

Baylor University
Robbins College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

12/13/21

Revisions Approved by the Office of the Provost, October 4, 2022—James Bennighof

Introduction

The faculty in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) are committed to educating future worldwide leaders. In the context of *Illuminate*, tenureable colleagues will display research productivity, teaching excellence, and service consistent with Baylor's Christian mission and with research universities nationwide.

The department's tenure and/or promotion evaluation will consider the candidate's area of expertise and the typical publication and granting patterns at research universities. The following section provides standards that indicate a candidate is qualified to be considered for tenure and promotion. These criteria are based on the mission and goals of Baylor University and the Robbins College of Health and Human Sciences as outlined in the *Pro Futuris* vision statement and the Baylor University Faculty Handbook.

This list of performance criteria is intended to guide: (I) Assistant Professors on the tenure track to establish themselves as *emerging* national/international scholars and educators; and (II) tenured Associate Professors to establish themselves as national/international scholars and educators.

It is the department's expectation that faculty members will be assigned workloads that allow for the development of research and teaching portfolios worthy of tenure and promotion.

Because support for faculty increases and programs is dynamic, faculty members within the Department of CSD will re-evaluate the departmental tenure and promotion criteria every five years.

I. Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

A. Teaching Expectations (Teaching & Related Scholarly Work)

Teaching has a central role within the University and all tenure-track and tenured faculty in the department of Communication Sciences and Disorders are required to participate and demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in this activity. Teaching takes numerous forms. It occurs in lecture rooms, small discussion groups, seminars, and laboratories, and during supervision and mentorship of graduate students. To meet tenure standards in teaching, candidates must demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in teaching. The teaching load for Baylor faculty who are tenure-track or tenured and have a required

research load is ordinarily 2-2. The first year of appointment in the tenure-track position will ordinarily be a 1-2 or 2-1 teaching load, and then a 2-2 thereafter. Teaching loads can be reduced through grant buyouts and research sabbaticals.

The following sources of information will be used to gauge the level of teaching effectiveness of tenure candidates:

Faculty members are expected to document a consistent record of quality teaching and development in teaching. Documentation should include peer and/or department chair evaluations, student course evaluations, artifacts of instruction (such as syllabi, class assignments, instructional development, student work, and student evaluations, formal and informal), evidence of self-reflection and growth in teaching through curriculum and instructional development, and professional development. Evidence of teaching quality, as required by university policy, must include a systematic assessment of student course evaluations and peer teaching evaluations.

Quality of Teaching

Indicators of teaching quality, either in classes involving groups of students or in work with individual students, *may* include, but are not limited to, the following characteristics:

- Goals and learning objectives are stated clearly in the course syllabus. These goals and objectives take into consideration the course experience and requirements relevant to accreditation and licensure guidelines.
- Teaching shows responsiveness to information gathered from student course evaluations and peer teaching evaluations.
- Teaching shows constant incorporation of recent scholarship in content and pedagogy, including appropriate application of information technology.
- Teaching shows responsiveness to student diversity and to the varying prior knowledge, needs, and interests of students.
- Teaching leads to student learning that gives evidence of critical and creative thinking and is consistent with the goals of the learning experience.
- Mentoring of students encourages them to succeed in achieving program goals and objectives and student educational goals and career aspirations, and results in increased student retention, when appropriate.
- Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students leads to their demonstration of professional leadership and development through presentations, publication, professional recognition, and/or other indicators appropriate to their level of academic training (i.e., undergraduate vs graduate).
- Faculty members implement professional programs that are indicative of best instructional practices (e.g., following practices advocated by national accrediting bodies or other similar organizations).

Development of Teaching

Indicators of growth or development in teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following characteristics:

- Faculty stay current with best practices and trends within their disciplines in order to meet requirements for licensure and adhere to professional standards.
- Growth in teaching is supported by effective participation in program decision-making processes about curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- Growth in teaching is promoted through refinement and development of curricula, including preparation of new courses, active participation in Professional Development Schools, revision of existing courses, and engagement in scholarly strategies such as service learning, action research, or publications and presentations about teaching practice.
- Growth in teaching is promoted through innovation in methods of instruction such as team teaching, and engaging in scholarly strategies that involve innovative methods of teaching.
- Mentoring of undergraduate/graduate students leads to products (such as portfolios, dissertations, examination results, grant submissions, publications, presentations, and teaching) of recognized quality.

Evidence of Participation in Student Mentoring

Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate evidence of providing guidance and leadership to students. Examples include:

1. Service on dissertation, thesis, and undergraduate thesis committees;
2. Joint authorship with students on publications, grants, and/or presentations; Mentoring students in group and individual research projects.

Department Peer Review Guidelines

In accordance with Baylor University tenure policy requiring submission of peer reviews of teaching over a period of at least three years as part of a candidate's tenure notebook/supporting materials, the CSD Department requires adherence to the following guidelines for the peer review process:

- Completion of at least three peer reviews, two of which must occur in the last three years of the probation period.
- The Chair will request a faculty peer to provide a peer review for the candidate. The selection of peer reviewer is at the discretion of the Chair. The peer review should be submitted to the Chair and the Chair will share the review with the candidate. The individual who writes the review may also meet with the candidate.
- The reviewer's letter needs to be submitted to the Chair within one month of the review.

- Peer reviews should be conducted using the CSD Peer Teaching Evaluation form (see **Appendix A**).
- Information from peer reviews should be shared with the CSD tenured faculty at each of the candidate's annual tenure review meetings. Copies of the completed Peer Teaching Evaluation forms should be kept in the candidate's tenure notebook and made available for review.

B. Scholarship Expectations (Research & Scholarly/Creative Contributions)

Scholarship is essential for all tenured academic appointments. Producing research of high quality or other evidence of scholarship is a necessary requirement for acquiring tenure. Research and other forms of scholarship include the discovery, development, and dissemination of new knowledge or understanding, regardless of whether this takes place in a laboratory, community, or clinical setting. Scholarly activity may also consist of innovative conceptualizations or novel solutions to problems that receive recognition. Candidates are considered for tenure who have achieved a level of excellence in their contributions to research in communication sciences and disorders or related fields.

1. Internal and External Funding

Application for and securing of competitive internal grants may be indicative of the quality of the candidate's research. Internal grant applications are encouraged as a method to provide seed funding for future external grants.

All forms of external funding are supported and encouraged in the Department of CSD. When appropriate and where possible, research grants with facility and administration costs (F&A) included are strongly encouraged.

Successful candidates for tenure are expected to have submitted externally funded grants as the PI or a Co-PI and shown consistent effort in attempting to obtain external grants/contracts during their probationary period. Receipt of an external grant is required for tenure.

2. Productivity

The minimum standard productivity rate in CSD is an average two peer-reviewed journal publications per year. Tenure candidates are encouraged to show evidence of scholarly engagement at national or international conferences through presentations. Tenure candidates should provide evidence of a trajectory of the quantity and/or quality of their publications over the length of the tenure period that suggests continued success. Scholarly output should reflect a clear, collaborative research agenda.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document the quality of publication outlets with respect to factors such as impact factor, circulation of journal, reputation, rejection rate, eigenfactor, article influence score, size of

circulation, number of peer reviewers, etc. It is the responsibility of CSD tenured faculty within the candidate's discipline to provide guidance and assessment of the quality of publication outlets. External reviewers also address such factors in assessing quality. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion may count articles in press toward his/her total number of publications.

3. Quality of Publications

It is expected that a majority of the candidate's publications be in high-quality journals within the candidate's discipline and that a majority of publications exhibit academic leadership (e.g., senior authorship, first author publications, corresponding author, or mentorship of students as first author). Individual faculty members must be able to document the impact of the scholarship produced (e.g., total number of citations, h-index, i-10 index, immediacy index, and other applicable metrics to demonstrate the impact of their articles).

a. Types of Scholarly Contributions and Varied Types of Publications

The CSD faculty fully supports varied types of scholarship (e.g., books of scholarly significance, book chapters, and refereed monographs). We identify here common, viable forms of publication in our fields. Generally, with the acknowledgment that there are often exceptions, the priority/importance of the different forms of publication follows the order below. *In any instance, a candidate may provide information regarding the scholarly work (e.g., circulation, awards, invited work, prominence of organization, etc.) to justify its consideration of higher quality placement. While we value scholarly work across these categories, a lower emphasis will be placed on scholarly works in the "Other" contributions categories below.*

Important Contributions

- Research published in peer-reviewed journals in print or electronic form
- Theory/review articles published in peer-reviewed journals in print or electronic form

Other Contributions

- Refereed conference proceedings or monographs for which candidates can demonstrate impact (e.g., citations)
- Refereed presentations
- Book chapters in edited texts
- Academic textbooks published by nationally recognized publishers (i.e., as opposed to self-published works)

Research Collaboration, Relative Contribution, and Order of Authorship

CSD faculty frequently engage in research, program development, and community service projects that involve a wide array of research collaborators, professionals, and community volunteers, all of whom may be critical partners in the effort. Multiple authors are commonly found on CSD publications, grants, and other projects. This is a natural outcome of the broad-based efforts in which CSD researchers are commonly engaged.

In this context, taking the lead role on a collaborative project may be of equal value as working as a solitary investigator (i.e., leading to sole authorship). Multiple authorships in CSD are valued and highly encouraged. In many cases, the first-author designation does signify the lead role and highest level of contribution. In some situations, alphabetical listings are used, particularly when the contribution is equally divided among the authors. Consequently, individual faculty members must be able to document the nature and extent of contribution made to coauthored articles. *For this reason, each CSD faculty member should provide a brief description of her or his amount and type of contribution to any project within all annual performance, tenure, and promotion documents. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should regularly be taking a lead role on collaborative projects, though solitary efforts (i.e., sole authorship) may also demonstrate this type of scholarly initiative.*

Faculty members are encouraged to discuss issues related to contributions and order of authorship upon initiating collaborative scholarly efforts.

In many instances, faculty may have mentored students through the research process. This mentoring process is highly valued within CSD. In addition, because there are many difficult ethical issues surrounding order of authorship, particularly as it pertains to student-faculty interaction and the potential for abuse, CSD encourages faculty members to list students first when appropriate. *Consequently, when considering relative contribution to publications, presentations, and other scholarly works, faculty members who list students' names before their own name on a publication should be acknowledged to have made an approximately equal contribution to that in the instance in which they are listed first on a publication. However, this is only the case if the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the scholarly work.*

4. Value of Longitudinal, Community-Based, and Other Research and Related Publication and Productivity Issues

When CSD researchers engage in long-range collaborative efforts, difficulties can arise in university-based performance evaluations for tenure and promotion. The individuals who are called on to make these evaluative

decisions may be from other disciplines in which research and publication rates can move at a faster pace. Faculty members in CSD are expected to document continuous progress in the areas of successful publication and grant procurement. We recognize, however, that the rate at which these two important areas progress will be, in part, dependent upon the nature of the research project (e.g., longitudinal vs. acute, clinical vs. field-based). Regardless, the minimum requirements for grant procurement and publication stated in this document apply for tenure and promotion.

Each faculty member is strongly encouraged to describe tasks accomplished and progress made within each research and grant-related project, and to include information that demonstrates how current research/grant procurement efforts are contributing to long-range research goals. As community-based and longitudinal research is greatly valued by our department, faculty members should identify work (i.e., publications, grants, etc.) in these areas.

C. Service Expectations (university, profession, community, and church)

A crucial element of faculty members' responsibility is a service program responsive to the larger society that sustains the university. To a great extent, service involves the application of the faculty member's professional training and competence to issues and problems of significance to constituencies.

Faculty members are expected to be contributing members, in a variety of ways, both of the University community and of the larger academic, civic, and religious communities as well.

Faculty members have obligations in such areas as internal governance, university outreach, patient care and other professional services to the university and community. Faculty members are expected to assume a fair share of such service. Types of activities that may demonstrate this are:

1. Service to the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders.
2. Service to Robbins College.
3. Service to Baylor University.
4. Service to professional organizations (grant reviews, journal reviews, editorships, leadership roles etc).
5. Service to the community.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty after their third probationary year are expected to serve on at least one and no more than three University committees. Faculty members are expected to serve consistently at the departmental, college and university levels. Promotion and tenure require evidence of significant departmental committee involvement. Finally, as part of the tenure evaluation, faculty members are asked to provide information about

active religious service as part of a local congregation and evidence of their commitment to Baylor's distinctive Christian mission.

D. Collegiality

CSD faculty members are expected to treat their colleagues and students with respect. In their personal activities and relationships, faculty members should maintain a level of ethical and moral behavior that is supportive of and consistent with the Christian mission of Baylor University. Civil resolution of disagreements is expected.

II. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Standards related to attainment of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor generally apply also to promotion to the rank of Professor. Additionally, the candidate's work should show evidence of outstanding achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and/or service (and administration, if applicable to a particular candidate) to exhibit national leadership, and, in some cases, international professional recognition as evidenced by peer reviews of scholarship in the faculty member's specific discipline.

The timing for applying for promotion to Professor is individual and can vary by discipline. It is not likely that an Associate Professor will achieve the level of prominence and leadership expected of the rank of Professor earlier than six years past the receipt of tenure. University policy does not allow an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor sooner than four years after the granting of tenure. In some cases an Associate Professor may pursue promotion to Professor before the sixth year after tenure was granted; however, such an action must be approved by the majority of departmental Professors, the Dean, and the Provost.

Teaching Expectations (Teaching & Related Scholarly Work)

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of continued growth in teaching and attention to provision of high-quality instruction. Evidence of teaching effectiveness and growth may be demonstrated through responses to student course evaluations, peer evaluations, and teaching artifacts (e.g., syllabi, class assignments, video teaching logs, graded student work, other evidence of teaching/professional development, etc.). It should also include teaching and/or mentoring graduate students (e.g., teaching graduate classes and serving on graduate student committees). Associate Professors will ordinarily have a teaching load of 2-2, and grants and research sabbaticals can be used for teaching reduction.

A. Scholarship Expectations (Research & Scholarly/Creative Contributions)

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of advanced scholarly activity that is recognized nationally/internationally through peer review and

impact. Specifically, a candidate for promotion would have an established national and international reputation for quality research and/or writing in his or her area of expertise supported by external funding. An important indication of such reputation is the opinion of external reviewers from the candidate's specialty/expertise area.

Productivity of publications during the years as an Associate Professor should be an average of two publications per year. Recognizing the University's support of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship, Associate Professors are encouraged to take advantage of the freedom afforded by tenure to pursue their scholarly interests whether they fall within or across traditional disciplinary boundaries. An Associate Professor may also have more opportunities for productive collaboration than would a candidate for tenure; though it continues to be expected that the individual's contribution should be significant.

Successful candidates are expected to apply for external grant funding on a regular basis. Promotion to the rank of Professor depends upon the candidate obtaining external funding to support research/scholarly activity.

B. Service Expectations (university, profession, community, and church)

Service to department, college, university, community, and a local congregation are highly important considerations for promotion to the rank of Professor. Candidates for promotion (and tenured faculty members as a group) also have special responsibilities for mentoring junior faculty and for leadership in service and governance on the departmental, college, and university levels. Additionally, however, it is important for candidates for promotion to have exhibited service efforts that receive attention across the College or University, in national/international professional organizations, and/or in the broader community. Such noteworthy service could include, but is not limited to: serving as an elected or appointed official for national/international professional organizations, departmental and/or college leadership roles, leading and/or initiating committees or task forces for professional organizations, or taking a major role in community projects or organizations.

III. Department External Peer Review Guidelines

In accordance with BU Tenure and Promotion Procedures as outlined in the Baylor University Faculty Handbook, the CSD department uses the following policy for selecting external reviewers for tenure and/or promotion at both the Assistant Professor and the Associate professor levels:

Process for External Review for CSD Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion:

- A. The Candidate shall submit a letter to the Department Chair along with a current curriculum vitae, representative publications, and a list of three names (including telephone numbers, addresses, nature of professional relationship, and brief professional profile) of potential external reviewers by April 1st prior to the academic year in which he or she will be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion. Outside evaluators must hold a rank at least equal to the rank that the candidate is seeking or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting. Evaluators should come from highly reputable programs at respected peer and/or aspirant universities. In addition, external evaluators should not include individuals for whom a close academic or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, fellow faculty, friends, former students of the candidate, etc.) might compromise their ability to evaluate the candidate's work objectively. Finally, it should be noted that letters from co-authors regarding the contributions of a candidate to co-authored work could in some circumstances provide useful information regarding the record of a tenure candidate, so departments may choose to submit letters of this nature as an additional part of the tenure and/or promotion review process. In no circumstance, however, shall a letter from a co-author be considered an "external review letter" with respect to the other recommendations in this report (see Tenure Procedures at Baylor University, p. 13).
- B. The Chair, upon consultation with the tenured faculty (or the Professors in the case of promotion to the rank of Professor), will add three names to the Candidate's list. The Candidate's list, along with the names added by the Chair and/or tenured faculty (or Professors), will be forwarded to the tenured faculty (or Professors) within the department. The tenured faculty (or Professors) will meet and rank order the potential reviewers and forward the list of names to the Chair. Reviewers will be recognized for their scholarly contributions to the Candidate's field of academic endeavor and should ordinarily be employed in a higher education setting at peer or aspirant universities. Every effort will be made to minimize biases for or against the candidate when selecting qualified reviewers.
- C. The Chair will subsequently write to the top four reviewers (with the remaining three serving as ranked alternates), requesting confidential, written assessments of the Candidate's scholarly activity. A copy of the Candidate's curriculum

vitae, representative publications, and Baylor University's guidelines for tenure/promotion will be sent to reviewers who accept this task. The external reviewers' letters of assessment will be included as part of the Candidate's professional portfolio at all levels of university consideration.

- D. Candidates will not be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. If tenure is granted, the candidate may request a written summary of the reviews from the department chair or dean. Confidentiality is granted to the external reviewers by the department, college, or school through the tenure process. The external reviews, however, may be discoverable if legal action is taken by a candidate who is unsuccessful in the tenure process.

At a minimum, the letter of invitation to review should request that the reviewer:

- a. Detail his or her acquaintance or familiarity with the candidate and the candidate's scholarly work.
- b. Review and critique of the candidate's scholarly activity on the basis of standards in the specific discipline or sub-discipline.
- c. Provide an assessment of the candidate's recognition and standing among his or her peers.
- d. Indicate whether his or her scholarship has had an impact on the discipline or advanced the discipline in meaningful ways, and, if it has done so, describe how it has affected the discipline.
- e. Indicate whether it has earned for the candidate a national reputation.
- f. Indicate whether the candidate's collective work/program of research is likely to yield further significant advances in knowledge.

The letter of invitation should provide a statement addressing confidentiality such as: Your letter will be provided to departmental, college and university review committees and appropriate administrators. Candidates will not be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. The letters will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law, although a candidate who successfully obtains tenure may request and obtain a general written summary of the reviews from the departmental chair or dean.

- E. The Chair (or the chair's designate) is responsible for ensuring the following are completed:
1. Securing names of potential reviewers by April 1st.
 2. Contacting external reviewers and securing their agreement to participate by June 1st.
 3. Securing reviews by Sept 1st.
 4. Placing reviews in the candidate's file.
 5. Summarizing the qualifications of the external reviewers and placing this summary in the candidate's file.

6. If needed, placing in the file any justification for why the external review process was not conducted in accordance with the stated criteria.

Appendix A
CSD PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING
 Peer Instructional Assessment Form

Date: _____ Class: _____
 Instructor: _____ Peer Reviewer: _____

Directions: This instrument consists of seven sections and twenty-four statements intended to serve as a guide for assessing instruction in lecture and lab settings. After attending an instructional period, please respond to each statement by circling the number that best corresponds to your observations. The scale is as follows: **(1) Poor; (2) Fair; (3) Average; (4) Good; (5) Excellent; and NA (Not Applicable)**

- A. DEMONSTRATES EXPERTISE IN SUBJECT AREA AND SKILL IN KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERENCE**
- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Specifies purpose of the instructional period | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 2. Sets general ground rules for audience participation and evaluation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 3. Relates the main body of information to the introductory purpose | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 4. Makes transitions between different segments of the instructional content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 5. Uses clear, relevant examples to demonstrate ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 6. Clarifies technical terminology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 7. Summarizes most important points of ideas of the instructional period | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 8. Develops a conclusion related to the purpose and body of the instructional period | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 9. Cites appropriate authorities to support statements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 10. Presents divergent viewpoints for contrast and comparison | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 11. Separates fact from opinion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 12. Can illustrate theory through practice models | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 13. Provides resources for further investigation of subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
- B. DEMONSTRATES SKILL IN USE OF VOICE AND BODY MOVEMENTS DURING INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS**
- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Speaks at a volume suitable for audience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 2. Speaks at a suitable pace for presentation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
- C. DEMONSTRATES SKILL IN THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT MEDIA (ie. over-heads, PowerPoint, dry erase board, slides, videos, demonstration, etc.)**
- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Coordinates support media with verbal presentation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 2. Uses support media to enhance understanding of subject matter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 3. Uses support media which are easily visible and audible to all students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
- D. GENERAL COMMENTS (Any score below a rating of "3", requires a comment)**
- E. STRENGTHS**

F. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

G. STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT