

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines for Faculty
Department of Communication Sciences and Special Education

Revised and Approved by the Departmental Faculty May 28, 2015

I. Introduction

The Department of Communication Sciences and Special Education (the “department”) adheres to all College and University policies and procedures for the appointment, development, support, promotion, and tenure of faculty members, including in particular the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure* and the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Clinical Faculty*. (“*Guidelines*” as used below refers to the appropriate one of these two documents for the faculty member in question.) The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University’s *Guidelines*, as those *Guidelines* require. All faculty members are expected to be familiar with both this document and with the University *Guidelines* document or documents relevant to their position. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found within this document or between this document and the University *Guidelines*, or if this document does not address any necessary issue, the University’s *Guidelines* will supersede this document.

These departmental criteria were shaped, in part, by the unique nature of this department. Specifically, the mission of the Department of Communication Sciences and Special Education (“CSSE”) at the University of Georgia, and therefore the task of the faculty, is to advance discipline-specific and interdisciplinary knowledge and practice for the many specialty areas that comprise communication sciences, communication disorders, special education, American Sign Language, and related disciplines and professions. Within and across these areas of specialization, faculty members are expected to contribute to the group’s efforts to

- (1) create, communicate, apply, and evaluate new knowledge in ways that influence our disciplines and professions;
- (2) prepare scholars, researchers, educators, clinicians, and other professionals to meet the needs of our global society; and
- (3) engage in outreach initiatives with matters related to the local community, the state, the nation, and the world.

Philosophically, the faculty in CSSE is dedicated to the mission of improving research-based theory and practice and using those as our foundation to prepare future professionals. In addition, the faculty aspires to achieve state, national, and international eminence for excellence in education, research, and service. We value individual effort, collaborative effort, and the contributions that every individual can make to his or her society given appropriate resources and support. We value both high-quality science that generates new knowledge and the best possible applications of current knowledge, we

seek to share our expertise with those who can benefit from it, and we value building toward a better future for our own community and beyond. These mission and value statements shape our actions and our expectations of ourselves, as defined in further detail in the following sections.

II. Appointment

In all matters relating to appointment of new faculty members, the department will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the University *Guidelines* and will follow the time-tables, deadlines, and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education or by the University.

Upon appointment, the department head will provide the faculty member with a copy of the relevant University of Georgia *Guidelines*, as well as a copy of these CSSE departmental guidelines. The department head will discuss with each new faculty member both documents. The new faculty member's budgeted and assigned workload for the first year in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service will be agreed upon by the faculty member, the department head, and the relevant program coordinator. Thereafter, each new faculty member will be required to participate in all of the following activities.

III. Mentorship, Annual Evaluations, and Third-Year Reviews

III.A. Mentorship Toward Promotion and/or Tenure

The department head will assist new faculty members to develop and engage in mentorship activities or relationships with senior faculty within or beyond the department. The goal of this mentorship is to help faculty members to understand fully the promotion and tenure processes and requirements. The structure of mentorship will be determined individually for each faculty member. At a minimum, it will include annual conversations with the department head and with one other person about the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate. These conversations or activities are to be in addition to the conversation with the department head that will occur as part of the annual evaluation (see immediately below).

III.B. Annual Evaluation

Every faculty member in the department will receive a written annual evaluation conducted according to the criteria presented in this document and the University criteria. The department head will present the faculty member with a written report that summarizes the individual's performance with respect to budgeted time and with respect to the relevant departmental criteria specified in Sections IV and V. Annual evaluations for faculty members who will be seeking any promotion or seeking tenure in the future will also provide the faculty member with clear information about progress toward meeting the relevant criteria during the specific year being reviewed and also about the

accumulating full record of accomplishments across more than one year. As part of this assessment of the accumulating full record, candidates who will be seeking promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure and who have assigned time in research will be provided with specific information each year about their progress toward meeting both the research productivity requirements in Section IV.A.2. and the separate research trajectory requirements in Section V.C.

III.C. Third-Year Review

Every faculty member in the department will receive a written third-year review conducted according to the criteria presented in this document and the University criteria. Procedures and timelines for the third-year review will be as specified by the College of Education and the University. The third-year review will evaluate and summarize the individual's performance with respect to budgeted time and with respect to the relevant departmental criteria specified in Sections IV and V. Third-year reviews will provide the faculty member with specific and clear information about progress toward meeting or not meeting the departmental and university criteria for promotion and, if relevant, for tenure, and will provide specific and clear recommendations about goals for future performance based on the departmental criteria in Sections IV and V.

IV. Promotion

In all matters relating to promotion of faculty members from any present rank to any higher rank, the department will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the University *Guidelines* and will follow the time-tables, deadlines, and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education or by the University. The requirements and criteria provided in this section are intended to serve as the discipline-specific criteria against which all candidates for promotion will be evaluated. The Clinical Appointment and Promotion Unit for CSSE clinical faculty members is the combination of tenure-track and clinical faculty in the department (i.e., Option B, page 4, *Clinical Guidelines*).

IV.A. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor or to the Rank of Clinical Associate Professor

As stated in the University *Guidelines*, candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor must “show clear and convincing evidence of excellence and emerging stature as regional or national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level.” Similarly, candidates seeking promotion to Clinical Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate “excellence in clinical competency and should at minimum be recognized at the regional level as an authority within a practice specialty based on documented excellence in patient care, student instruction, scholarly activities, professional leadership, practice and/or service as related to the position.” To clarify these requirements at the department level, the faculty in CSSE has defined the following indicators as clear and convincing evidence of excellence for all candidates for promotion

to either Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor. All of the following criteria are intended to refer to full-time (9 month or 12 month) faculty members and should be appropriately adjusted for part-time faculty.

IV.A.1. Excellence in Teaching

The department is aware that student evaluations are incomplete and are often problematic as measures of instructional quality. Many of our students, however, are experts in teaching or clinical instructional methods themselves, or for other reasons are relatively highly qualified to be able to provide informed and useful evaluations of teaching excellence, especially as related to their own learning and to their perceptions of the learning environment and opportunities provided by faculty members. Therefore, the departmental criteria for teaching excellence are based on student evaluations, with the possibility of additional measures if necessary.

For faculty members who have had assigned time in classroom, academic, or didactic teaching, excellence at the point of promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor is defined as student course evaluation means of 4.00 or better, on the 5-point scale where 5.0 is positive that is typically used in the College of Education, for each course taught during the 2 academic years and the intervening summer preceding the completion of an application for promotion, ending with and including a spring semester.

For faculty members who have had assigned time as supervisors of students in teaching practicum, clinical practicum, student teaching, internship, or similar assignments, excellence at the point of promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor is defined as student supervisor or course evaluation means of 4.00 or better, on the 5-point scale where 5.0 is positive that is typically used in the College of Education or on the clinical supervision rating instrument typically used by master's students in the speech-language pathology program, or the equivalent on any similar instrument, for each semester of supervision during the 2 academic years and the intervening summer preceding the completion of an application for promotion, ending with and including a spring semester.

If a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor has had assigned time in instruction and does not meet these criteria, the voting faculty may also judge excellence in teaching to have been demonstrated alternatively through the data provided in the curriculum vita and "Evidence of Contributions" document. This alternative demonstration of teaching excellence will require evidence that the candidate has attempted to develop his or her teaching or supervision abilities and must include student evaluations, peer review of teaching or supervision, records of having completed some instructional improvement or development program or activity as these relate to instruction or supervision, and the faculty member's written reflection about his or her attempts to adhere to best practices in teaching or supervision.

IV.A.2. Excellence in Research

In general, for the disciplines represented in this department, research results are typically distributed through peer-reviewed research articles completed by individuals or collaborative teams of approximately two to six persons. Other forms of scholarship may be more appropriate for individual faculty members, but in the absence of any compelling reason to the contrary, candidates will be expected to satisfy the following departmental requirements.

For faculty members who have had assigned time in research, excellence at the point of promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor is defined as a record that includes both

- (a) a total of at least eight peer-reviewed scholarly articles in print or in press that meet the additional requirements immediately below, and*
- (b) a record of having participated in the preparation and submission of at least two internal or external proposals for research funding.*

Further, the candidate's publication record at the time of the departmental vote should include, within the total of at least eight articles, all of the following:

- (c) at least four peer-reviewed scholarly articles in print or in press that present the new results of original research that required gathering new data from human participants;*
- (d) at least four peer-reviewed scholarly articles in print or in press for which the candidate for promotion was the sole or senior author;*
- (e) at least four peer-reviewed scholarly articles in print or in press that a majority of the voting faculty interpret as reflecting a coherent research focus; and*
- (f) at least two peer-reviewed scholarly articles in print or in press in journals that a majority of the voting faculty interpret as among the highly regarded journals in the candidate's field, with the candidate's remaining publications primarily in journals that a majority of the voting faculty interpret as at least respectable, mainstream venues for the discipline.*

These criteria for excellence in research are intended to refer to a candidate who has spent 4-5 years at the assistant-level rank and who has been assigned .375 EFT (50% time during the academic year) in research. Criteria should be appropriately adjusted to evaluate the contributions of a faculty member who has had greater or lesser EFT in research, but this flexibility is not to be interpreted in terms that create more stringent requirements for faculty members whose probationary period toward tenure has been extended by full calendar years. Publications completed before the faculty member was employed at the University of Georgia are relevant and will be counted as part of the faculty member's complete body of work. These criteria are also to be interpreted such that a total of eight publications is sufficient to satisfy all of criteria *c* through *f*; that is, any one publication can be used to satisfy more than one of criteria *c* through *f*. There is no expectation that the research funding proposals will necessarily have been funded; the

expectation is that the faculty member will have completed, or completed with colleagues, at least two proposals.

If a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor has had assigned time in research and does not meet these criteria, the voting faculty may also judge excellence in research to have been demonstrated alternatively through the data provided in the candidate's curriculum vitae and "Evidence of Contributions" document. This alternative demonstration of research excellence will require evidence that the lack of peer-reviewed articles, the lack of peer-reviewed articles that meet criteria *c* through *f*, and/or the lack of funding proposals as described above has been balanced in the particular case by other major demonstrable research products (e.g., published books or submission as Principal Investigator of a large federal research grant proposal), by specific characteristics of the research that justify the reduced number of products (e.g., longitudinal or exceptionally time consuming research or analysis methods), or by reduced assigned time in research.

IV.A.3. Excellence in Service

For faculty members who have had assigned time in service, excellence at the point of promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor is defined as having completed the assigned tasks in an exemplary manner and to the high satisfaction of those who were meant to be served.

Relevant measures of satisfaction for this criterion include but are not limited to client satisfaction surveys from clients or families, if the service assignment was direct clinical or educational service provision; evaluations from school district personnel, if the service assignment was in public schools; or the professional judgment of colleagues, if the service assignment included program coordination or management.

IV.A.4. Stature as an Authority

"Emerging stature as regional or national authorities" at the point of promotion to Associate Professor, and "recognized at the regional level as an authority" at the point of promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, are both defined for this department as requiring and including professional contributions, invitations, and recognitions beyond those that can be described as minimally expected within the faculty member's areas of work assignments. These are to be both within and beyond the department; they are to have been both volunteered by the faculty member and requested by others; and they are to have influenced the department, the institution, and the profession, either regionally or nationally.

Thus, recognition as an authority for promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor requires all of the following:

- (a) attended and made substantive contributions to relevant meetings of the entire department;*
- (b) attended and made substantive contributions to relevant meetings of academic program area faculty, and contributed to the completion of related required tasks for that academic program area;*
- (c) served as the elected or appointed member of at least two departmental (or college or university) committees other than those related to academic program needs;*
- (d) has been invited by professionals other than the candidate's own colleagues or students to provide information or to judge other professionals' work; and*
- (e) has been depended on, used, cited, or referred to as an expert by professionals other than the candidate's own colleagues or students.*

Criteria *d* and *e* must be met at the regional or national (or international) level unless it is clear that the candidate's assignments and expertise are intended to be at a more local or state level. Relevant evidence for these criteria may come in the form of invitations to provide professional learning experiences or continuing education experiences for professionals; in the form of invitations to present the faculty member's work, to write or contribute to a collection of writings, or to review or edit other persons' work; in the form of appointment or election to committees external to the university; in the form of citation analyses or other evidence of adoption of the candidate's work; in the form of comments from external reviewers that the reviewer is aware of the candidate's work or reputation; or in other ways relevant to the faculty member's assignments and area of expertise.

IV.B. Promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer

The ranks of Professor, Clinical Professor, and Senior Lecturer all represent the highest level of attainment for faculty. Therefore, as stated in the University guidelines, candidates wishing promotion to Professor must "show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. Unless the candidate's assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature." Similarly, candidates for promotion to Clinical Professor "should demonstrate excellence in clinical competency and should be recognized at the national level as an authority within a practice specialty based on documented excellence in patient care, student instruction, scholarly activities, professional leadership, practice and/or service as related to the position. In addition, candidates should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline." University requirements for the rank of Senior Lecturer also set a very high standard: "Promotion to Senior Lecturer...requires...exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the university."

To clarify these requirements at the department level, the faculty in CSSE has defined the following indicators as clear and convincing evidence of the high levels of attainment,

national or international recognition, and superior performance that are expected of all candidates for promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer. All of the following criteria are intended to refer to full-time (9 month or 12 month) faculty members and should be appropriately adjusted for part-time faculty.

IV.B.1. High Attainment or Exceptional Ability in Teaching

The following standards apply to applicants who have had any assigned time in teaching and are to be interpreted and applied in proportion to that assigned time.

Candidates for promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer will have maintained the steady record of student evaluations at 4.0 or better (on 5-point scales where 5.0 is positive) described above in Section IV.A.1.

In addition, candidates for promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer will provide evidence of having developed, extended, maintained, and/or obtained financial support for instructional programs in a manner that demonstrates leadership in the area of teaching. This standard reflects the department's belief that the highest levels of attainment in teaching cannot be reflected solely in teaching individual courses but must be reflected in contributions to collaborative or program-level development and continuing support of programs of instruction.

Candidates who do not meet these standards may be judged on the basis of other evidence to have demonstrated the “high attainment” or “exceptional teaching ability” required for promotion to these ranks, as also described in Section IV.A.1.

IV.B.2. High Attainment or Exceptional Ability in Research

The following standards apply to candidates who have had any assigned time in research and are to be interpreted and applied in proportion to that assigned time.

Candidates for promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer will have maintained a steady record of publications that continues to reflect consistent quantity, quality, and impact on the field, as appropriate for their assignments and assigned time, and reflecting the types of variables described in Section IV.A.2.

In addition, candidates for promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer will provide evidence of having developed, extended, maintained, and/or obtained financial support for organized research programs in a manner that demonstrates leadership in the area of research. This standard reflects the department's belief that the highest levels of attainment in research cannot be reflected solely in the completion of individual projects or publications but must

be reflected in the development, management, and financial support of coherent, organized, and ongoing programs of research.

IV.B.3. High Attainment or Exceptional Ability in Service, including Patient Care, Professional Leadership, Practice, and/or Service

Budgeted or assigned time in “service” in this department can include a wide variety of assignments, ranging from direct clinical patient care to coordination of instructional or service programs within the department to state or national level policy work. Regardless of the specific assignments, candidates for promotion to the highest faculty ranks who have had assigned time in service are expected to demonstrate, in a manner commensurate with their assigned time, the highest levels of achievement and leadership.

For faculty members who have had assigned time in the budget category referred to as “service,” high attainment at the point of promotion to Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer is defined as having developed, extended, maintained, and/or obtained financial support for service programs in a manner that demonstrates leadership in the area of service and in a manner that has changed how that service is provided for relevant groups of people. This standard reflects the department’s belief that the highest levels of attainment in service cannot be reflected solely in the completion of individual projects or assignments but must be reflected in the faculty member’s larger contributions to the development, ongoing successful management, and continuing improvement of coherent, organized, and ongoing service or outreach programs.

Relevant measures of satisfaction for this criterion include but are not limited to client satisfaction surveys from clients or families, if the service assignment was direct clinical or educational service provision; evaluations from school district personnel, if the service assignment was in public schools; or the professional judgment of colleagues, if the service assignment included program coordination or management.

IV.B.4. National or International Recognition

Candidates for promotion to Professor or Clinical Professor must be routinely sought out, depended upon, cited, and/or referred to as experts in their fields. The form and scope of this evidence will vary with the faculty member’s assignments in academic instruction, clinical instruction, clinical service delivery, research, etc. In addition, the department explicitly acknowledges, recognizes, and accepts that persons in the “Clinical” faculty line, through the nature of their assignments, may have had primarily local or regional impact, rather than national. This variation is expected and allowed within the University *Guidelines*, and candidates for Clinical Professor who are recognized regionally as having developed or improved systems for instruction, patient care, cooperation with local school districts, or other relevant activities will be considered to have met the

requirements for “recognition.” Thus, the requirements for recognition for this department include the following.

Regardless of the faculty member’s assignments, candidates seeking promotion to Professor or Clinical Professor are responsible for providing evidence that shows a steady or increasing pattern of routine and meaningful ways in which their contributions have been sought out, used, adopted, adapted, or evaluated by other professionals or by the public. In addition, specifically, candidates for Professor who have had assigned time in research are required to demonstrate national or international recognition, adoption, and citation of their research. Examples of possible types of evidence are provided in Section IV.A.4., above, and include citation analyses, invitations, and related work.

In addition to the evidence that can be provided by the faculty member, it is also expected and required that external review letters will confirm the candidate’s reputation within a relevant realm, group, or area and will also confirm the positive impact of the candidate’s work on the profession or the discipline or in relevant specific applications.

V. Tenure

In all matters relating to the tenure of faculty members, the department will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the University *Guidelines* and will follow the timetables, deadlines, and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education or by the University. The requirements and criteria provided in this section are intended to serve as the discipline-specific criteria against which all candidates for tenure will be evaluated.

The department interprets the criteria for Tenure as described in the University *Guidelines* in terms of the following three requirements.

V.A. Exemplary Performance

The University *Guidelines* specify that candidates for tenure will have a record of “exemplary performance in the discharge of their primary responsibilities” in teaching, research, and/or service. This requirement will be considered met within this department for candidates who meet the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, as relevant to their rank or intended rank, as described above in Section IV.

V.B. Continuing and Long-Range Need

The University *Guidelines* specify that a “fundamental consideration” with respect to tenure must be “the University’s continuing and long-range need for what the candidate for tenure may be expected to do.” This requirement will be considered met within this

department for candidates whose work falls within the areas described within our mission and value statements, as described above in Section I.

V.C. Likelihood of Continued Productivity

Finally, the University *Guidelines* specify that “tenure review committees are responsible for considering whether or not candidates are likely to continue to be active and productive scholars over the extended period of time that tenure supposes.” Within the department, this expectation requires substantial evidence that the trajectory of the candidate’s work is toward sustainable and growing creative efforts in instruction, clinical instruction, research, service, or other assigned areas. Evidence of a positive trajectory can be provided by increasing scope of work, development of steadily larger instructional or research programs, receipt of steadily larger external contracts or grants, or in other ways. Departmental tenure review committees will also address this requirement by assessing whether the faculty member’s research accomplishments, in particular, satisfied the research requirements listed in Section IV.A.2. in a manner that shows a trajectory of productivity and professionalism that can reasonably be interpreted as suggesting the future productivity that tenure supposes. It is explicitly possible for a faculty member to meet the research requirements for the rank of Associate Professor listed in Section IV.A.2. and yet not demonstrate a trajectory that predicts future productivity as required for tenure.

VI. History and Procedures for this Document

This document replaces the previous departmental criteria for promotion and tenure, dated 2006, for the following faculty and applications for promotion:

- (a) all faculty hired as of Fall 2015 or later; and
- (b) all promotion applications, regardless of the faculty member’s hire date, forwarded to the college in Fall semester 2018 or later.

For faculty hired before Fall 2015, promotion applications forwarded before Fall semester 2018 will be evaluated using these new criteria, but with the following caveats. Until 2018, if these new criteria would in any way disadvantage a faculty member who has been attempting to satisfy the 2006 criteria, then departmental decisions will be made in 2015, 2016, and 2017 using the 2006 criteria. It is the department head’s responsibility to make this transition clear to all faculty in the department. It is also the department head’s responsibility to make this transition clear to all college- and university-level review committees (e.g., in the department head’s cover letter in the candidate’s dossier and application for promotion, in the Unit Level Criteria provided within the dossier, and in other ways as may be relevant).

This document was initially drafted by a faculty committee that included persons at all ranks (assistant, associate, and full), both tenured and untenured, and from both the “Clinical Professor” line and the “Professor” line. It has been accepted by the faculty within the Department by a majority vote. Any future changes or updates to this

document that originate in the department must be initially drafted by a faculty committee that must include, at a minimum, persons from two different faculty lines (e.g., the clinical professor line, the professor line, and/or the lecturer line, which are the three lines currently represented in the department), at least one person who currently holds the “assistant” level rank in any line, and at least one person who currently holds tenure. All such changes or updates to this document must then be approved by a majority vote of the departmental faculty.

This document must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

All revisions and approval dates will be listed in this section.

Revised and Approved by the Departmental Faculty May 28, 2015