

DIANA R. GARLAND SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK (GSSW)
TENURE GUIDELINES

**Approved by Office of the Provost and GSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee:
October 26, 2021**

Reference:

- 1) BU-PP 704-Policy for tenure at Baylor University
<https://www.baylor.edu/risk/doc.php/339345>
- 2) Tenure Procedures at Baylor University
<https://www.baylor.edu/provost/doc.php/98048.pdf>

I. Scope

These guidelines and procedures apply to tenure-track faculty and specify how the University Tenure Policy (BU-PP 704) and Tenure Procedures are implemented within the GSSW. In the event of any discrepancies between this document and either of those, the university document(s) will prevail.

II. Guidelines

A. Context

A recommendation to the university of appointment to tenure indicates that a tenure candidate demonstrates excellence according to university policies and procedures and GSSW guidelines, and fills a need vital to the GSSW and university mission. The process of tenure review, therefore, takes place in the context of the mission and objectives of the GSSW as well as in response to the qualities of the nominee.

B. GSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee (Committee)

For the purposes of implementing the university tenure policy and procedures and this GSSW guideline and procedure, the GSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee (Committee) refers to the Dean and the tenured faculty members of the GSSW. Senior Lecturers are active on this committee, but do not participate in the tenure review processes.

C. Professional and Personal Conduct

Tenure candidates must observe the standards of the university with particular attention to BUPP-023-Standards of Personal Conduct, BUPP-024-Code of Ethics, and BUPP-031 Sexual Conduct Policy. They conduct themselves in ways that are sensitive to the relationships between the GSSW and the communities it serves. They are expected to be role models to students who combine a quest for intellectual rigor with faithful living and

personal integrity. Tenure candidates demonstrate that they know how to establish and maintain appropriate boundaries and should do so in working with students and colleagues.

III. Evaluation

A. Criteria

Recommendations and actions are based on judgments regarding performance in four major areas of tenure evaluation: 1) teaching; 2) research/scholarship; 3) service to the GSSW, university, profession, community, and church; and 4) collegiality. Each is critical to the GSSW and they warrant separate evaluation. Tenure candidates will establish a program of high quality research/scholarship that reflects the potential for independent, novel, and significant contributions to the social work knowledge base. Effectiveness as a teacher is also necessary but by itself is not a sufficient basis for tenure. To be on the cutting edge of knowledge in the discipline and to be responsible members of the university professoriate, candidates must be actively involved in research/scholarship.

Because of the unique mission of the GSSW, contributions are valued that develop knowledge in the areas of ethical integration of religious faith and social work practice, social work practice in religiously-affiliated organizations and congregations, and the development of resources and models for excellence in professional social work practice that contribute to social justice and the well-being of individuals, families, and communities.

B. Teaching Effectiveness

Baylor University has a long tradition of excellence in teaching that will continue to be an essential requirement for the faculty of the GSSW. Social work practice is based on self-awareness and the capacity to form and maintain meaningful, productive relationships, particularly as evident in the tenure candidate's engagement with students. The following formal methods of evaluation guide the assessment and continuous improvement of teaching effectiveness:

- Self-assessment of teaching effectiveness
- Peer reviews of teaching
- Course evaluations.

Tenure candidates are required to write a Description of Teaching, as prescribed in the Tenure Procedures. The Description of Teaching is a succinct summary of teaching effectiveness, strengths and areas of growth, and a plan for improvement, written with a maximum length of 5 pages.

The GSSW requires tenure candidates to reflect within that document on these three evaluative sources to clearly identify strengths and areas of growth, and to describe how they are building on them as part of their ongoing plan for teaching effectiveness.

1. Self-assessment of teaching effectiveness

Self-assessment is one method for tenure candidates to use in their Description of Teaching. The table below illustrates how different elements of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated through an array of curricular and instructional activities. Neither the elements nor the examples are comprehensive. They are intended to aid in identifying and providing evidence of areas of strength and growth as part of the candidate's self-assessment. In addition, they serve as a framework for all faculty to use in conversations about teaching effectiveness.

In their self-assessment, tenure candidates are expected to demonstrate evidence of their teaching effectiveness in three areas of instructional focus: student-centered, instructor-centered, and course-centered. Tenure candidates provide examples of curricular and instructional activities associated with at least two elements from each of the three areas of focus as illustrated in the table below.

Focus of Teaching Effectiveness	Elements of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Teaching Effectiveness (Activities for each Element)
Student-centered	Responsiveness to students' learning needs	Summary of Teaching – Examples by faculty Faculty response to course evaluations
Student-centered	Availability to students	Summary of Faculty Availability to Students Office hours (on-line and/or in-person) Timely responses to student communication Meetings with students in courses Meetings with students for mentorship (official and unofficial mentees) Faculty response to course evaluations
Student-centered	Helpful evaluation of student work	Faculty response to course evaluation (helpful feedback, timely responses, etc.) Timely grading of student assignments Example of mastery learning process (syllabus, deidentified feedback to student, etc.)
Student-centered	Evaluation of student learning	Faculty measurement of students' self-efficacy Faculty measurement of students' knowledge
Student-centered	Commitment to students' integration of knowledge, skills, and values	Case scenarios used in teaching that integrate course content with other curricular areas Examples that show integration of knowledge, skills, and values Collaborative research/writing projects with students Professional presentations with students Integration of faith & spirituality in relation to course content

Instructor-centered	Engagement in professional development to improve teaching	Participation in Summer Faculty Institute Participation in Academy of Teaching and Learning seminars Participation in on-line program Faculty Enrichment Seminars Participation in other professional development related to teaching Baylor Faculty Fellow
Instructor-centered	Personal plan for teaching effectiveness	Faculty documents plan for building on strengths and addressing areas for growth (shows connection to self-assessment, student evaluations, peer review)
Instructor-centered	Use of Teaching innovations	Creative elements in course syllabi Innovative assignments and lessons Products from classes (i.e. asset maps, evaluation plans, etc.)
Instructor-centered	Effective course design	Creation/Revision of Canvas and/or on-line course LMS Course syllabi Peer Review
Instructor-centered	Course Leadership	Number of faculty supported in an academic year Number of courses for which leadership is provided Number of courses created and revised
Course-centered	Coherent Organization of Course Content	Faculty documents organized syllabi Faculty documents organized Canvas and/or on-line course LMS Faculty response to peer review insights Attendance at trainings (Canvas, on-line program, etc.)
Course-centered	Effective Presentation	Lesson plan example (i.e., multiple modes of teaching that meet students' unique needs) Peer review highlights
Course-centered	Use of current literature related to course taught	Incorporation of current resources Teaching innovations Newly developed asynchronous teaching content Professional presentations for course content areas

2. GSSW peer review

Tenure candidates participate every other year in the GSSW peer review process and present the findings from this review as part of the evidence for effective teaching and plan for continuous improvement. The GSSW peer review process is administered in conformity to the university's tenure procedures. The system of peer review should be as supportive and

nurturing as possible, with the focus on the tenure-track candidate's development and success.

The GSSW peer review will be conducted by two faculty members. It is preferred that at least one of the faculty reviewers teach in the same content area as the tenure-track faculty member. A different course will be observed in each evaluation year, to the extent possible. Reviewers should include at least one tenured faculty member.

Reviewers are selected in the following manner:

- 1) By September 1 tenure candidates to be reviewed will e-mail the Assistant to the Dean the names of three faculty members (at least two of whom are tenured faculty) nominated to complete the review.
- 2) With approval of the Dean, the Assistant to the Dean will match faculty to be reviewed with faculty reviewers and notify all parties via e-mail.

Peer review includes three dimensions:

- 1) Review of syllabus and assignments;
- 2) Observation of a classroom session; and
- 3) Reflections of the teacher, before and after the classroom observations.

Tenure candidates will choose the class and negotiate dates with the reviewers. Before the observation, tenure candidates will submit to the reviewers a syllabus and assignments. The reviewers will meet with the tenure candidate at least once before the observation session to discuss the course, its purpose, and any areas about which the tenure candidate wishes to have specific feedback. They will also discuss the class session to be observed, the goals for that session, and how the goals relate to the overall goals of the class. The reviewers will agree on a length of time that they will come to the class on the date selected.

Tenure candidates will inform students of the observation prior to the date on which it occurs, noting that this is a routine review process in which tenure-track candidates are participating and that the purpose is to strengthen teaching. Peer collaboration fits the culture of social work education and models what we are teaching our students about life-long learning.

The tenure candidate and the two reviewers will meet after the observation to discuss the session, hear the tenure candidate's reflections on the session, and receive the reviewers' evaluation findings and recommendations.

At this meeting, the reviewers will provide a written report to the tenure candidate. The tenure candidate will include the report as part of the materials to be reviewed by the Dean and the GSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee in the course of conducting annual tenure-track reviews and the final Tenure Review.

In addition to the reviewers' report, reflection on the peer review process should be included in the Description of Teaching. Guidance for addressing peer review as well as course evaluations is provided below.

3. Course evaluations

In addition to self-assessment and peer review, elements of each semester's university administered Course Evaluations are relevant to assessing teaching effectiveness. The Description of Teaching should include findings from the course evaluations as well as reflections on the peer review process. The table below provides guidance in determining the extent of response needed to this evaluation data ranging from optional to required.

Levels	Address in Description of Teaching	Course Evaluation	Peer Review
1) Consideration	Optional	One student's comment about an issue in one course	NA
2) Attention	Yes	Several students' comments about an issue in one course	"Think about," "Consider," etc.
3) Improvement	Yes	Multiple students' comments in multiple courses and/or one course over multiple semesters	Specific recommendations

A well-written Description of Teaching will include a reflective summary and plans for improvement. Additional questions to consider include:

- 1) Is the feedback from the Course Evaluations and Peer Reviews of Teaching included?
- 2) Is the feedback addressed in ways that are likely to promote professional growth?
- 3) Is there evidence that the tenure candidate is building on strengths and making improvements in other areas over time?

C. Research/Scholarship

Excellence in research/scholarship may be demonstrated in several ways. In the field of social work, the highest priority is placed on the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed journal publications. Additionally, excellence may be demonstrated through the pursuit of external research funding and national/international dissemination of work at peer-reviewed conferences.

Research in the field of social work is inclusive of interdisciplinary scholarship, including but not limited to the following: historical documentation and investigation, contributions to theory, ethics, philosophies of the field, and empirical research. Some examples of empirical research include the development of reliable and valid instruments for data collection; systematic reviews and meta-analyses; randomized controlled trials and other group designs;

survey research; single-case and program evaluation; community-engaged research and community-based participatory action research; policy analysis; secondary data analysis; theory development; and qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method studies.

1. The research agenda

Tenure candidates should show evidence of an ongoing, coherent, fundable research agenda that is likely to continue beyond receiving tenure, and that will make a significant contribution to our discipline and to the mission of the GSSW. It is from this clear, coherent research agenda that candidates are expected to seek external funding to support their research and to disseminate their research findings through peer-reviewed scholarship. The sections below outline the GSSW tenure expectations for the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed scholarship, external research funding, and additional indicators of impact.

2. Quantity of peer-reviewed scholarship

The number of peer-reviewed publications of tenure candidates are an important measure of professional growth and an indication of the potential for continuing scholarly activity. As such, the quantity of peer-reviewed publications provides an important metric of the candidate's professional contribution both within the field of social work and within the GSSW. Therefore, tenure candidates should average publishing a minimum of two peer-reviewed academic articles per year over the tenure track (i.e., a minimum of ten articles accepted while on the tenure track by the time the candidate submits the tenure notebook at the beginning of year six). Peer-reviewed publications are counted when they are accepted for publication, as evidenced by a letter of acceptance from the journal editor.

The following are examples of other highly valued forms of supplemental scholarly activity that do not substitute for the required two articles per year, but further support the strength of a tenure application in addition to peer-reviewed journal publications: editing of an issue of a journal, editing a book, authoring a book chapter or monograph, and presenting juried presentations at professional and/or academic conferences. Candidates have discretion to decide whether to take on additional and/or supplemental forms of scholarly activity beyond the core expectation of two peer-reviewed journal articles per year. Candidates are encouraged to include all scholarly activity in their notebook as evidence of their impact and leadership in the field.

3. Quality of peer-reviewed scholarship

The quality of peer-reviewed scholarship and outlets for dissemination are also significant. The field of social work is broad and interdisciplinary. The careful review of the GSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee and external reviewers should assess the extent to which the tenure candidate shows leadership in scholarship (i.e., as demonstrated by first author, sole-author, or other noteworthy contributions) that makes an important contribution to the field and supports the profession of social work.

The Office of the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development maintains a list of highly respected journals in social work and related fields. This is not an exhaustive list but may be helpful for the tenure candidate when considering where to submit a manuscript for publication. Tenure candidates are encouraged to submit their work to journals with a

documented impact factor, with those having higher impact factors when appropriate, to more widely disseminate their work and to increase its impact on the field.

Authorship. Tenure-track faculty should submit evidence of independence and leadership in designing, implementing, and publishing research through sole-authored and/or co-authored publications. In the latter case, tenure-track faculty members should describe their role as a joint author to clarify the unique contribution of their work.

The GSSW values meaningful collaborative research with colleagues and students in the school, in other disciplines in the university, and in other institutions. First authorship with other colleagues provides evidence of the ability to lead and include others in the research enterprise, expanding the contribution to scholarship and impact of the GSSW's mission. Being a co-author also indicates collaboration and is valued. Tenure candidates should seek to demonstrate both leadership and collaboration in their publication record.

Peer review. One characteristic of a scholarly work is its evaluation by members of the professional community qualified to judge the quality and value of the work. All scholarship must go through peer review. The status of peer review (i.e., under review, accepted for publication) is demonstrated by the date stamp on articles and/or e-mail correspondence from journals to which it is submitted. For any in-press manuscripts, candidates may submit correspondence with the journal showing current status.

The GSSW accepts and encourages the use of the following terminology used in reporting peer-reviewed publications:

Published: For this category, candidates should indicate date of publication with complete bibliographic information (including DOI), as typical for curriculum vitae entries.

In Press: Page proofs must have been received from the publisher.

Accepted: Works accepted for publication by an editor must be documented with a letter of acceptance. It is at the point of acceptance that the work counts in the metrics for tenure decision and must occur within the candidate's time on tenure track at GSSW.

Revise and Resubmit: Works considered for publication by an editor, pending revisions, must be documented with a letter from the editor, but are not counted in the metrics for tenure decision.

Submitted: Works submitted but still in review may be listed on the curriculum vitae (assuming documentation of receipt from the publisher), but are not counted in the metrics for tenure decision.

In Progress: Works in progress but not yet submitted for publication may be listed on the curriculum vitae, but are not counted in the metrics for tenure decision.

4. External research funding

Successful tenure candidates demonstrate the potential for obtaining external research funding to support a long-term research agenda. Evidence of success is demonstrated by obtaining extramural research funding or submitting proposals that receive promising feedback from competitive external funding sources (e.g., a grant with call for proposals) in a leadership role (i.e., as PI or Co-PI) by the time candidates go up for tenure. Some areas of research may require less funding than others; therefore the amount of the grant is less

relevant than its ability to support candidates' planned research agenda and candidates' role on the funded grant. Tenure candidates' ability to obtain external research funding is valued, whether it supports individual work, colleagues within a research team, and/or student research assistantships. Tenure candidates will clearly describe their contribution and role in tenure materials.

5. Peer-reviewed presentations at national/international conferences.

One important and valued indicator of participation in the field of social work is the dissemination of scholarship and research at peer-reviewed, national and international conferences. The ideal frequency includes annual participation in at least one national or international peer-reviewed presentation, contingent on annual availability of financial support for travel within the GSSW. Fewer presentations can be offset by excellence in other research-related areas.

6. Additional indicators of impact.

In addition to peer-reviewed publications, a fundable research agenda, and national/international dissemination of work at peer-reviewed conferences, indicators of impact on the profession are also highly valued and further strengthen the tenure application. These may include citations of the work in publication by other scholars, the rejection rate and impact factor of academic journals in which publications appear, the candidate's h-index and i-index, reviews of publications by others, media coverage, awards for publications, and scholarly contributions or overall contribution to the field of social work.

D. Service

The mission of the GSSW calls for involvement of the tenure candidates in service activities, whether or not that service always relates directly to the research agenda of the individual or the academic community. The tenure-track faculty member is expected to be involved in significant service opportunities at one or more levels of community.

1. Participation in GSSW and university service.

Tenure candidates are expected to assume willingly their proportional, fair share of GSSW and university service and administrative tasks. Administrative tasks are especially heavy in professional degree programs such as those of the GSSW, with demanding accrediting standards and close involvement with student internships and the community. Although scholarship is critical to the tenure process, participation in scholarship activities does not excuse the tenure-track faculty member from these responsibilities. Evidence of service includes:

- 1) Involvement in the infrastructure of social work education through service on regional and national committees, commissions, or site-visit teams, and in other roles of academic social work organizations;
- 2) Attendance and participation in GSSW faculty and committee meetings as assigned;
- 3) Participation in GSSW events;
- 4) Substantive administrative tasks and the development of GSSW-related documents, including accreditation-related tasks; and
- 5) Professional student-mentoring responsibilities.

2. *Participation in a faith community*

Because of the mission of the University and the GSSW, tenure candidates are expected to be active participants in a faith community; that activity might, for example, take the form of serving in various programs and committees.

3. *Participation in the profession and community*

Tenure candidates may engage in this form of service through paid and unpaid consultation with social service agencies, communities, congregations, or other organizations. They may serve on boards and committees, give speeches, or lead workshops. Opportunities for service may also arise through direct services to clients and supervision of students or practitioners. Finally, tenure candidates may show evidence of service through leadership in organizations and networks concerned with social welfare and social work. Service includes public identification with or support of the profession of social work, reflected by membership and leadership in professional social work organizations, as well as editorial board or journal editor work.

E. Collegiality

Collegiality is a highly valued cultural characteristic of the GSSW and the university. The tenure candidate demonstrates collegiality in diverse ways such as (but not limited to) sharing information with colleagues relevant to their work, providing support to colleagues by guest lecturing when asked (within reasonable limitations of frequency), collaborating in various projects (research, service, and/or teaching), providing constructive support and critique to colleagues in formal and informal settings, demonstrating respect and appropriate care for members of the staff and faculty in the GSSW, and contributing to the good humor of the GSSW. No faculty member should denigrate other faculty or students or engage in manipulation or contentiousness. Tenure candidates are not expected to document collegiality; tenured faculty members of the GSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee will bring any concerns to their attention in their review.