professor. The candidate should also submit brief biographies of each of the potential evaluators. (Entries from standard professional biographical sources are sufficient.)

The Process of Evaluation

In departmentalized colleges, the department chair or director and committee initiate the detailed evaluation of a candidate for tenure and/or promotion. In other units this function is carried out by the dean/director and the college committee. These are generally referred to as the initiating committee or administrator.

The initiating administrator will maintain the candidate's application file, including the materials submitted by the candidate and the materials compiled by administrators and committees. Although the initiating administrator assembles and maintains the candidate's file and submits it the next level of review, the candidate is ultimately responsible for presenting a full and accurate record of his/her performance.

The initiating administrator and committee develop a basic statement of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. This evaluation shall be based on a full reading of the candidate's submissions, on such additional evidence as may be obtained by the administrator and/or committee to assist them to evaluate the candidate's qualifications, and on the opinions of outside evaluators obtained by the procedures specified below.

Ordinarily, the dean and college committee in a departmentalized college may base their evaluation of the candidate on the materials compiled by the department chair and unit committee. But if those materials are inconclusive or incomplete, the dean and college committee may seek additional information.

The provost and the university committee may ordinarily rely on materials and recommendations submitted by the dean and college committee as well as on those submitted by the department chair and department committee. If the provost and the university committee find the file incomplete or inconclusive, the provost may, with the concurrence of the candidate, suspend deadlines and return the file to the college for additional documentation for submission by a specified date, or may seek additional information from appropriate sources within or outside the University.

The department chair and department committee in departmentalized colleges and the college dean and college committee should each provide separate signed evaluative statements about the candidate's qualifications. Members of review committees who disagree with the conclusions and evaluative statements of the majority of the committee may submit separate signed opinions setting forth their views, and they are encouraged to do so.

The evaluative statements (1) should clearly state whether or not the candidate meets the standard of excellence separately in teaching, scholarship (or creative professional achievement), and service; (2) should describe the person's performance on each of these criteria and demonstrate how that performance conforms to the standard of excellence; and (3) should describe the administrator's or committee's procedure for obtaining, reviewing, and evaluating the evidence.

In making assessments, administrators and committee shall refer to academic unit, school/college, and University factors and show whether and how the candidate's credentials conform to those factors. Their evaluation is not, however, confined to the kinds of evidence of the professional activities that are mentioned in the factors statements; they may consider other evidence of achievement in scholarship (or creative work), teaching, or professional service.

In making tenure evaluations, administrators and faculty committee should keep in mind that: "There is no right to receive tenure but there is a right to fair consideration for tenure . . ." (Article XXII.A.) The burden in tenure cases therefore falls on the candidate to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly achievement (or creative performance), and service. Tenure should not be recommended unless the standard of excellence is fully met on these criteria, with teaching and scholarship given equal and primary weight and service given secondary consideration. At the same time, administrators and committees should follow very carefully the procedures set forth in the collective bargaining agreement to assure that a candidate receives fair consideration for tenure.

Similarly, "a recommendation for promotion is based upon a candidate's qualifications in the light of specific department/division, college and University considerations and not primarily upon length of service in rank." (Article XIII.A.2) Consequently, the burden in promotion cases also falls upon the candidate to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship (or creative performance), and service. Promotion should not be recommended unless the standard of excellence is fully met on these criteria, with teaching and scholarship given equal and primary weight, and service being given secondary consideration.

Outside Evaluators

Except where unusual circumstances can be demonstrated by the candidate and the appropriate unit and college administrators and committees, the provost and the university committee will expect to find recommendations for tenure and promotion supported by letters from outside evaluators. These should be important figures in the candidate's field who are capable of speaking with authority about standards of excellence in the discipline.

At least four letters should be submitted from external evaluators selected by administrators and committees. These evaluators should be selected for their standing in the field and for their detachment from the candidate. Additional letters from external evaluators selected by the candidate or by administrators and committees may also be considered.

All evaluators should be provided with the candidate's resume and with such items of the candidate's scholarship as the evaluator agrees to review. It is especially desirable for evaluators to review the entirely scholarly record if that is feasible.

All evaluators should be asked to comment on the quality of the candidate's scholarship, the recognition the candidate has achieved in the field, and the candidate's potential for future excellence in scholarship in the field. In addition, it is helpful if the evaluator can comment on elements of the candidate's teaching. This might be based on the evaluator's knowledge of the candidate's former graduate students who are now actively engaged in professional pursuits, on the

evaluator's knowledge of textbooks or other instructional materials that candidate may have published, on the candidate's effectiveness in making presentations at professional meetings or giving invited lectures or on other circumstances where teaching skills are in evidence.

The letters of outside evaluators should be included by the appropriate administrator in the candidate's application file. The letters should be accompanied by a copy of the letter sent to the evaluator seeking his/her assistance, by a brief biography of the evaluator (standard statements from professional biographies are sufficient), and by a notation whether each evaluator's name was supplied by the candidate or nominated independently by the administrator and committee.

Where letters of outside evaluators are deemed insufficient for any reason by subsequent levels of review, the appropriate administrator and committee may independently seek further letters from independent outside evaluators.

The Standard of Excellence

The official mission statement of Wayne State University provides that:

Wayne State University is a national research university with an urban teaching and service mission.

This mission sets the standard of excellence for teaching, scholarship, and service.

In teaching, excellence consists in both outstanding methods of pedagogy that serve the University's unique student body and in demonstrated high levels of learning by the students who are taught. Excellence in teaching should also be judged by contribution to curricular development, by student advising and other support, by preparation of curricular materials or publication of pedagogical articles, textbooks, or other pedagogical work. The supervising of independent student work, including the direction of long projects, independent studies, masters theses, and doctoral dissertations should also be taken into consideration.

In scholarship (and creative performance), 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. For most purposes, the standard of excellence in scholarship may be met by achievements that are comparable to those attained at the other universities designated (1) by the State of Michigan as research universities--namely, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and in technological fields, Michigan Technological University--and (2) by the Carnegie Foundation as national research universities in the public sector.

In service, the standard of excellence is measured not so much by the number of offices held or activities undertaken, although that may be considered, as by the demonstrable substantive value of the faculty member's contribution to the quality of the University, to the well being of the community, and/or to the advancement of his/her profession or discipline. In all cases, service consists in the application of a faculty member's knowledge in his/her professional field to benefit the University, the community, and/or his/her profession.

The standard of excellence in teaching, scholarship and service not only requires attainments that are at least as great as the attainments of faculty members in other public national research universities, but it also contemplates that the quality and quantity of performance of faculty members at Wayne Sate University improves steadily as national standards themselves become more demanding.

Performance and Future Prospects

For tenure, "assessments of a candidate's qualifications must take into consideration both performance to date and prospects for continued excellence based on that performance." (Article XXII.C; emphasis added) While a candidate's work in progress may therefore be considered in tenure cases, such work should be sufficiently tangible and complete to already constitute some level of performance that is susceptible to rigorous assessment that meets the standard of excellence. Most important, however, since prospects for continued excellence are to be based on performance to date, an applicant for tenure should not only have achieved excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service, but he/she should also have done so with a degree of continuity and in a sufficient variety of ways through the pre-tenure period to demonstrate a very strong commitment to academic work, creativity in identifying and meeting new challenges, and adaptability to the changing demands to his/her field. In scholarship, for instance, a single piece of excellent work should not be sufficient to show future prospects. Rather a continuity of excellent scholarship, a demonstration of the ability to identify and pursue new issues worth of investigation, and a willingness to create or master new methods of research pertinent to new subjects of investigation are strong indicators of future prospects for excellence in scholarly achievement.

For promotion, "prospects for continued excellence and professional growth" pertinent to profes-sorial rank is required. (Article XXIII.A.2) This future potential should be evaluated in the same way as prospects for continued excellence are evaluated in tenure cases.

Promotion from Rank to Rank

The level of achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service that is necessary for promotion increases for each higher academic rank. This is contemplated by the collective bargaining contract, which provides that:

Assessments of a candidate's qualifications must take into consideration proven abilities, professional experience, and prospects for continued excellence and professional growth as appropriate to the candidate's current and contemplated ranks . . . (Article XXIII.A.2)

For some ranks, the emphasis is wholly or mainly on performance on a single criterion. Hence, the ranks of lecturer and senior lecturer are based mainly on steadily greater attainments in teaching. The ranks of assistant professor (research), associate professor (research), and professor (research) are based mainly on steadily greater attainments in scholarship and research. The ranks of assistant professor (clinical), associate professor (clinical), and professor (clinical) are based on steadily greater attainments in clinical care and in clinical supervision and teaching, with growth in scholarship being given secondary consideration. These special ranks are defined in

position descriptions issued by the president or his/her designee.

For the standard academic ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor, assessment is based on excellence primarily and equally in teaching and scholarship (or creative performance) with secondary consideration given to excellence in service.

As contemplated by the collective bargaining contract, greater levels of proven ability, professional experience, and potential for future professional growth are necessary to advance from one standard academic rank to the next. The standard of excellence in the case of promotions in standard academic ranks should be achievements comparable to those that would be expected to gain promotion to each rank in other designated research universities in Michigan and in the public national research universities identified by the Carnegie Foundation. After giving heaviest weight to these comparative considerations, attention should be given to the following statements of achievement expected of candidates for promotion.

A candidate for promotion to assistant professor (from the rank of instructor) should demonstrate a strong capacity for teaching, including the potential to teach and supervise the work of graduate students in those fields where Wayne State University offers advanced degrees. He/she should have already completed a substantial piece of research in his/her doctoral dissertation that, in the eyes of administrators and faculty committees recommending promotion, should have very strong prospects for publication in whole or in substantial part. Exceptions may be made in disciplines wherein the doctorate is not a terminal degree, provided that the candidate for promotion has demonstrated the capacity to produce scholarly work of a quality commensurate with that expected of applicants possessing (or about to possess) a doctorate in related disciplines. In fields where persons seeking the rank of assistant professors are expected to have already obtained grants, published articles or abstracts, presented papers, and so forth, the appropriate administrator and faculty committee should recommend promotion only if the quality of such work is very good and promises to support further work reaching a standard of excellence during the candidate's term as an assistant professor; and his/her scholarship should hold promise of excellence service to the community and to the profession even if such service has not already been undertaken.

A candidate for associate professor should already have attained excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The breadth and magnitude of performance are the main characteristics that distinguish the rank of associate professor from the rank of professor. A candidate for associate professor should have already demonstrated excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching (where the University offers graduate programs), in curricular development, in student advising, in supervising individual student work, and in the preparation of such materials (e.g., syllabi, exams, demonstrations, experiments, supplementary course readings, problems or workbooks or laboratory manuals, audio-visual instructional materials, etc.) as are appropriate to the discipline and the courses taught. In scholarship, a candidate for the rank of associate professor should already have developed a continuous program of publication (or creative professional achievement) that has made important contributions to knowledge or to creative artistry in his/her field and has already gained substantial favorable national attention from scholars in his/her field. In

fields where grant or fellowship support is generally expected for scholars in the field, he/she should have successfully obtained such support after external review by peers or officials of granting agencies. A candidate for associate professor should also give evidence of high quality scholarly activity or other kinds that are common to his/her field--e.g., publication of abstracts, publication of book reviews or essays, presentation of papers to important conferences where proposals for presentation are screened or reviewed, creative exhibition or performance in juried or refereed forums with national visibility, publication of presentations in conference proceedings, etc. Finally, a candidate for associate professor should demonstrate substantial service to the University through active and productive undertakings at the department, school/college and--where possible--university level. He/she should also demonstrate substantial community service. At least some record of service to one's discipline or profession may be expected of person applying for the rank of associate professor, but these contributions will usually be less numerous and less responsible that will be made by persons who have longer experience and are better established in the discipline.

An applicant for the rank of full professor should be widely recognized within the University and should have attained recognition outside the institution for the quality of his/her teaching, using such measures as are mentioned subsequently in the list of activities generally to be reviewed in evaluating teaching excellence. A candidate for full professor should demonstrate diversity, innovation, effectiveness, and quality of teaching methods, curricular development, course materials and preparation, and student attainment. In scholarship, a candidate for full professor should have already made extensive contributions to knowledge in his/her field that are widely recognized by peers nationally as significantly advancing learning in the discipline. There should be substantial evidence that his/her work is widely acknowledged and extensively used by other scholars in the field. In service, a candidate for full professor should have served repeatedly and productively in significant positions in the department and in the school and usually also in the university. He/she should have successfully made repeated contributions to the community by applying his/her scholarly (or artistic) knowledge in such a way as to substantially benefit individuals, organizations, or public or private agencies or institutions. By the time a faculty member is ready for promotion to the rank of full professor, he/she should have contributed productively and substantially to his/her discipline through holding association offices, serving as editor or reviewer or panelist for professional journals or granting agencies, sitting on major professional deliberative bodies, or through similar endeavors. He/she should be known nationally in the discipline for making contributions to the organized profession.

Evaluation of Teaching

The evaluation of teaching should be based on an examination both of a faculty member's teaching methodology and his/her success in transmitting knowledge and intellectual methods to students.

In evaluating teaching, the different capabilities of faculty members should be considered. Where a faculty member has special abilities in certain kinds of teaching and his/her academic unit has

emphasized that kind of teaching in a faculty member's assignment, the faculty member should be evaluated on performance in that focused teaching assignment. In general, however, faculty members should be evaluated on the excellence of teaching and on the breadth of teaching assignments in keeping with Wayne State University's diverse mission as an urban and research university. Hence, teaching from introductory courses through advanced graduate work, off-campus teaching, advising, direction of theses and dissertations (in programs offering graduate degrees), and involvement with teaching-related student activities (e.g., advising student honors societies) may generally be expected for most members of the University faculty; and teaching performance should be evaluated with this expectation in mind.

The quality of teaching is susceptible to various methods of evaluation. Student evaluations are now provided pursuant to agreements between the University and the AAUP-AFT, and they should always therefore be given substantial weight. Other student opinion, such as letters and testimonials, should be given substantial weight only if solicited in a systematic way that will provide a reasonable representation of opinion.

Classroom visits by peers is useful. It should be given greatest weight when done periodically, guided by a clear set of criteria for evaluation, and undertaken as part of a broader system of classroom visiting for all or most members of the academic unit. Episodic and nonsystematic classroom visits are much less reliable. Implementation of a system of visits to evaluate teaching should include written reports of visits, which should be kept in the teacher's file and should be reviewed with the teacher by the visitor.

Teaching skills may be evidenced by a faculty member's public lectures or other presentations to professional conferences, faculty and/or student groups within the university, or community groups.

The evaluation of teaching should take into account the instructional materials of a course, including the syllabus (which should conform to established university policies), exams, demonstrations, experiments, supplementary course readings, problems or workbooks or laboratory manuals, audio-visual instructional materials, etc.

Published textbooks or other instructional materials are evidence of teaching ability. The appropriate administrators and faculty committees should read the text to determine its quality. The extent of adoption elsewhere, the reputation of the publisher, and the quality of universities in which adoption occurs should also be considered in evaluating texts or other published instructional materials.

Pedagogical articles or similar studies of instruction should be considered as evidence of teaching and should be evaluated for their quality.

Student work deriving from the instructional process should be taken into account in evaluating teaching. Hence, master's theses, doctoral dissertations, student published materials, student performances, recitals, and exhibitions, and similar evidence of student performance in classes or other instructional situations should be considered.

Prizes, awards, and other forms of formal recognition of teaching excellence should be given substantial weight in evaluating teaching.

Evaluation of Scholarship

Except for faculty whose entire assignment is in the performing or creative arts or for faculty in academic units whose missions have been specially defined by a clearly stated University policy as not including scholarship, publication or books, journal articles, Articles, creative pieces, and similar materials that contribute directly to the advancement of knowledge is an essential part of the scholarly achievement of faculty. The scope and standing of the journals in which publication occurs, the reputation of the publishing house, the refereeing process to which submitted materials are subject, the selectivity of the journal or publisher, and similar measures of quality should be carefully considered.

Other published contributions may importantly supplement the record of scholarship, including published abstracts, book reviews, etc. Again, the reputation, selectivity, and reviewing procedures of the publisher should be taken into account.

Papers and presentations at professional meetings make a contribution to scholarship, but their importance is not as great as published work because they are not as widely and readily available throughout the profession for use in teaching and in scholarship. Papers should be read and evaluated by appropriate faculty committees and administrators. In addition, the prestige of the meeting, the selectivity of the conference, the scope of the meeting (e.g., local, national), the character of the audience, and similar considerations may be evidence of the importance of the scholarly work.

For exhibits and performances of creative work, the nature of the work (solo performance; one-person show), the standing of the forum in which the performance or exhibit occurs, the scope of the audience, the method of selecting participants, and the subsequent formal reviews of the creative work should all be taken into account.

For grants, contracts, and fellowships, the selection process, the scope of the project, the applicant's special qualifications for the award, the continuity of funding, and the prestige of the funding source and the funding review panel should all be taken into account.

While external funding is important for the advancement of scholarship, it is not in itself evidence of scholarship. The scholarly work, usually in the form of publication, exhibition, or performance, which is made possible by such funding, is the best and final basis for judging the value of external grants, contracts, and fellowships.

Internal Wayne State awards to support scholarship should be given relatively little weight, since they are generally intended to support a faculty member's efforts to develop an appropriate nationally recognized program for scholarship and are not evaluated on a competitive national basis.

In all cases, recognition in the discipline of scholarly work should be given heavy weight. This

would include prizes, favorable reviews, wide and favorable citation of scholarly work, and similar recognition of the quality and importance of scholarly contributions.

Evaluation of Service

Service activities are also considered in tenure and promotion deliberations. Service falls in three categories pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement, which says, "Consideration shall also be given to non-instructional service to the department, college and/or University and/or public and/or professional service which benefits the University." While not given the weight of teaching and scholarship, service is expected and must be held to a standard of excellence.

1. In evaluating service within the University, the importance and duration of the assignment together with the extent and effectiveness of participation of the candidate should be considered. Hence, distinctions should be made between very important and nominal service assignments, between brief and extended service, between regular and erratic participation, and between effective and ineffective involvement. Merely holding committee or other assignments does not meet the standard for service; it is the extent and effectiveness of participation that bears on the quality of the candidate's service contribution. Evaluation by the committees and academic administrators should detail the character of the responsibilities and the faculty member's contributions in meeting those responsibilities.
2. Community or public service entails the application of a faculty member's knowledge of his/her discipline's subject matter or method of inquiry on behalf of individuals, foundations, agencies, organizations or other entities in the public or private sector. Where service is manifested in written reports or other documented contributions, these should be reviewed and evaluated by the committees and academic administrators. A mere listing of service activities in the resume is not sufficient to meet the standard for community service; nor should the sole evidence of such service be information provided by the faculty candidate. Instead, administrators and committees should seek impartial evidence for and evaluation of the quality and scope of the professional service provided by the candidate.
3. Service to the profession may involve service to academic associations and/or to professional associations in disciplines that train professionals for practice. Hence, a faculty member in the Medical School may make contributions to the academic association or endeavors in his/her field and/or to the American Medical Association, local medical association, or other groups relating to professional practice.

Service to the academic profession may include such academic endeavors as serving as editor of a journal, reviewing manuscripts for journals or publishers, serving on accreditation panels, serving on grant or award review panels, serving on visiting teams, serving on licensing or examining committees, or serving as an officer of professional associations. The importance of the professional journal, organization, etc., should be described by the faculty committees and academic administrators, and the nature of the applicant's contribution--when the activity itself is not inherently apparent--should be discussed.

Hence, reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals is a familiar activity and may not need as much explanation as the service entailed in serving on a committee of a professional association.

Service to a profession may also include serving as an officer of professional groups, serving on examining or licensing bodies of the profession, advising government agencies or private entities on matters relating to professional practice, and similar activities that advance the profession and enhance its contributions to society at large. Simply holding positions in professional associations does not meet the standard of service; it is the quality and extent of participation and the magnitude of responsibility that are essential in tenure and promotion considerations. The quality and scope of each kind of service activity should be carefully defined and evaluated. Administrators and committees should seek impartial evidence for and evaluation of the quality and scope for the professional service provided by the candidate.

No candidate can be expected to undertake all of the activities listed as examples of teaching, scholarship (or creative professional achievement), and service. Nor is the evidence of teaching, scholarship (or creative professional achievement), and service limited to the activities listed in this document. Both the candidate and the evaluating committees and administrators are free to review additional activities that meet the contractual criteria. At the same time, excellence in both teaching and scholarship (or creative profession achievement) are required for tenure and promotion, and some consideration will be given to service. In all endeavors there must be clear evidence that the candidate meets the standard of excellence.