

Department of Communication Studies
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Amended by Faculty April 28, 2015

Preamble

In all matters related promotion and tenure, the Department of Communication Studies will carefully adhere to the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the *University's Guidelines*. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this PTU document and the *University Guidelines*. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the *University's Guidelines* will supersede this document.

In the written annual faculty performance evaluation, the department head will provide advice to faculty below the rank of professor on their progress towards promotion, with specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must do in the areas of research, teaching and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure, if appropriate.

Third-year reviews will carefully adhere to the protocols detailed in the University of Georgia *Guidelines*.

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Communication Studies, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

Excellence in Research

The Department of Communication Studies is made up of faculty representing two research models. Our Interpersonal and Health Communication faculty study communication as social scientists, and our Rhetorical Studies faculty study communication as humanists. These dual approaches are characteristic of the Communication discipline at large. Accordingly, it is necessary that the department's guidelines for assessing scholarship take into account the distinct expectations of these research models.

To do so, the guidelines offer a general set of expectations a candidate should meet for promotion followed by exemplars of the ways in which excellent scholarship can be met. These exemplars are not exhaustive—instead they are meant to educate the reader about disciplinary expectations.

Associate Professor. Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional and national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level.

The primary evidence for emerging status is a consistent pattern of publication in *refereed journal articles* and *scholarly books* published by scholarly presses or publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers. Given the diversity of scholarly traditions and models in the discipline, we evaluate candidates using exemplars utilized at peer institutions.

Exemplar #1: One model has a primary emphasis on research articles.* (A) The expectation is that a candidate publish on average 2 peer-reviewed articles for each probationary year.** Articles of *extraordinary* quality will be given more weight. Of these articles, at least 4 should be first or sole authored. Further, at least 3 should be published in tier one journals. (B) Additional evidence of excellence should be taken from the list below.

Exemplar #2: The second model combines a scholarly book with research articles. (A) Such a book is a work of original scholarship, published by a scholarly press or publishing house that accepts work only after rigorous review and approval by peers;*** and (B) At least 2 solo authored or first-authored articles published in tier one journals.* In a situation in which the book includes previously published work, the case will have to be made that the book represents a substantial revision of previously published work in order for the book to receive maximum credit. (C) Additional evidence of excellence can be taken from the list below.

Exemplar #3: The third model emphasizes directing a competitive intercollegiate debate program. The benchmarks for evaluating promotion in this area can be found in “Status of Standards for Tenure and Promotion in Debate (2010).” (A) The expectations include directing a successful debate program. (B) Corroborating evidence of excellence in program development may include:

- Annual program reviews by experts
- ADA, CEDA or NDT rankings
- A summary of the director’s work as a debate judge
- Program awards
- Appointments to regional, national and international groups involved in facilitating competitive debating
- A summary of efforts to secure financial support for research, programing, and/or outreach and development programs
- Participate in the emerging international debate competitions

(C) In addition, the program director should also publish at least 5 articles** in refereed journals.* At least 2 should be first or sole authored, and at least 1 should be published in a tier one journal. In addition to developing the competitive elements of a debate program, the successful candidate should facilitate public debates and contribute to the debate community.

For the exemplars above, evidence of national excellence will also include:

- Evidence of programmatic research
- Assessment of quality by recognized leaders in the discipline

For the exemplars above, evidence of national excellence will also include a combination of one or more of the following activities that are tailored to the candidate's research program:

- Special fellowships for research or selection for special institutes for advanced study
- National and/or international awards for research
- Scholarly reviews of books written by the candidate
- Quality and quantity of citations and reprints of research publications
- Major funded grant (competitive) when the grant is subject to rigorous peer review and approval. Examples of major grants include such agencies as NIH, CDC, NSH, Pew Foundation, and the Woodruff Foundation
- Renewal or extension of grants
- Guest editing a scholarly journal issue
- Editing a scholarly book
- Scholarly book chapters
- Writing book reviews for journals
- Serving on an editorial board or as an ad hoc reviewer for scholarly journals
- Producing digital scholarly archives
- Invited presentations to learned societies or at other universities
- Peer-reviewed conference papers
- Participation at a scholarly event via the internet
- Invitations to testify before governmental groups concerned with research
- Participation in the emerging international debate competitions
- Appointments as consultants to state, national, and international groups engaged in scholarly endeavors
- Interdisciplinary research and scholarship

*On-line publications count equally with print publications towards satisfying these criteria if they appear in recognized and professionally refereed on-line locations.

**Publications before the probationary period count toward the judgment of scholarly productivity yet are not a substitute for sustained high levels of productivity during the probationary period at the University of Georgia.

***Textbooks count under teaching.

Full Professor. Candidates 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 candidates' assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

Evidence of high levels of attainment and likelihood of maintaining national or international stature will be demonstrated by:

- Evidence of programmatic research
- Assessment of quality by recognized leaders in the discipline

Evidence of high levels of attainment and likelihood of maintaining national or international stature will also include a combination of one or more of the following activities that are tailored to the candidate's research program:

- Peer reviewed journal articles*
- Scholarly books and monographs published by scholarly presses, or publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline
- Edited scholarly book, issue of a scholarly journal, or scholarly anthology
- Production of scholarly digital archives
- Serving as editor of a scholarly journal
- Directing the Debate program: Benchmarks for evaluating promotion in this area can be found in "Status of Standards for Tenure and Promotion in Debate (2010)"
- Review Essays
- Scholarly reviews of publications by the candidate
- Quality and quantity of citations and reprints of the candidate's research publications
- Book chapters (invited or competitively selected)
- Honors and awards for research or other creative activity
- Special research fellowships, visiting appointments or selection at institutes for advanced study
- Invitations to testify before government groups concerned with research
- Appointments as consultants to state, national, and international groups engaged in scholarly endeavors
- Public impact including press coverage
- Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, when these grants and contracts are subject to rigorous peer review and approval
- Continuance or Renewal of Grants and Scholarship Support
- Membership on panels reviewing proposals for grants and contracts
- Election to offices, committee activities, and important service to professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer reviewing as related to research, directing a nationally competitive speech program and other creative activities
- Membership on editorial boards reviewing publications
- National or international association leadership positions
- Appointment or election to important national or international committee membership
- Ad hoc reviewer for journals
- Evidence of graduate and post-doctoral students' scholarly achievements (e.g. publications, awards, grants)

Effectiveness in Teaching

A candidate for associate professor with tenure must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching that is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. A candidate for the rank of professor must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching that is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. In general the quality of instruction may be measured by demonstrated evidence of academic rigor, instructional success, student engagement, and pedagogical creativity. Such evidence can only count toward promotion and tenure if a faculty member is also meeting a baseline of instruction-related responsibilities. These include sharing responsibility for classroom observation of graduate student instructors, advising graduate students and serving on graduate committees as needed.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be based on a variety of information that may include but is not limited to the following:

- Teaching awards
- Written peer evaluations based on classroom observations by other senior departmental faculty
- Course materials: course outlines, syllabi, textbooks authored by faculty, lecture notes, assigned readings, instructional web sites, examinations, course supplements and other class materials
- Written and numerical student evaluations relative to the type of courses taught (these evidences may be interpreted alongside grade distribution data and other evidence of rigor)
- Grants and awards for developing new courses
- Letters from students
- Extracurricular student guidance, such as faculty advisor for the undergraduate student organization, participating in honors conferences, serving as faculty advisor to student groups
- Publications related to instruction*
- Significant curriculum development
- Contribution of non-classroom instruction
- Interdisciplinary teaching and collaboration
- Contributions to international education
- Development of on-line courses
- Teaching on-line courses
- Supervising on-line instruction

Contributions in Service to Society, the University and the Profession

With few exceptions, faculty in the Department of Communication Studies are not budgeted for service. For those not budgeted for service there is an expectation that they will make general service contributions to enhance the operation of the department, institution, and discipline. In rare instances where faculty are budgeted for service, the

service contributions should be consistent with expectations communicated in the faculty member's letter of offer. We adhere to the university guidelines for defining contributions as existing at 3 levels: Service to Society, the University and the Profession. The University's Standard Service to society refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service for purposes of promotion and tenure if the following conditions are met:

- There is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise
- There is a direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns
- The ultimate purpose is for the public or common good
- New knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele
- There is a clear relationship between the activities and the department's mission

Service to the University includes participating in departmental, college and university committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a college representative on a major University committee or task force); and developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional associations and journals; and review of grant applications.

Approved by the University, June 8, 2015