

## **Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences (HESP) Department guidelines for promotion and tenure decisions: Tenure Track faculty**

In addition to the UMD Policy and Guidelines, the Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences has developed its own Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Decisions. All tenure-track and tenured faculty shall be provided a copy of these Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Decisions upon appointment and/or whenever the guidelines are revised. Upon appointment, the Chair shall discuss the criteria for appointment with the faculty member.

### *General Departmental Philosophy*

The role of a faculty member in a large state university is quite broad and encompasses a range of diverse activities. Three important areas, scholarship, teaching, and service, are identified as predominant activities of the faculty. Excellence in each of these requires a sizeable amount of time and effort and each should be thoroughly evaluated.

Although scholarship, teaching and service are all valued faculty activities, the area of scholarly activity is emphasized, and is viewed as particularly important. It is widely acknowledged that a commitment to scholarship is a distinctive feature of the University and of its faculty, and that faculty contributions to service and teaching are enriched to the extent that research activities contribute to them, or that research may derive a scholarly contribution from them. Teaching and service are also important aspects of our University functions. They contribute to the educational and service missions of the University and permit the application of research ideas.

These Guidelines represent the results of departmental efforts to address directly the multiple problems confronting both the faculty who make the promotion decision and the candidate about whom the decision is being made. It is exceedingly important that the review process be orderly, equitable and uniform while, at the same time, responsive to individual differences. We believe that these objectives and the means to implement them are fulfilled by these Guidelines.

In addition, we recognize that decisions about promotion in a department reflect the programmatic priorities of a department. These priorities should be evident in the ongoing activities of the department, and should not be evidenced solely during the appointment, promotion and tenure process. In no case will programmatic considerations affecting a particular candidate be changed following the first renewal of the faculty contract of a candidate. The following sections of the report define scholarship, teaching and service activities, how they are evaluated, and how these evaluations are integrated into a set of procedures for making decisions about promotion and tenure.

## *Expectations for promotion to the ranks of associate and full professor in HESP*

### *Summary of criteria for promotion and tenure to the rank of Associate Professor*

The University APT Policy states that the minimum qualifications for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor include a high level of competence in teaching and advisement in the relevant academic field, demonstrated significant research or scholarship with promise of continued productivity, competence to direct work of major subdivisions of the primary academic unit and to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research, and service to the campus, profession, or community. Thus, factors considered in tenure and promotion fall into three general categories: 1) Research and scholarship; 2) Teaching and mentoring; and 3) Professional service. Candidates are judged both on their level of productivity and the quality of their work in these areas.

#### 1. Research and scholarship

The candidate should show evidence of an active research program. The primary evidence of scholarly research is publication of research results in highly ranked, peer-reviewed journals. Authorship should reflect a high level of contribution by the candidate. *Additional* evidence of research productivity and scholarship may be shown by:

- Peer recognition, as evidenced by citation rates in the Social Sciences Citation Index, Web of Science, or Google Scholar
- Rankings of peer-reviewed publication outlets in which the candidate's publications appear, including published journal impact factors, journal rankings by the HESP Department and other measures (h-index, eigen factor, etc).
- Publication of book chapters in prestigious edited volumes or handbooks
- Evidence of the ability to work independently or to take leadership in publication and presentation of research
- Presentation of results at national conferences
- Demonstration of national recognition for work in a specific area of research
- Development of an externally-funded research program (e.g., submission of grants to external agencies or grants awarded by external agencies)

#### 2. Teaching and mentoring

The candidate should show establishment of the foundations of a successful teaching and mentoring program, with strong evidence of potential to excel in the following areas:

- Classroom instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Mentoring, advising and supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, as appropriate, in different professional activities
- Participation on thesis and dissertation committees

### 3. Service

The candidate should show involvement in service activities that have potential to positively impact the Department's programs, as well as service to the profession. Appropriate activities include those listed in Table 1. Among the most important are:

- Professional service:
  - Service to professional societies
  - Service on editorial boards
  - Ad hoc reviewing of articles or conference proposals
  - Review of federal grant proposals
  - Participation on national, regional or state commissions or panels
- University service may include service provided to the Department, the College, interdisciplinary campus programs (e.g., NACS, C-CEBH), the University and/or the state and local community.

### *Summary of criteria for promotion and tenure to the rank of Professor*

The University APT Policy states that in addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, candidates seeking appointment to the rank of Professor shall have established a national and international reputation for outstanding research and scholarship, a distinguished record of teaching, and relevant and effective professional service. Thus, factors considered in tenure and promotion to this rank fall into the same three general areas delineated for that of the Associate Professor, but with increasing emphasis on the productivity and achievements commensurate with promotion to this highest rank conferred by the University. These additional expectations include the following:

#### Research and scholarship:

The candidate should show demonstrated and significant research productivity and impact on the field with excellence in the following areas:

- International recognition for a specific area of research
- Evidence of primary contribution to published research results in major, peer-reviewed journals as ranked by the Department
- Additional research contributions might include:
  - Publication of books or book chapters
  - Presentation of research results at national and international conferences, including invited addresses
  - Participation in externally funded research
  - Recognition by peers, as evidenced by citation rates and other impact indices, such as honors and awards.

#### Teaching and mentoring:

The candidate should show establishment of a successful teaching and mentoring program, with strong evidence of excellence in the following areas:

- Classroom instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels

- Supervision of completed MA., AuD and PhD theses and dissertations
- Dissemination of mentored student research via publication and presentation
- Recognition of student achievement via awards and other honors
- Successful placement of graduate students in positions relevant to their degrees
- Participation on thesis and dissertation committees
- Mentoring of junior faculty

#### Service:

The candidate should show involvement and leadership in service to both the profession and the University. Examples of potential contributions might include:

##### Professional service:

- Elected or appointed office in international, national or state professional organizations
- Editorships of highly-ranked, peer-reviewed journals
- Membership on editorial boards of such journals
- Participation on international or national panels or commissions, including funding or policy-recommending groups

University service should include leadership roles in Department, College, Interdisciplinary and University programs.

### *Further guidance to candidates for tenure and promotion: definitions of scholarship, teaching and service*

#### Evaluation of scholarly activity

Universities are known, not just for the dissemination of knowledge, but for the generation of knowledge. Aspects of productive scholarship inevitably permeate teaching and service activities. The interrelationships that exist among these areas are of inestimable benefit to students, faculty and the University.

An active commitment to scholarship will be strongly emphasized as the most important endeavor and unique resource of University faculty and, therefore, the most important criterion in evaluation for promotion. It must be recognized that there are many models of scholarship, and thus many acceptable patterns of research activity. Such endeavors could range from laboratory studies of basic behavioral or electrophysiological processes, to applied and clinical research involving diverse populations. Such diverse activities all contribute to the breadth and quality of the Department, and the value of diversity in research topics and methods must be incorporated into the criteria used to evaluate the results of these efforts.

Some faculty may elect to engage in professional activities that do not typically result in publishable work, but individuals pursuing such paths should realize in advance that ordinarily these activities will not facilitate favorable promotion and tenure decisions.

Accordingly, individuals who choose such career paths should be prepared to document their cases thoroughly in light of these guidelines.

In evaluating a faculty member's research contributions, the main focus should be on quality, rather than quantity of publications as a measure of suitability for tenure and promotion. An emphasis on quality demands specifiable criteria by which such an assessment can be conducted. These are given in greater detail below. Numerical specifications are not included in the formal portions of the guidelines. However, the absence of an index defining an adequate number of publications does not and should not be interpreted as a de-emphasis on the obvious importance of continued productivity. It is likely that some quantitative measure of research productivity will be employed. However, the sheer number of publications is neither a good measure nor a good predictor of tenure or promotion decisions.

The candidate's appointed Review Committee has the responsibility to provide information concerning the quality of a candidate's scholarly activity. The members of this committee must engage in extensive analysis of the candidate's work and should seek additional evaluative input from other members of the candidate's specialty area concerning the quality of the candidate's research contributions. The Evaluation Report of the candidate's Review Committee plays a critical role in decisions pertaining to promotion and tenure. Specific points to be incorporated into this report are given below. It is critical that the report be an integrative review and evaluation of the candidate's research activity. The candidate's Review Committee should construct both a Descriptive Report and an Evaluative Report that contain specific and adequate documentation.

The Review Committee should consider the following specific points in evaluating the candidate's research contributions:

- a) Have the candidate's publications contributed (or will they be likely to contribute) significantly to the knowledge base in the candidate's discipline, and to further scholarship?
- b) Is the candidate's research published in refereed journals held to be of high quality by the Department and the discipline?
- c) If extensively collaborative, what have been the candidate's specific contributions to the research being evaluated?
- d) Were the research approaches adequate to answer the questions being raised?
- e) Were the statistical analyses appropriate and the conclusions justifiable?

Other measures and/or more objective guidelines should be consulted and incorporated into the report if available and appropriate (e.g., the number and nature of citations in textbooks and journal articles, and as measured by the Citation Index, etc.).

The specific research activities listed below are to be included in assessing the quality of the candidate's scholarship during the review stage:

- a. Scientific Activities
  - i. Published articles in peer-reviewed journals (e.g., empirical or theoretical articles or scholarly reviews; models for training or therapy, case studies)
  - ii. Accepted/in-press articles in peer-reviewed journals
  - iii. Funded grants and contracts (e.g., basic and applied research, clinical or training grants, both internal and externally funded)
  - iv. Book chapters or textbooks
  - v. Books written or edited
  - vi. Unpublished papers selected by peer review for presentation at conferences or conventions
  - vii. Papers currently in submission and under review
  - viii. Ongoing research activity
  
- b. Professional Activities Related to Scholarship
  - i. Editorial board memberships, regular editorial reviewing, or review activities on an ad hoc basis
  - ii. Membership on grant review committees, or ad hoc grant reviewing
  - iii. Conference organization activities, or membership on review committees for conferences
  - iv. Book reviews
  - v. Colloquia and invited addresses

### Evaluation of Teaching

Classroom teaching and the supervision of student research activities are central facets of the University faculty member's role. The relationship between teaching and research is clear for a University faculty member: We educate our students to understand the research ideas central to our discipline, and, at the graduate level in particular, we strive to produce the future generation of research scholars.

Teaching is a multidimensional activity, and therefore there are numerous facets of the activity that may be considered when it is being evaluated. A good teacher may be able to excite otherwise indifferent students, stimulate their interest in a discipline, and get them to do their best work. A good teacher may present information and organize a course in a manner that facilitates learning and attention. A good teacher may teach students to think. A good teacher may be able to shape talented students into productive scholars. A good

teacher may be highly effective in small classes or in one-to-one teaching situations. The fruits of a good teacher's efforts may be apparent immediately or they may take a relatively long time to become evident. Good teaching may be inferred from content learned and/or ideas developed by students.

A great teacher demonstrates many of these characteristics much of the time. A good teacher demonstrates some of them. An average teacher displays one or two of these characteristics frequently, or many of them irregularly. A poor teacher is one who is rarely performing well on any of these dimensions.

How should a candidate's teaching skills be evaluated? The university relies on the campus-wide standardized course evaluations collected for a faculty member over the last five years. In addition, an evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching, advising, and mentoring activities are made at the time of review. Detailed analyses and student comments from the standardized course evaluations are included in these assessments.

Faculty members are encouraged to submit a teaching portfolio to aid the process of teaching evaluation. The teaching portfolio typically includes the following materials:

- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Course syllabi, sample notes, assignments, exams and other materials which can allow assessment of teaching excellence
- Documentation of the candidate's teaching excellence, as determined by College or Departmental Teaching Committee correspondence or awards, or by student or peer testimonial
- Evidence of effective learning by the candidate's students, such as may be shown by student performance on learning outcome assessments. Candidates should document their teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. At the graduate level, candidates should be prepared to present data regarding their contributions to graduate theses, dissertations and comprehensive examination committees. Candidates may wish to include numbers of publications or presentations with students as one index of faculty effectiveness, as well as document the progress of their students after they leave the University.

An additional method to evaluate a faculty member's teaching is through peer evaluation. Colleagues' opinions are normally solicited each semester, such that there is a record of systematic class visitations by the faculty member's peers in their home department, during the last five years.

Each faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure should facilitate evaluation of teaching by supplying performance evaluation documents. The Initial Review Committee will be required to integrate all information on the candidate's teaching performance, and submit a report that is informative, evaluative and factually based. The

report should summarize the candidate's performance on as many relevant teaching dimensions as possible, using the listings contained in this section as a guideline.

As in the case of research, it is important for the Department to set explicit goals for faculty regarding teaching, and to provide both feedback and opportunities sufficient to aid faculty members in meeting departmental expectations well before promotion and tenure decisions are to be made. Typically, this feedback will occur during the annual review.

### Evaluation of service activities

Service contributions are an important aspect of a faculty member's role. Service is essential to the ongoing functions of the Department and, in addition, is related to the department's visibility in the University, community, and profession. Faculty service activities are integral to the governance and operation of the department. Thus, service is seen as an asset to the larger community on whom the Department's continued support is based. Some of the forms that faculty service may take are listed in Table 1.

While service is an essential facet of the faculty member's role that should be evaluated in the review process, in the recent past no faculty member has been granted tenure and/or promotion on the basis of service alone. Consequently, each faculty member must make choices about an appropriate balance between service contributions and other requirements of the faculty role.

Service activities may be categorized into three types: (a) Department and University service; (b) service to the community; (c) service to the profession. Service to the University and to the Department may consist of active participation on administrative committees, directing or administering programs, or working with student organizations, to mention just a few (see Table 1). Service is expected of every faculty member. Failure to meet minimal expectations as well as unusually productive contributions should be noted and considered in the review process.

The inclusion of service contributions in the faculty evaluation process is predicated on the idea that faculty members bring specific skills - conceptual, theoretical, and scholarly - to a service situation. Service contributions are of value especially when they involve students in a training capacity and/or have as an outcome some scholarly product. Thus, service contributions will be given recognition to the extent that they include training and evaluation as integral components of the activities. Value is attached to combining scholarship, service and teaching but recognition may also be given to activities in which emphasis is given to only one of these areas.

Faculty service must be amenable to peer judgment if it is to be considered in promotion and tenure decisions. If service is to be considered in promotion and tenure decisions, it is up to the faculty member under review to provide adequate documentation of this work. Candidates may wish to offer outside letters of evaluation and support, peer recognition of Department and University service activities, or other forms of evaluation.



The role of the candidate's Review Committee in evaluating service is to delineate how the candidate views his or her service activities as extensions of an academic career, and to evaluate the extent and quality of the candidate's service contributions. In preparing their report, the candidate's Review Committee should describe what the candidate has done, how the candidate's service has been evaluated, and the committee's own evaluation of those activities.

### *Examples of Service Contributions for HESP Faculty*

#### Service to the Department and University

- Active participation on Departmental, College, University and System Committees
- Administration of a department or special area program
- Administrative work related to undergraduate program (advising)
- Assisting with student recruitment, orientation and advising
- Organizing colloquia
- Developing and running departmentally-sponsored workshops, conferences, etc.
- Provision of clinical services to the campus community
- Active participation in inter-departmental activities and initiatives (e.g., NACS, CEBH, etc.)
- Serving as mentor to junior faculty

#### Service to the Community

- Provision of clinical services
- Technical consultation to community groups and agencies (educational, legislative, judicial)
- Provision of program development/program evaluation services
- Assistance to government and planning agencies in implementation of research findings
- Dissemination of information on speech, language and hearing to lay audiences (e.g., radio, newspapers, magazines, television, educational and consumer groups such as P.T.A., schools)

#### Service to the Profession

- Reviewing manuscripts, texts, and programs
- Reviewing federal grant applications
- Invited presentations before professional groups
- Organizing national or regional professional conferences
- Chairing or organizing panels or symposia for professionals
- Holding offices in national or regional professional organizations
- Service on committees of national or regional professional organizations
- Service as a consultant or advisor to national or regional professional organizations
- Consulting with local, state, national, international governmental agencies (e.g., grant reviews, policy committees)