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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 and learning, 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 and Learning

1. Philosophy
The communication discipline finds its roots in the rhetorical training of the ancient Greeks, and the National Communication Association was founded by teachers of speech communication. Thus, teaching is an integral part of communication scholars’ professional identity.

In the Department of Communication Studies, we promote effective teaching and learning 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. All faculty members under review must provide evidence of:

1. Effective teaching and learning. Evidence includes, but is not limited to: course materials, student feedback on teaching, student work, and peer observations of teaching.
2. Effective student advising and mentoring. Evidence includes, but is not limited to:
   - number of UG advisees/mentees, graduate advisor and committee member roles,
   - oversight of student internships and research projects.

b. The department encourages additional teaching and learning activities beyond the baseline evidence in Section 2a above. Evidence of such activities includes, but is not limited to:
   1. significant course revision or development of new courses;
   2. participation in professional development programs related to teaching;
   3. formal teaching beyond one’s assigned courses (e.g. extra course sections, guest lectures, teaching in the community);
   4. student presentations or publications that result from one’s instruction;
   5. teaching that involves significant community engagement (e.g. service-learning);
   6. activity that significantly advances international, cross-cultural, or global engagement;
   7. publication of textbooks or other instructional materials;
   8. publication of peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching and learning (may, at the faculty member’s discretion, alternatively count as scholarship);
   9. receipt of teaching awards;
   10. teaching general education courses and writing courses.

3. Evaluation

   To be evaluated as Normal, the candidate must provide evidence of effective teaching and student advising and mentoring as described in Section III.A.2.a. The evidence must demonstrate that teaching is appropriately rigorous, up-to-date, and regularly evaluated above the mid-point on quantitative student evaluations. Teaching may be evaluated as Less-Than-Normal if there is evidence of a pattern of fundamental problems in the candidate’s teaching, advising, or mentoring.

   To be evaluated as Above Normal, the candidate must fulfill the expectations for Normal teaching, AND provide evidence of additional teaching activities as described in Section III.A.2.b. A pattern of student evaluations that indicate above average teaching performance may also contribute to an Above Normal evaluation, but they are not sufficient for that rating.

   To be evaluated as Outstanding, the candidate must fulfill the expectations for Above Normal teaching, AND provide evidence of exceptional impact, prominence, and/or depth of involvement in one’s additional teaching activities.

The department recognizes that both qualitative variability within types of teaching activity and the amount of activity must be taken into account for Above Normal and Outstanding ratings. For example, local vs. national awards, short trainings vs. long-term professional development, and different kinds of formal teaching beyond one’s workload must be weighed by the FEC and Chair to make those determinations.
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. Scholarship

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 publication of scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and chapters in scholarly books. For the purposes of evaluation, prominent journals include those published by the International Communication Association and the National Communication Association 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 scholarship includes:
      1. publication of original scholarly work in the form of refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited volumes, or books;
      2. in cases involving tenure, written expert opinions on the quality of a candidate’s research.

   b. The department has further agreed that additional evidence can be important to have when documenting accomplishment in the area of research scholarship. These items may include:
      1. conference papers, both competitive and invited;
      2. submission of grant proposals and/or receipt of grants;
      3. evidence of incorporating community engagement into one’s scholarship, such as by conducting community-based research, partnering with community organizations in one’s research endeavors, or engaging other research-related activities that clearly contribute to the public good;
      4. dissemination of scholarly knowledge to a public audience (e.g., publication in The Conversation or public lectures)
      5. invited essays in scholarly publications;
      6. book reviews in peer-reviewed journals or major association newsletters;
      7. invited professional and public addresses and colloquia;
      8. evidence of utilization of research by academic colleagues in and outside the field, professional audiences, and various publics;
      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;
10. receipt of honors or awards related to research.
11. publication of peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching and learning (may, at the faculty member’s discretion, alternatively count as teaching);
12. submission to journals of original scholarly work;
13. editing an academic journal (may, at the faculty member’s discretion, alternatively count as service).

c. The department also recognizes that some of the above activities are more involved or indicative of accomplishment in scholarship than others in determining “above normal” and “outstanding” performance. Such items may include:
1. publication of original scholarly work in the form of refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited volumes, or books, particularly in quality, visibility, frequency, or impact;
2. receipt and successful management of external grants;
3. receipt of honors or awards related to research.

3. Evaluation

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 below in Section IV.

To receive an evaluation of above normal, the candidate must demonstrate publication of two or more articles/chapters in a prominent journal or edited volume, 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), have garnered special recognition for research activity (e.g., awards or other acknowledgement of research quality or impact), or meet the expectations for “above normal” and have other examples of items outlined in section III.B.2 demonstrating impact, prominence, and/or depth of involvement.

Scholarship 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

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 provide department service. 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

a. The department recognizes service at the departmental, university, disciplinary, and community-levels. Faculty members are expected to develop a mix of service activities appropriate to rank, competencies, and interests. The department has agreed that various types of service activities at the departmental, university, or discipline-wide level can be important to have as part of one’s regular service activities.

b. At the departmental level, these activities may include, but are not limited to:
   1. contributing to other activities that are essential to ongoing operation of the department, such as creating newsletters, overseeing commencement ceremonies, serving as a liaison between the department and other campus units or offices, and organizing/overseeing special events;
   2. contributing to intermittent departmental needs, such as serving on search committees or specific task-oriented committees;
   3. engaging in graduate program activities that are not related to teaching or mentoring, such as the graduate admissions committee, temporary advising, and program development;
   4. engaging in activities related to undergraduate or graduate program development;
   5. serving in a substantial administrative position in the department, such as Department Chair or Director of Graduate Studies.

c. At the university level, these activities may include, but are not limited to:
   1. serving on University committees or in the Faculty Senate;
   2. demonstrated leadership in areas such as program development or curriculum review and development,
   3. leading faculty professional development seminars, including those on teaching improvement and research;
4. serving as an official faculty advisor to a student organization;
5. serving as a liaison to other units, offices, or programs within the MUS;
6. service for the university’s recognized bargaining agent;
7. student recruitment and retention activities;
8. nominations or receipt of honors or awards related to university service.

d. At the discipline-level, these activities may include, but are not limited to:
1. serving in leadership roles for professional associations (e.g., an association executive
   or officer, or officer of a division or interest group);
2. serving on professional association committees;
3. refereeing papers for presentation or publication, reviewing grant and contract
   proposals, moderating/chairing convention panels;
4. journal editorship;
5. membership on academic journal editorial boards;
6. presentation of continuing education activities related to professional expertise such
   as workshops and/or seminars for professionals, business, or government personnel;
7. serving on professional boards;
8. nominations or receipt of honors or awards related to professional activities.

e. At the community level, these activities may include, but are not limited to:
1. membership on community boards, commissions, or committees, especially those
   related to one’s area of expertise;
2. high quality contributions to projects or initiatives that support the public good;
3. partnership with community agencies in providing service-learning opportunities for
   students;
4. consulting and/or training in areas of professional competence (IPR 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. nominations or receipt of honors or awards related to community service activities,
   especially when directly related to faculty expertise.

f. The department further recognizes that some of the above activities are more involved or
indicative of accomplishment in service than others for determining “above normal” and
“outstanding” performance. Such items may include but are not limited to:
1. Serving in leadership roles for professional associations (e.g., association executive or
   officer, or officer of a division or interest group);
2. Receiving awards for service accomplishments, especially when related to one’s
   faculty role and expertise;
3. Editing an academic journal (may, at the faculty member’s discretion, alternatively
   count as scholarship);
4. Making high-quality contributions to projects or initiatives that support the public
   good, such as grant applications, seminars, or service on public or community-
   organization advisory boards;
5. High-level involvement or leadership on university committees, task forces, the UFA,
   or Faculty Senate.
6. Significant, unusual, or unexpected responsibilities that stem from one’s service roles (e.g., attending to a crisis).

3. Evaluation

*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), and/or other examples from section III.C.2.f.

Service will be judged *less-than-normal* when a faculty member fails to provide specific evidence to the FEC that they 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.

### IV. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

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. (in Communication Studies or closely related fields) or equivalent terminal degree (e.g., Ed.D. or J.D.).

#### B. Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Teaching: The FEC expects evidence of a regular 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 regularly evaluated above the mid-point on quantitative student evaluations. In addition, the FEC will look for evidence of participation in graduate student mentoring, specifically advising/mentoring and committee participation. Beyond this essential evidence, other evidence of teaching effectiveness may further strengthen the case for promotion.
2. Scholarship: At the minimum, the candidate must demonstrate two things: a) that they are 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 Professor, the candidate should have at least three publications or equivalent, with demonstration of peer-review and lead or co-lead authorship. The candidate must also demonstrate success in scholarship while in current rank. 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). 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: Departmental 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. For the award of tenure, a peer evaluation of teaching will also be used as evidence. The candidate shall ask any tenured faculty member in the Department of Communication Studies to complete the review prior to October 15th.

2. Scholarship: To be considered for tenure, the candidate should have at least four article-length publications or equivalent, with demonstration of peer-review and lead or co-lead authorship. The expectation for prominence and quality of these publications is the same as for promotion to Associate Professor. The FEC 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 before the end of the previous Spring 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 by the end of June. In soliciting letters, the Chair will tell the external reviewers that letters will be anonymized, that reviewers should write their letters in such a way as it will not reveal their identity and that reviewers should submit both a signed and an unsigned copy of their letter to the chair. After the Department Chair receives the letters, the names, addresses and other potentially identifying materials will be removed to protect the anonymity of the
 reviewers before the letters are placed in the faculty member’s application materials by October 15.

3. Service: Candidates must demonstrate 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. Scholarship: 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 Professor. 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 Professor. For promotion to rank of Professor, the candidate may ask for outside letters of support. If the candidate chooses to do so, the process will follow the same conditions as laid out for letters in the process for tenure in Section IV.C.2.

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

V. SALARY DETERMINATION

1. Merit. As stipulated by Section 10.110.3.a of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, eligibility for a merit award requires above normal performance in at least two of the three areas of teaching and learning, scholarship, and service, or outstanding performance or special recognition in at least one of these areas, and normal performance in the remaining areas of assigned duties.

2. Normal Increment. To receive a normal increment, normal performance or above normal performance in all areas of assigned duties is required. See Section 10.110.3.b in the CBA for additional information.

3. 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 10.110.3.c of the CBA. Failure to submit an IPR for evaluation by a faculty member, when required (see CBA 10.210, 10.220), is grounds for a less-than-normal increment.
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.

VI. EVALUATION OF TENURABLE, PARTIAL FTE APPOINTEES

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. According to section 10.110.3.c of the CBA, performance is to be evaluated consistent with workload assignment. 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 regularly evaluated above the mid-point on quantitative student evaluations, appropriate and competent participation in student advising/mentoring, 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/mentoring) 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.

VII. EVALUATION OF NON-TENURABLE APPOINTEES

Non-tenurable appointees shall be evaluated according to the standards in Section V: 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 350, 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 lecturers and adjuncts shall be based upon the procedures and categories described in UM Policy 350 (as revised 10/13/2017). Evaluation 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.

*Outstanding Performance Award 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.2 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 and learning, scholarship, 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.

**VIII. RETENTION/NON-RETENTION**

As per the CBA, 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 and/or Provost.

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).

**IV. EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

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

- Submission of Individual Performance Record (IPR) — including course evaluation summaries
A. Individual Performance Record

By October 15, each faculty member shall submit to the Faculty Evaluation Committee an Individual Performance Record (IPR) documenting evidence of performance in teaching, research and service. Examples of past IPRs 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. Upon request, a faculty member being evaluated shall be permitted to personally address the committee regarding their evaluation.

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 10.230 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 for all courses taught during the academic year, and may seek or receive additional evidence from students who have taken courses or been advisees of the faculty member.

According to Section 10.235 of the CBA, “The absence of Student Evaluation Committee participation shall not be regarded as a defect in the evaluation process. The sole intent of this section is to allow the evaluation process to proceed in the event the SEC has not exercised its role in the process within the specified deadlines. Units and faculty members may not exempt themselves from the requirement to have student evaluation committee participation in the evaluation process. This section pertains only to those instances where a Student Evaluation Committee has failed to act within the stipulated deadlines.”

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, appointed by the FEC Chair, will serve as observer on the FEC with full rights of participation but no right to vote.

Following the procedures outlined in Section 10.240 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 III and IV of this
document, and must include a specific recommendation in the appropriate categories in Section
IV and/or V. 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 of the College of Humanities and Sciences.
All FEC recommendations will be determined by majority vote. A faculty member is required to
excuse themselves from the final deliberations and voting on their own recommendation
and/or deliberations involving a person with whom a conflict of interest exists as defined in
Section 10.310 in the CBA. 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 and the Dean of
the College of Humanities 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 10.250 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. (The merit list will be ranked in order of priority for the
Dean of H&S unless the Department Chair gives reasons for not doing so.) The Chair's
recommendations shall be signed by the faculty member involved to attest that the faculty
member has read it. The recommendations and materials shall be forwarded to the Dean,
College of Humanities 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 Sections 10.250 and 10.270 of the CBA.
Department of Communication Studies Unit Standards

605 Approved by COMM faculty September 30, 2019