An Interpretation of University Criteria on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases

The University criteria and College of Health and Human Sciences interpretation of the criteria apply to all tenurable appointments in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. These criteria and interpretations are found in the Handbook for Faculty and University Staff and in the College of Health and Human Sciences document, “Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases.”

In keeping with these criteria and the mission of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, each faculty member is evaluated in terms of achievement in the following categories: teaching, research, service, advising, and professional development. An exception is appointment to the rank of tenure-track instructor, which is evaluated in terms of achievement in teaching, service, advising, and professional development. For all ranks, performance is expected to be distributed across all categories with priority being given to teaching and (for professorial ranks) research. Outstanding performance in one or more areas is not a substitute for inadequate performance in others. All faculty are expected to comply with the Statement on Professional Ethics adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 4, 1993.
Performance expectations for appointment and reappointment at the various ranks do vary with higher expectations for the senior ranks. These expectations are specified in the College of Health and Human Sciences document, “Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases.” The expectations articulated for the junior rank of Assistant Professor in the areas of teaching, service, advising and professional development will be applied to the rank of Tenure Track Instructor.

I. TEACHING

The primary component of a faculty member’s role in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is quality undergraduate and graduate teaching. Each faculty member should demonstrate expertise in content areas and methodologies relevant to the discipline and to his/her areas of specialty. Faculty members should initiate innovations in teaching which lead to improvement in the teaching/learning experience, conduct timely revision of course materials, and develop new courses as needed. Faculty are expected to demonstrate competence by organizing significant and current subject matter; to present class material with expertise, coherence, and the degree of articulate expression expected of a professor; to maintain grading standards in line with program expectations; to establish a rapport with students that enhances and nurtures the educational process; to evaluate students fairly and impartially; and to maintain professional standards and expectations, including those outlined in the Handbook for Faculty and University Staff.
Competence and effectiveness in teaching are evaluated by self, students, colleagues, and the department chair. Evaluation by students is formally represented through administration of the Student Perception of Teaching form. Faculty ratings will be compared to department and division means and should receive scores at or near the department mean. Evaluation of clinical teaching includes the use of the Evaluation of Supervisor form plus other relevant materials provided by the teacher. Informally, students and alumni express views through letters and informal communications. Colleagues may evaluate teaching during formal reviews by the tenured faculty and by observing long-term trends in student performance during activities which contain an evaluative component (e.g., oral and written comprehensive graduate examinations, clinical experiences, performance in courses, and feedback from externship supervisors, clients, and their families).

Further information regarding teaching effectiveness may come from, but is not limited to, inspection and review of course syllabi, directed theses, teaching awards, efforts toward funding of instructional development grants, and grade distributions. Faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of quality teaching. This teaching portfolio may include past and current teaching evaluations, grade distributions, course syllabi, letters of support, descriptive commentary, and any other relevant evidence the faculty members deem appropriate.

II. SCHOLARSHIP
Scholarship complements quality teaching. Department faculty must demonstrate competence in a research methodology and a content area appropriate to the discipline, as well as a commitment to an on-going program of research. Publication of a faculty member’s work implies a judgment by editors and reviewers of its relative merit. A reasonably regular rate of publication should be maintained.

Faculty members are expected to publish research in forums appropriate to their discipline and to the subject under investigation. The preponderance of the faculty member’s published work should appear in forums associated with Communication Sciences and Disorders. Although some work in related areas (psychology, sociology, education, etc.) is acceptable, it should be presented in addition to, rather than in lieu of, publication in traditional outlets. These traditional outlets include both association journals and other closely allied, reputable journals. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate whatever generally accepted methodology is suitable to their needs, to the subject under investigation, and to the discipline. In addition to the primary evidence of refereed publications, secondary evidence of research activity includes papers presented at professional meetings; participation in invited seminars, symposia, and workshops; and grant writing activities. Ideally, convention papers are an initial form of scholarship that can lead to publication.
Evaluation of scholarship is based first upon quality and second upon quantity. Measures of quality include judgments made through the publication process as well as independent judgments made by the chair and individual committee members. Factors which delineate quality of research include:

1. The level and reputation and publication forum. Association-sponsored journals are evaluated relative to the quality of the journals and the level of the association which publishes them: national, regional and state in descending order. Some non-association journals rate very highly (e.g., quality standards, acceptance rates, editorial boards, disciplinary relevance) and others do not. While faculty are encouraged to publish in outlets they consider appropriate to their content and methodological specializations, they may wish to seek the opinions of colleagues within the Department and the discipline regarding the quality and appropriateness of journals.

2. The review process utilized by the forum. Blind review by multiple reviewers is the commonly accepted procedure for publication research. Many times peers in the discipline or editorial boards will be responsible for such review. Publications which are reviewed by only the editor or editorial staff and non-refereed publications are considered secondary, rather than primary evidence of research competence.

3. The number and sequence of authors on the publication. In cases of single authorship the contribution of the researcher is obvious. Accordingly, junior faculty can clearly demonstrate
research competence if some of their work is single authored. Evidence of the ability to conduct independent research is expected. Multiple authorships are also encouraged. Each author will be recognized as an equal contributor to the quality of the publication unless otherwise indicated and supported by the faculty member.

4. The nature of the publication. Publications which utilize research methods to contribute to the growth of knowledge or which make theoretical contributions are particularly noteworthy. Textbooks and textbook chapters, such as instructional literature reviews and pedagogical/clinical impressions, may be fitting complements to a research program, but are not acceptable as sole expressions of scholarship. Books and book chapters may or may not be considered primary evidence of scholarship depending on the application of research methodology or contribution toward theoretical advancement.

III. Service

Service is an integral aspect of faculty responsibility. Faculty members should actively seek and willingly respond to calls for their service within (1) the University, (2) the profession, and (3) the community. We recognize that individual faculty members will have different inclinations and interests in service and that service in all three of the above areas may not always be equally distributed. Keeping in mind that it is important to allocate time between all areas of faculty
performance, evaluation of service should include consideration of:

1) workload, time, scope and complexity of service;
2) committee memberships;
3) committees chaired;
4) time devoted to committee meetings;
5) contribution to professional meetings;
6) conducting clinics, workshops;
7) consulting or editorial services;
8) lecture or speaking invitations;
9) participation on boards of directors;
10) other professionally relevant service activities within the University, profession, or community.

IV. ADVISING

Academic advising is an important faculty function which encompasses both academic and career counseling. Advising activities include but are not limited to helping plan academic programs, clarifying degree requirements, suggesting electives and complementary majors and minors, assisting students in course selection, monitoring student progress toward graduation, supporting students who experience academic difficulties, facilitating post-graduate education, making appropriate referrals, and assisting in career counseling.

Quality advising is reflected in a faculty member’s understanding of requirements such as University Curriculum, ASHA, TEA, major, minor, and related requirements (e.g.,
probationary status, credit by examination, the Honors Program). The faculty adviser also must have a thorough knowledge of advising materials and registration procedures. Evidence of a faculty member’s quality of performance in advising should include a review of not only the accuracy and value of the information disseminated, but also the advising technique reflected in the student/faculty adviser interactions. The following factors may also be considered when reviewing these areas: relevant comments from students, participation as a University pre-major adviser, attendance at and participation in advising workshops, the number of advisees, and availability for formal and informal advising throughout the school year.

The evaluation of a faculty member’s dedication to advising, considering the factors listed above, could consist of solicited and unsolicited feedback from students and colleagues as well as direct student evaluations.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Faculty members are expected to maintain currency in their discipline, particularly in areas of teaching and research specialization. The scholarly community places great stock in the value of continuing education. Faculty members should actively pursue programs of study and self-development and should continue to cultivate their interests and professional competencies, and should serve as role models to students and colleagues in the lifelong pursuit of learning.
Evaluation of professional development may include consideration of:

1) accumulation of continuing education credits;
2) receipts of research and faculty development grants;
3) receipt of post-doctoral fellowships;
4) receipt of professional certification or license;
5) attendance at professional meetings and workshops;
6) development of new professionally-related skills (e.g., skills in languages, data analysis, computers and other technical areas).
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