Department of Communication Disorders

Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit

The Department of Communication Disorders strives to offer high-quality education to its students through a strong curriculum, an emphasis on experiential learning, and a commitment to scholarship and service. The goals and objectives of the Department of Communication Disorders are driven by the mission of the University and College as well as performance accreditation standards mandated by the Council on Academic Accreditation of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

An important process in the maintenance of high academic standards, as well as program accreditation, is the ongoing review of faculty performance. This document describes the criteria by which a faculty member is evaluated for the purposes of promotion, merit, and tenure. These criteria are consistent with the policy and procedures for faculty tenure and promotion as detailed in the Faculty Handbook (FH) (Chapter 2, Section F). In addition, these criteria were developed at the departmental level with strict adherence to the policy and procedures for development of criteria as specified (FH Chapter 2, Section F)

Standards for eligibility must be met by any faculty member seeking tenure, merit and/or promotion (FH Chapter 2).

Department criteria are developed with an acknowledgment that on rare occasions a faculty member who does not meet minimum standards in every area may be able to support such a powerful case for promotion that his or her application deserves consideration through the regular promotion process. In those unusual instances, the dossier must indicate that the objective criteria are not completely met, and the faculty member's dossier must unequivocally demonstrate exceptional merit.

<u>Definitions</u>

Sustained: Accomplishments are not single, isolated occurrences, but are evidenced throughout the evaluative period.

Effective: reaching attainable outcomes in the identified areas (i.e., teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service). Because of the inter-connected nature of the teacher-scholar model, items could be placed in multiple categories (e.g., teaching effectiveness and service to students). It is at the candidate's discretion to report evidence in the category that best supports the overall narrative of the dossier. Evidence may not be included in more than one category.

Tenure: In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, decisions regarding tenure shall essentially conform to departmental standards for promotion from assistant to associate professor. (Faculty Senate Bill 03-A-05) Candidates should consult the Faculty Handbook for the calendar for tenure consideration, evaluation procedures, appeal processes, and a definition of tenure. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with this procedure prior to applying for tenure consideration.

I. The Dossier

The faculty member is required to submit a dossier including a summary form, a record of service, a professional curriculum vita, supporting materials, and a minimum of three letters of support from professional colleagues addressing the evaluation areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service. The specific nature of this dossier, including a guide for collecting evidence and the format of the

dossier, are specified in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 2, Section F). The dossier must be submitted at the time of application.

II. Criteria for Rank

Tenure-track faculty members are eligible for promotion to the next rank as stated in the Faculty Handbook Section F.   For promotion consideration, faculty are expected to show sustained performance over time in rank. Evaluation areas include Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service. (FH, Chapter 2, Section F). Performance in each area is graded as Outstanding, Superior, Good or Unsatisfactory. Minimal performance standards for promotion are as follows:

For promotion to the Assistant Professor Rank: The faculty member has acquired the appropriate terminal degree which is designated as a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in communication disorders or a related field or a clinical doctorate (e.g., SLP.D.; Au.D., CSc.D., D.SLP) and a minimal rating of superior in teaching effectiveness and a rating of good or higher in professional growth and service.

For promotion to the Associate Professor Rank: The faculty member has acquired the appropriate terminal degree (see Assistant Professor) and a minimum of ratings of superior in two areas of evaluation, one of which must be in Teaching Effectiveness and one rating of good in the third evaluation area.

For promotion to the Professor Rank: The faculty member has acquired the appropriate terminal degree (see Assistant Professor) and achieved a rating of outstanding in one evaluation area and ratings of superior in the remaining two evaluation areas.

Post-Professorial Merit: Criteria are established in the Faculty Handbook: "criteria for the first award of post-professorial merit shall be the same as those for the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor" (Chapter 2, Section F). For subsequent applications faculty members may select either to meet the criteria for promotion to Professor or "contract an exception to the criteria" (Chapter 2, Section F).

III. Performance Review Criteria

A. Teaching Effectiveness
Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated through sustained evidence of 1) delivery of effective instruction; 2) currency in course content and instructional technique; and 3) student mentoring.

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness

Outstanding
To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of effective teaching and sustained involvement for the period covered by the record of service with at least 3 examples of activities from among those listed in category 'Delivery of Effective Instruction' and 2 examples from among those listed in the other two categories: 'Evidence of Currency in Course Content and Instructional Technique' and 'Evidence of Student Mentoring'.

Superior
To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of effective teaching and sustained involvement for the period covered by the record of service with at least 2 examples of activities from among those listed in category 'Delivery of Effective Instruction' and at least 2 examples from among those listed in the other two categories: 'Evidence of Currency in Course Content and Instructional Technique' and 'Evidence of Student Mentoring'.

Good

To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of effective teaching and sustained involvement for the period covered by the record of service with at least 1 example of activities from among those listed in category 'Delivery of Effective Instruction' and at least 1 example from among those listed in the other two categories: 'Evidence of Currency in Course Content and Instructional Technique' and 'Evidence of Student Mentoring'.

Unacceptable

Faculty member fails to meet the standards required for a rating of "good."

1. **Delivery of Effective Instruction**

   Delivery of effective instruction may be demonstrated by any of the following documented activities:

   a) Results of student evaluations for courses taught (including clinical practicum) during the evaluation period (Note: faculty members are not required to submit student evaluations of instruction as evidence of teaching effectiveness).

   b) Peer evaluations (including classroom observation reports).

   c) Chairperson and/or Dean evaluations (including classroom observation reports).

   d) Attendance at conferences, seminars, and workshops <u>directly related</u> to teaching effectiveness.

   e) Participant evaluations pertaining to professional workshops or seminars taught.

   f) Unsolicited student and/or alumni responses to assessment instruments neutrally administered by various University offices and departments for assessment purposes.

   g) Professional assistance of personnel from the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning to evaluate classroom performance through observation(s), documented development of a plan of improvement and provision of feedback to the faculty member on progress using that plan.

   h) Presentation of course planning activities such as: syllabi, bibliographies, methods for testing and evaluation, and assignments.

   i) Other evidence of delivery of effective instruction.

2. **Evidence of Currency in Course Content and Instructional Technique**

   Currency in course content and instructional technique may be demonstrated by providing evidence such as:

   a) Involvement in curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses, revisions of established courses, etc.).

b) Involvement in web-based instruction (e.g., web-support for existing courses, delivery of online-courses, etc.).

c) Development of innovative instructional techniques and/or course materials.

d) Compilation of student portfolios of completed work from courses taught.

e) Incorporation of instruction on new technology or software.

f) Other evidence of currency in course content and instructional technique.

3. **Evidence of Student Mentoring**

Student mentoring may be demonstrated by providing evidence such as:

a) Supervision of theses, non-thesis projects, and/or independent studies.

b) Advising of students.

c) Participation in documented student retention activities.

d) Involvement of students in professional development activities not related to course requirements.

e) Other evidence of accessibility to students.

B. Professional Growth

Professional growth is demonstrated through 1) basic and/or applied scholarship; and 2) participation in continuing education. Candidates are responsible for making the case for the scope of their scholarly work (international, national, regional), and the review status (refereed or non-referred). They should also provide the acceptance rate and/or citation rate, when available. Candidates should indicate their specific role in multiple author publications.

Criteria for Evaluating Professional Growth

Outstanding
To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence of effective achievement in scholarly activities, including two refereed journal articles or equivalent and scholarly activity. Faculty must earn at least 15 points (without rounding) using the defined scale.

Superior
To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence of effective achievement in scholarly activities, including two refereed journal articles or equivalent and scholarly activity. Faculty must earn at least 12 points (without rounding) using the defined scale.

Good
To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence of effective achievement in scholarly activities, including one refereed journal article or evidence of scholarly activity. Faculty must earn at least 6 points (without rounding) using the defined scale.

Unacceptable

Insufficient evidence of achievement in intellectual contributions. Fewer than 6 points earned over the review period.

The candidate is required to submit within the record of service a table showing the activities included and the points earned for each activity with total points earned included.

	Activity	Points
1	Top level (from externally verifiable list, such as SCOPUS Quartile Ranking 1, etc.) refereed journal publication (e.g., research, case study, teaching note).	10
2	Publication of first edition scholarly book or textbook by a reputable publisher; revised editions would be valued at 50 percent.	10
3	Authorship/co-authorship of external grant proposal awarded with a value of $100,000 or more.	10
4	Editor of peer-reviewed journal.	10
5	Mid-level (from externally verifiable list, such as SCOPUS Quartile Ranking 2, etc.) refereed journal publication (e.g., research, case study, teaching note).	7
6	Authorship/co-authorship of grant proposal (internal or external) awarded with a value between $50,000 - $100,000.	5
7	Lower level (from externally verifiable list, such as SCOPUS Quartile Ranking 3, etc.) refereed journal publication (e.g., research, case study, teaching note).	5
8	Chapter in scholarly compendium, book, or monograph.	5
9	Achievement of an Award for Continuing Education (ACE) from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.	4
10	Authorship/co-authorship of grant proposal (internal or external) awarded with a value between $10,000 - $50,000.	4
11	Associate editor of peer-reviewed journal. (Points can be awarded in addition to points awarded for #23).	4
12	Refereed journal publication in outlet not otherwise listed.	3
13	Publication of article in professional publication.	3
14	Editorial board member.	3
15	Authorship/co-authorship of grant proposal (internal or external) awarded with a value less than $10,000.	2
16	Award received for published paper/presentation.	2
17	Published book review.	2
18	Publication in peer-reviewed conference proceedings (also eligible for journal publication points).	2
19	Attendance in credit-earning courses to maintain currency in the field.	2
20	Maintain current licensure and certification (State and ASHA CCC).	2
21	h-index ≥ 10 or i10-index ≥ 10 over the last 5 years (obtained from Google Scholar).	2
22	First time presentation of paper/panel participant in academic or industry conference.	2
23	h-index of $5 - 9$ or i10-index of $5 - 9$ over the last 5 years (obtained from Google Scholar).	1
24	Reviewer for journal, conference, book, grant agencies, etc. Points awarded for each individual manuscript reviewed. (Can be in addition to points awarded with #5 or 11).	1
25	h-index of $1 - 4$ or i10-index of $1 - 4$ over the last 5 years (obtained from Google Scholar).	0.5
26	Participation in a special interest group sponsored by a professional organization.	0.5
27	Other evidence of research. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple research artifacts may be reported (max of 3 points per item).	0.5-3

C. Service Provision

Service to the University may be demonstrated through 1) service at the department, college, and/or university levels; 2) service to academic and professional organizations; 3) service to the community or region.

Criteria for Evaluating Service Provision

Outstanding

To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective service (e.g., leadership positions and/or high involvement) to the university, college, department, and program and evidence of effective service across the other three areas ("service to students," "service to the community," or "service to academic and professional organizations"). Faculty must earn at least 20 points using the defined scales with a total of at least 8 points for category 1, and a total of at least 12 points between the other three categories (2, 3, 4, 5).

Superior

To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective service to the university, college, department, and program and evidence of effective service across the other three categories ("service to students," "service to the community," or "service to academic and professional organizations"). Faculty must earn at least 15 points using the defined scales with a total of 5 points for category 1, and a total of at least 10 points between the other three categories (2, 3, 4, 5).

Good

To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective service to the university, college, department, and program (category 1) and to students (category 2). Faculty must earn at least 10 points from the defined scales for categories 1 and 2.

Unacceptable

Insufficient evidence of acceptable service in the five categories (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). This is determined by the lack of ability to meet the requirement for good in service in this document.

Service refers to support given to the university, students, the academic discipline, and to professional organizations or to the community/region. Evidence of service to the university should include active service that promotes the mission and goals of the university, the college, the department, and program. Justification for point values must be provided for all activities. The candidate is required to submit within the record of service a table showing the activities included and the points earned for each activity with total points earned included.

1. **Service to the University and Department**

	Activity	Points Awarded
A1	Chair of university committee or task force, per year (cannot also claim membership).	3
A2	Chair of college committee or task force, per year (cannot also claim membership).	2.5
A3	Chair of department committee or task force, per year (cannot also claim membership).	2
A4	Membership on university committee or task force, per year.	2
A5	Membership on college committee or task force, per year.	1.5

A6	Involvement in planning/coordinating university, college, or department activities, per year.	1.5
A7	Membership on department committee or task force per year.	1
A8	Development and presentation of professional workshops and/or training seminars for internal university constituencies.	1
A9	Service to other units of the university.	1
A10	Attendance at university, college, or department programs/events. Points available for each event, with a maximum of 3 points available.	0.5
A11	Alternate for university or college committee, per year.	0.5
A12	Other evidence of service to the university, college, department, and program. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

2. **Service to Students**

	Activity	Points Awarded
B1	Faculty advisor to active student organization, per year.	3
B2	Involvement in student programs, such as the Jane Stephens Honors Program, First Step, and/or the Mentor Program. Multiple service commitments may be reported.	2
B3	Out of load supervision of internships, and/or involvement in arrangements of internships, placements, etc.	2
B4	Involvement in planning/coordinating student-focused activities, e.g., NSSLHA activities or Welcome Back event.	1.5
B5	Involvement in student recruitment activities, such as admission meetings, athlete recruitment events, and high-school visits.	1
B6	Advisor for a substantial number of students and/or graduate students and/or complex advising situations. Justification must be provided for how advising exceeds standard load.	1
B7	Attendance at university, college, or department student recruitment events. Points available for each event, with a maximum of 3 points available.	0.5
B8	Attendance at university, college, or department student-focused programs/events. Points available for each event, with a maximum of 3 points available.	0.5
B9	Supervision of student projects, such as graduate papers, theses, independent studies, honors contracts, internships, applied research projects and/or serving on a student's graduate committee. Multiple service commitments may be reported.	0.5
B10	Other evidence of service to students. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

*Activities may not also be counted in teaching effectiveness

3. **Service to the community (local, regional, and/or international)**

	Activity	Points Awarded
C1	Service on city or county advisory board, per year.	3
C2	Elected officer of board of directors of a community service organization, per year.	3
C3	Member of board of directors of a community service organization, per year.	2

C4	Professionally related contributions to civic groups/community service organizations.	1
C5	Involvement in professional consulting, per event.	1
C6	Professional presentations to civic groups or organizations.	1
C7	Representing university/college at community events.	1
C8	Other evidence of service to the community. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	-0.5-3

4. Service to academic and professional organizations

	Activity	Points Awarded
D1	Officer of an academic or professional organization, per year.	4
D2	Board member of an academic or professional organization, per year.	3
D3	Conference program chair for academic or professional meeting.	3
D4	Editor of conference proceedings.	3
D5	Participation in academic accreditation activities sponsored by a national or state organization.	3
D6	Editorial board member, per year.	3
D7	Associate editor of conference proceedings.	2
D8	Track chair for academic or professional meeting.	2
D9	Session chair/discussant for professional or academic conference.	1
D10	Textbook and/or supplemental package reviewer.	1
D11	Membership in academic organizations, per year.	1
D12	Membership in professional organizations related to teaching discipline, per year.	1
D13	Reviewer for journal, conference, book, grant agencies, etc. Points awarded for each individual manuscript reviewed.	0.5
D13	Other evidence of service to academic and professional organizations. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

**Activities may not also be counted in professional growth.

5. **Other factors for consideration (optiona**l): If there is additional information the candidate feels should be considered that does not fit in a category provided above or unique circumstances the candidate would like to explain, the candidate may include that content in this section of the document.

IV. Appeals Process
Appeals at all levels of review are considered according to individual tenure, promotion, and merit policies found in the Faculty Handbook.