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I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This document serves three purposes: (1) it fulfills the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement as the basis for faculty evaluation, (2) it establishes shared guidelines to direct and interpret individual and departmental development, and (3) it defines our departmental identity within the broader professional standards of the field of Communication Studies.

II. PHILOSOPHY

The department values a balanced program of teaching, scholarship, and service from each faculty member in order to fulfill the department’s mission. We recognize that while individual faculty members may differ from each other and across their own careers in what constitutes an appropriate balance, there are baseline expectations for all faculty members. One expectation is that each faculty member fulfills obligations to students by being an effective teacher. An equally significant expectation is that each faculty member, appropriate to rank and position, establishes and maintains a visible research agenda that furthers scholarly understanding of human communication. Finally, each faculty member is expected to show a commitment to essential service activities.

III. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

A. Teaching

1. Philosophy

Historically, teaching has been an integral part of the professional identity of communication scholars. The discipline finds its roots in the rhetorical training of the ancient Greeks, and the major national association for communication was founded by teachers of speech communication.

In the Department of Communication Studies we promote effective teaching by:

- valuing teaching in the promotion and tenure process;
- encouraging faculty members to develop a repertoire of courses that takes advantage of scholarly expertise, and serves the needs of the department and university; and
- sustaining formal and informal discussions of pedagogy among faculty members at all levels.
2. Evidence

A. Essential evidence of teaching effectiveness involves three areas:

1. student perceptions of teaching, including quantitative evaluations and SEC summaries of qualitative evaluations for all courses taught;
2. course syllabi and examples of assignments, exams, or other course materials;
3. graduate student mentoring (advising and committee participation).

B. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (in no particular order) may include, but is not limited to:

1. significant curricular development (e.g. major course revision, new preparations, inclusion of service-learning or other instructional innovation);
2. peer observations of teaching;
3. effective undergraduate advising, as indicated by offering sound guidance to students regarding curriculum choices, fulfilling one’s share of the advising, meeting scheduled appointments, maintaining a current understanding of general education and departmental requirements, and making appropriate referrals (e.g., for university services, scholarships, or award opportunities);
4. development of instructional materials used by other faculty (e.g. textbooks);
5. teaching awards;
6. guest lectures in a classroom setting;
7. publications or conference presentations by students as a result of instructional activity;
8. pedagogical publications;
9. participation in professional development programs;
10. instruction of General Education courses.

B. Research

1. Philosophy

We view scholarship broadly, as the active construction of knowledge in the field of Communication Studies. In general, we see scholarship as fundamental to our identities as professors of communication. Good scholarship is founded on research, and we recognize that the vitality and reputation of the department depends upon the active research agendas of the faculty. Although we recognize multiple modes and outlets for research within our field, we place primary emphasis on upon publication of scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and chapters in scholarly books. For the purposes of evaluation, prominent journals include those published by major communication associations and those that are recognized as important journals in the candidate’s particular area of study. Similarly, books and book chapters should generally be published by presses that are recognized for scholarship in the candidate’s particular area of study. Regardless of publication venue,
faculty publications will be evaluated on the basis of quality, visibility, and impact.

2. Evidence

A. Essential evidence of research includes:
   1. publication of original scholarly work in the form of refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited volumes, and books;
   2. in cases involving tenure, written expert opinions on the quality of a candidate’s research.

B. Additional evidence of research (in no particular order) may include, but is not limited to:
   1. conference papers, both competitive and invited;
   2. book reviews in journals;
   3. written dissemination of scholarly knowledge to a public audience;
   4. invited professional and public addresses and colloquia;
   5. receipt of honors and awards related to research;
   6. submission and/or receipt of grants;
   7. evidence of utilization of research by academic colleagues in and outside the field, professional audiences, and various publics;
   8. scholarly research in progress.
   9. In cases involving promotion to the rank of Professor, written external opinions on the quality of a candidate’s research may be consulted at the request of the candidate for promotion but are not required.

C. Service

1. Philosophy

Service is necessary to the maintenance and growth of our department, university, profession, and community. Involvement in service activities also can enhance societal welfare by facilitating integrated programs of scholarship that meld basic knowledge with practical applications through community partnerships. Although service is not the primary responsibility of the faculty role, it is required to create and sustain a vital academic community, making it a necessary and essential activity for faculty at all levels.

Since service to the department is essential for ongoing program viability, all faculty members are expected to participate in a moderate level of department service appropriate to rank, competence, and teaching obligations. Other types of service are encouraged to the extent that they contribute to a faculty member’s career goals and aspirations or to the university’s local, national, or international partnerships and reputation. Faculty contributions to service will be evaluated by quality, as well as quantity and frequency. Service quality can be demonstrated by filling significant needs or clearly creating valuable outcomes for the department, university, profession, or community.
2. Evidence

The Department recognizes four broad areas of service. Faculty members are expected to develop a mix of service activities appropriate to rank, competencies, and interests. Examples of typical service activities are listed below; the order of presentation is not indicative of relative importance. *The evidence noted in these lists is in no particular order.*

A. Evidence of *departmental service* includes, but is not limited to:

1. serving in a substantial administrative position in the department, including but not limited to Department Chair or Director of Graduate Studies
2. contributing to other activities that are essential to ongoing operation of the department, including but not limited to newsletters, commencement ceremonies, library liaison, computing and instructional technology, and special events;
3. contributing to intermittent departmental needs, such as serving on search committees or specific task-oriented committees;
4. engaging in activities related to undergraduate program development;
5. engaging in graduate program activities that are not related to teaching or mentoring, such as the graduate admissions committee, temporary advising, and program development;
6. receipt of honors or awards related to departmental service.

B. Evidence of *professional service* includes, but is not limited to:

1. active involvement in professional associations by filling leadership roles (e.g., an association officer or officer in a division or interest group), serving on committees, refereeing papers for presentation or publication, reviewing grant and contract proposals, moderating/chairing convention panels;
2. editorship or membership on editorial boards of professional organizations;
3. presentation of continuing education activities related to professional expertise such as workshops and/or seminars for professionals, business, or government personnel;
4. serving on professional boards;
5. receipt of honors or awards related to professional activities.

C. Evidence of *University service* includes, but is not limited to:

1. serving on University committees or in the Faculty Senate;
2. demonstrated leadership in areas such as program development, curriculum review and development, faculty growth, teaching improvement, and research;
3. advising student organizations;
4. liaison with other units, offices, and programs within the MUS;
5. service for the University’s recognized bargaining agent;
6. receipt of honors or awards related to university service.
D. Evidence of community service includes, but is not limited to:

1. membership on community boards, commissions, or committees;
2. involvement in acquiring grants or contracts that are primarily intended to enhance the provision of public services;
3. partnership with community agencies in providing service-learning opportunities for students;
4. consulting and/or training in areas of professional competence (the Individual Performance Report should distinguish compensated from uncompensated activity);
5. public presentations related to professional expertise (e.g., community panels, debates, talks, radio or television appearances, newspaper editorials, etc.);
6. receipt of honors or awards related to community service activities.

IV. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

The following standards for evaluation are to be interpreted in the context of the overall department philosophy articulated in Section II of this document: quality teaching is one expectation; research performance is an equally significant expectation; and a moderate level of service is expected of all faculty members. The rest of this section specifies the standards for the particular recommendation being made.

A. Promotion to Assistant Professor

Under no circumstances will a faculty member be promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor until the faculty member possesses the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree (e.g., Ed.D or J.D.).

B. Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Teaching: The FEC expects evidence of a consistent pattern of effective teaching, with no continuing pattern of significant problems. (While the FEC recognizes that new faculty members may encounter some challenges early in their career, for promotion candidates need to demonstrate that any significant, initial problems with teaching have been addressed and rectified.) Evidence should demonstrate that courses are appropriately rigorous, up-to-date, and consistently positively evaluated by students. In addition, the FEC will look for evidence of participation in graduate student mentoring, specifically advising and committee participation. Beyond this essential evidence, other evidence of teaching effectiveness may further strengthen the case for promotion.

2. Research: At the minimum, the candidate must demonstrate two things: a) that she/he is the primary contributor to a program of research that addresses significant questions about communication, and b) some success at publication in prominent scholarly journals or presses. To be considered for promotion to Associate, the candidate should have an average
of at least one article-length publication per year, with demonstration of peer-review and lead or co-lead authorship on some of those publications. In determining research productivity, the FEC may consider work that is in progress at the time of evaluation as well as extenuating circumstances (e.g., family or medical issues) that are approved by the FEC in advance. Additionally, the FEC will consider the strength of the research agenda in terms of its potential for continued growth, and the overall scholarly impact and dissemination of the agenda as measured by honors, awards and utilization of research.

3. Service: An appropriate share of department service is required. The FEC also expects a moderate level of service to broader constituencies, (i.e. the discipline, the university, or the community).

C. Award of Tenure

1. Teaching: The FEC will look for evidence of continued rigor in instruction and positive feedback on student evaluations, as well as evidence of ongoing development of courses. The FEC also will look for evidence of positive involvement in graduate mentoring. At either the request of the faculty member or the FEC, a peer evaluation of teaching may also be used as evidence.

2. Research: To be considered for tenure, the candidate should have an average of at least one article-length publication per year, with demonstration of peer-review and lead or co-lead authorship on some of those publications. The expectation for prominence and quality of these publications is the same as for promotion to Associate. The FEC also will look for the potential for continued growth of the research program, but in determining research productivity it will place greater emphasis upon demonstrated success at publication and the establishment of research than it will upon works in progress. In weighing this evidence, the FEC will consult written assessments of the candidate’s scholarship from tenured faculty members with relevant expertise at other universities. The candidate shall make a list of five potential reviewers available to the Department Chair by the beginning of the Fall Semester. The Department Chair, in consultation with the FEC, shall generate a list of additional potential reviewers. The potential reviewers shall not include the candidate’s graduate program advisors or committee members nor any of the candidate’s scholarly collaborators/co-authors. The Chair’s list shall be shared with the candidate, and the candidate may strike one or more of the names from the Chair’s list. The Department Chair shall then solicit three reviewers, including two from the candidate’s list and one from the Chairs’ list.

3. Service: Candidates must demonstrate some form of department service and some combination of service beyond the department level. In particular, the FEC expects candidates to have established a presence at the university level through service on university committees, participation in faculty governance, or other University service that is requested of the department.
D. Promotion to Professor

1. Teaching: The FEC will look for evidence of continued rigor in instruction and positive feedback on student evaluations, ongoing development of courses, and successful graduate mentoring.

2. Research: An individual’s entire scholarly record will be evaluated for promotion to the rank of Professor. The FEC will evaluate available evidence in terms of a) the successful development of a nationally recognized program of research, attributable primarily to the candidate; and b) significant publication success beyond the award of promotion to associate. To be considered for promotion to Professor, the candidate should demonstrate multiple publications after achieving tenure, with demonstration of peer-review and lead or co-lead authorship on some of those publications. In determining research productivity, the FEC will recognize that the quantity of post-tenure research may be affected by the initiation of new programs of research and participation in additional teaching and service responsibilities; however, no faculty member may be promoted to Professor on the basis of teaching and service alone. The expectation for prominence and quality of these publications is the same as for promotion to Associate.

3. Service: The FEC expects evidence of a sustained commitment to service at the department, university and discipline levels.

E. Salary Determination

1. The following standards will be used to evaluate faculty performance for purposes of salary determination:

   A. For teaching performance to be evaluated as normal, the candidate minimally must provide evidence that s/he delivers appropriately rigorous and up-to-date courses. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence that those courses are received satisfactorily by students. The candidate must also perform an appropriate share of student advising and do so competently.

   To receive an evaluation of above normal, teaching must exceed the standards for normal teaching. A consistent pattern of excellent teaching evaluations or additional evidence of teaching excellence can support an above normal recommendation. Evidence of above normal teaching may be based in excellence in a combination of any of the criteria for teaching effectiveness designated in Section III, A of this document. To receive an evaluation of outstanding, a candidate must exhibit a consistent pattern of excellent teaching evaluations, as well as additional evidence of teaching excellence.

   Teaching will be evaluated as less-than-normal if there is a pattern of substantive problems with course content or structure or student dissatisfaction with course instruction. Faculty members who are released from teaching responsibilities during the evaluation period only need to provide evidence of effective teaching commensurate with the amount of teaching performed in order to be judged normal in
the area of teaching.

**B. Research:** To receive an evaluation of *normal*, the candidate must provide evidence of at least one research activity per year, as defined in Section III.B of this document, during the performance period. The evidence must demonstrate ongoing development of a research agenda on which they are the primary contributor, such as publications, conference presentations, grant preparation, manuscript submission, or significant data collection. Candidates should be aware that meeting the *normal* standard annually may not be sufficient to achieve the specific promotion and tenure standards defined above in this section.

To receive an evaluation of *above normal*, the candidate must demonstrate publication of two or more articles/chapters in prominent journals, books, and/or presses (i.e. “essential evidence” as defined in section III.B.2.A) during the period under review. To receive an evaluation of *outstanding*, the candidate must exceed the level of productivity for above normal (e.g., more than two articles/chapters or publication of a scholarly book) or have garnered special recognition for research activity (e.g., awards or other acknowledgement of research quality or impact.)

Research performance will be considered *less-than-normal* when a faculty member fails to provide specific evidence to the FEC that s/he was directly involved in research activity during the evaluation period. However, an exception applies when a faculty member has, by agreement with the Department Chair, accepted significantly higher teaching and/or service responsibilities in exchange for reduced research during the evaluation period. In this case, the faculty member will be judged normal in the area of research if the level of research activity is consistent with the agreed upon reallocation of faculty time.

**C. Service:** *Normal* service performance will be satisfied by consistent service activity at the department level and at least one service activity to the discipline, university, or community appropriate to rank.

Service performance will be considered *above normal* if the candidate provides evidence of multiple service activities on multiple levels (e.g., department and university levels). To receive an evaluation of *Outstanding*, the candidate must provide evidence of exceptional performance in service activities (e.g. leadership roles, significant impact, awards/honors).

Service will be judged *less-than-normal* when a faculty member fails to provide specific evidence to the FEC that he/she participated in service activity during the evaluation period. However, an exception applies when a faculty member has, by agreement with the Department Chair, accepted significantly higher teaching and/or research responsibilities in exchange for reduced service during the evaluation period. In this case, the faculty member will be judged normal in the area of service if the level of service is consistent with the agreed upon reallocation of faculty time.
2. **Merit Award.** As stipulated by Section 13.240 the Collective Bargaining Agreement, eligibility for a merit award requires above normal performance in at least two of the three areas of teaching, research and service, or outstanding performance or special recognition (i.e., receipt of a highly-coveted national or international award; election to a national or international leadership position) in at least one of these areas, and normal performance in the remaining areas of assigned duties.

3. **Normal Increment.** To receive a normal increment, normal performance or above normal performance in all areas of assigned duties is required. See Section 13.220 in the CBA for additional information.

4. **Less-Than-Normal increment.** Below normal performance in any area of assigned duties may be grounds for recommending a less-than-normal increment during the evaluation period, as specified in Section 13.210 of the CBA.

If a faculty member receives three recommendations for less-than-normal increments for three successive years, tenure review will be initiated following the procedures outlined in Section 17.100 of the CBA.

**F. Evaluation of Tenurable, Partial FTE appointees**

Tenurable faculty members whose permanent appointment is 1.0 FTE but who have a temporary reduction in FTE are evaluated by the same criteria as other full-time tenurable faculty; however, the candidate may apply for additional time to achieve tenure if desired (subject to approval according to the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement).

Tenurable faculty members whose permanent appointment is less than 1.0 are evaluated using the same qualitative standards as other tenurable faculty but with the expectation that the amount of evidence needed to support a favorable evaluation in any area will reflect the proportion of FTE and other terms of employment. For example, the amount of teaching, research, and service activity expected of an individual with a tenurable .5 FTE appointment would be one-half of that expected of individuals with full-time appointments, unless the terms of employment are adjusted to specify otherwise. (Similarly, the evidence submitted by an individual with a permanent .5 appointment might be weighted by a factor of 2 for the purpose of comparison to full time faculty.)

However, the same standards of quality apply to all tenurable faculty. An evaluation of normal or above for any evaluation cycle requires evidence of rigorous and up-to-date courses that are consistently positively evaluated by students, appropriate and competent participation in student advising, evidence of direct involvement in research, and a level of service appropriate to the terms of employment.

Promotion and tenure similarly require evidence of a consistent pattern of effective teaching
(including advising) and service to the department and other constituencies that is appropriate to the proportion of FTE and terms of employment. With respect to research expectations, for promotion to Associate Professor, a partial FTE appointee should be the primary contributor to a program of research that addresses significant questions about communication, should demonstrate some success at publication in prominent scholarly journals and presses, with peer-review and lead or co-lead authorship on some of those publications. For tenure, a partial FTE appointee should demonstrate success at publication in prominent scholarly outlets and show the potential for continued growth of the research program. For promotion to Full Professor, the candidate should demonstrate successful development of a visible program of research, attributable primarily to the candidate, with evidence of publication beyond the award of tenure.

**G. Evaluation of Non-Tenurable Appointees**

Non-tenurable appointees shall be evaluated according to the standards in Section E: Salary Determination. Evaluation is required only in those areas of performance stipulated by the terms of his or her appointment. For example, nontenurable appointees may or may not be required to perform advising, to engage in departmental or university service, or to participate in scholarly activities. If the terms of employment are not explicit, non-tenurable faculty shall only be evaluated on the basis of teaching performance.

However, a non-tenurable appointee may request evaluation in other areas if seeking a merit increment or promotion. Contributions in areas that lie outside assigned duties are to be noted in the FEC evaluation only for the purposes of providing special recognition or providing a case for merit or promotion; they are not a required element of the evaluation. Candidates receiving a less-than-normal increment two years in a row will be ineligible for reappointment.

*Promotion for non-tenurable appointees* shall be based upon the standards set forth in University Policy 101.2 (as revised 7/2001), the CBA, and this document. As such, promotion for adjunct, research or visiting instructors is based upon the entirety of the instructor’s academic record since the last promotion, with particular emphasis on the nature of the academic appointment and duties. Promotion is based upon showing a “clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University” (CBA 10.110). Evidence of such growth and contribution might include teaching evaluations, development of new curriculum, awards, research in the form of peer reviewed journal publications, book chapters and books, as well as service to the Department, the University and the community.

Promotion for Lecturer to Distinguished Lecturer shall be based upon earning distinction in the field (University Policy 101.2). Evaluation of distinction shall be based upon the nature of the lecturer’s appointment, but may also include activities that go beyond the nature of the appointment (such as research for a teaching lecturer). Evidence of distinction might include teaching evaluations, development of new curriculum, awards, research in the form of peer reviewed journal publications, book chapters and books, as well as service to the Department, the University and the community.
Merit for non-tenurable appointees requires above-normal performance in those areas stipulated by the terms of his or her appointment. Evidence of above normal teaching may come from any of the areas of teaching effectiveness defined in Section III A of this document. In addition, evaluation of above normal performance can be bolstered by activities that go above and beyond the scope of the appointee’s contracted duties, but should bring recognition to UM and should remain within the general categories of teaching, research, and service that are used to evaluate tenurable appointees. For example, research activities (journal articles, books, etc.) undertaken at UM while on a teaching appointment could be considered as additional evidence in support of above normal performance.

H. Retention/Non-Retention

A probationary appointee has no right to reappointment, and a probationary appointment shall automatically expire at the end of the specified term in the absence of a written reappointment signed by the President.

The FEC may recommend non-reappointment of a probationary appointee if it determines that the appointee's performance in teaching, research, or service does not indicate the eventual accomplishment of requirements for continuous tenure. The procedures for cases of non-reappointment are established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

V. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

There are four components to faculty performance review within the department:

- Submission of Individual Performance Report (IPR)
- Summary of teaching evaluations by Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)
- Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) recommendation
- Department Chair’s recommendation

A. Individual Performance Report

By October 15, each faculty member shall submit to the Faculty Evaluation Committee an Individual Performance Report documenting evidence of performance in teaching, research and service. Examples of past reports should be made available to faculty members by the Chair. Faculty members should consult section 10.210 of the CBA to determine the length of the performance period that must be documented. Faculty members should consult Section III of this document as they prepare their IPR, but may include other material they deem relevant to their review. All supplementary material should be attached as exhibits at the end of the document. In addition, they may present additional written material or oral testimony directly to the FEC.

B. Summary of teaching evaluations by Student Evaluation Committee

By September 15, the Department’s student representatives shall organize a Student
Evaluation Committee consistent with Section 10.220 of the CBA. The SEC shall consist of between three and seven students who are majors or graduate students in the department, and one faculty observer (tenured or tenure-track) who has all rights of participation and access to information except voting. Final authority for selection of the SEC rests with the Department Chair.

By October 15, the SEC shall submit to the FEC a written summary of qualitative data regarding the teaching and advising of each faculty member under review. To prepare this summary, the committee shall review faculty members’ course evaluations, and may seek or receive additional evidence from students who have taken courses or been advisees of the faculty member.

C. Faculty Evaluation Committee recommendation

The FEC shall consist of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Members of the FEC shall elect a chairperson from their ranks. One member of the SEC will serve as observer on the FEC with full rights of participation but no right to vote.

Following the procedures outlined in Section 10.230 of the CBA, by November 15, the FEC shall submit to the Department Chair a written evaluation of the performance of each faculty member under review. The evaluation shall adhere to the standards in Section IV of this document, and must include a specific recommendation in the appropriate categories in Section IV. The FEC shall rely upon the faculty member’s IPR, the SEC evaluation, and additional written or oral testimony from the faculty member. The FEC also may consider relevant evidence from other sources, provided that the use of such evidence is incorporated into the record and that the faculty member is afforded an opportunity to respond to this evidence.

By November 15, the FEC also shall produce a written review of the Department Chair. The FEC shall elect one member to conduct and prepare the review. Data and testimony may be obtained from faculty members, office staff, students, and administrators. The written review will be presented to the Chair, appended to the Chair’s FEC recommendation, and submitted to the Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

All FEC recommendations will be determined by majority vote. A faculty member is required to excuse himself/herself from the final deliberations and voting on her/his own recommendation or deliberations involving a family member. A faculty member may appeal to the FEC for a reconsideration of the recommendation. Recommendations of the FEC together with supporting documentation and an appended summary of those who have been recommended by the FEC for promotion, salary increase, or tenure, respectively, shall be forwarded to the Department Chair, the Standards Committee, and the Dean, College of Arts and Sciences by November 15.
D. Department Chairperson’s Recommendation

By December 15, the Department Chair shall prepare a written recommendation for each member of the Department who is under review regarding promotion, tenure status, salary increment, and retention, in accordance with Section 10.240 of the CBA. In addition, the Department Chair shall prepare a summary list of those recommended by him/her for promotion, merit increase, or tenure. (This list will be ranked in order of priority unless the Department Chair gives reasons for not doing so.) The Chair’s recommendations shall be signed by the faculty member involved. The recommendations and materials shall be forwarded to the Dean, College of Arts and Sciences by December 15.

E. Guarantee of Peer Review

These procedures are intended to guarantee peer review and consultation among faculty members within the Department. Faculty members shall have the opportunity to discuss advancement recommendations with the Department Chair. Each faculty member also shall have the opportunity to review his or her evaluations from the SEC, FEC, and Department Chair. The faculty member’s signature on these forms indicates review of the evaluation; it does not indicate endorsement.

F. Appeals Process

Within 10 days of receipt of a recommendation from the FEC or Chair, a candidate may submit a written appeal regarding any aspect of the evaluation record or process in accordance with the procedures described in Section 10.200 of the CBA.

Approved by COMM faculty August 25, 2014