

# Department of Communication Bylaws

Approved: September 20, 2002

## Introduction

These Bylaws provide for faculty participation in the operations of the Department, in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the American Association of University Professors - Wright State University Chapter (AAUP/WSU) and the Board of Trustees of Wright State University. They are subject to and consistent with the Bylaws of the College and may be amended in accordance with the current CBA. Throughout these bylaws "department faculty" shall include all full-time faculty at any of the following ranks: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer and instructor. Bargaining unit faculty members (BUFM) shall refer to members of the faculty who are included in the bargaining unit as defined by the contract. These bylaws define and include operational procedures for both standing and ad hoc departmental committees.

## Section I. Procedures by which Bargaining Unit Faculty give advice and make recommendations

### 1. Faculty Appointment

**Faculty Appointment:** A committee (ad hoc) shall be formed, of which Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (BUFM) shall constitute a majority, to review candidate applications, rank them and recommend the top candidates to management for interviews. Once management approves candidates for interviews, all departmental faculty shall be offered an opportunity to meet with each candidate. After all interviews for a faculty position are completed, the departmental faculty will rank the interviewed candidates at a departmental faculty meeting. The rankings will be summed to provide an overall ranking which, along with the reasons for the rankings, will be presented to the Department Chair and Dean. If none of the ranked candidates are selected the Dean shall meet with the faculty to explain his or her decision.

**Chair Appointment:** A committee (ad hoc) shall be formed, of which BUFM shall constitute a majority, to review candidate applications, rank them and recommend the top candidates to management for interviews. Once management approves candidates for interviews, all departmental faculty shall be offered an opportunity to meet individually or in small groups with each candidate. After all interviews for a chair position are completed, the departmental faculty will rank the interviewed candidates at a departmental faculty meeting. The rankings will be summed to provide an overall ranking which, along with the reasons for the rankings, will be presented to the Dean. The Dean will meet with the faculty to announce and explain his or her decision.

### 2. Promotion and Tenure

**The Promotion and Tenure committee** shall perform the annual cumulative reviews of progress toward tenure and/or promotion required by the contract and shall review and make recommendations on candidates for tenure and/or promotion. The committee shall elect its chair. The committee shall be composed of all those bargaining unit faculty who hold the rank of tenured associate professor or full professor. The Department Chair serves as a non-voting member. If there are not at least three departmental faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor, the candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure may suggest bargaining unit faculty at this rank in other departments who would be qualified to evaluate his/her file. The department promotion and tenure committee shall

select additional members to bring the committee membership up to three, but is not limited to those suggested.

**Procedures for Promotion of Tenure-track Assistant Professor to Tenured Associate Professor:**

The Promotion and Tenure committee will review the candidate's promotion document and any internal or external letters of support. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee will take notes of the discussion so that the reasoning behind the committee's recommendation may be summarized in a written letter from the committee. The letter should include the finalized results of a ballot. If the results are not unanimous, balloting will occur, with further discussion between balloting, until identical results are obtained in two successive ballots, at which time the results are finalized. A committee member should abstain from voting only if: 1) there is a conflict of interest or 2) the committee member is serving on the college and University P&T committees, such that voting in the department would allow him or her more than two votes on the same file. The P & T committee will write a letter summarizing the committee vote and the reasoning for the vote before it is sent to the Dean. Any abstentions should be explained in the letter.

**Tenured Associate Professor to Tenured Full Professor:** The composition of the committee and procedures for voting are as described for the assistant professor above unless there are not at least two department faculty at the rank of full professor in which case bargaining unit full professors from outside the department will be added to the committee. The candidate seeking promotion may suggest full professors in other departments who would be qualified to evaluate his/her file. The department promotion and tenure committee shall select additional members to bring the committee membership up to at least three, two of whom must be full professors, but is not limited to those suggested.

3. **Professional Development of New Faculty**

**Professional Development Committee:** The department faculty will elect a committee of three bargaining unit faculty. These faculty members will constitute the departmental Professional Development Committee. At least one member of this committee shall be assigned to each new faculty member as a mentor. Each mentor will meet periodically with the new faculty member to discuss any problems being encountered and offer suggestions for improvement. If the promotion and tenure committee identifies an area in which a department faculty member needs to improve, such as teaching, this committee will be charged with meeting with the faculty member and providing some suggestions to that faculty member which should result in improvement in the problem area. This committee will do peer reviews of faculty teaching described in Section II. This committee will also make a recommendation for any faculty member seeking Professional Development Leave from the department. Formal recommendation of a professional development leave and formal suggestions for improvement of faculty must be written.

4. **Other Committees:**

Ad hoc committee may be established to meet any departmental need. The majority of members of any ad hoc committee must be BUFMs.

5. **Teaching Assignments and Class Schedules Including Summer and Overloads**

**Teaching Assignments:** Individual faculty members may submit scheduling recommendations to the chair. The schedule developed by the chair shall be presented to the faculty at least two weeks before the deadline for scheduling classes. The faculty will forward any written recommendations for schedule revisions to the department chair.

**Summer Teaching:** If a faculty member is willing to teach summer he or she should indicate such in writing, identifying the course or courses which he or she prefers to teach. If the number of bargaining unit faculty members who are qualified and desire summer teaching exceeds the number of courses available the following rotation shall be used: Courses will first be offered to BUFM who have indicated a desire to teach and have not been offered an opportunity to teach in the previous two summers. If courses still remain they will be offered to BUFM who have indicated a desire to teach and were not offered an opportunity to teach in the previous summer. New bargaining unit faculty will be included in this group. If courses still remain, then they will first be offered to the ones who taught the courses the most times in the past year and then to the ones who taught them most recently.

**Overload Teaching:** If requested by the chair, faculty members will indicate if they are willing to teach an overload.

6. **Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards:**

**Curriculum Committee:** The department curriculum committee will review all proposed new department courses, suggested modifications to existing department courses, changes to academic standards for admission into the department's courses, graduate study, and programs; and changes to graduation requirements for the department's programs. Committee recommendations will be forwarded to the department chair, who will schedule a department meeting for a full faculty vote on the recommendations. The committee first shall be filled by volunteers. If at least three faculty members do not volunteer, the faculty shall elect members to fill the committee. A majority of the committee must be bargaining unit faculty members.

**Assessment Committee:** The department assessment committee will conduct any assessments of the department's major programs including course content and learning outcomes that may be required. Assessment committee reports shall be submitted to the department faculty and the chair. The department chair shall select three members for the committee. If the faculty desire, additional members may be elected to the committee. A majority of the committee must be bargaining unit faculty.

7. **Faculty Involvement in the Review of Chairs:**

The department faculty will cooperate in any administrative review of the chair. The faculty shall receive a copy of formal reviews.

8. **Issues Affecting the Department:**

Issues which affect the department will be presented to the faculty at regularly scheduled departmental faculty meetings by the department chair or by any faculty member, so that the recommendations or advice of the departmental faculty may be heard by the department chair. The department will meet at least once per quarter during the first two weeks. Other meetings will be called when the chair desires or when requested by the chair of any department committee as needed. Any faculty member who desires to discuss any subject may ask the chair to call a meeting. If the chair does not agree to the meeting, the faculty member should ask the appropriate committee to hear his or her request. If the committee concurs that a meeting is desirable it will so inform the chair. If a majority of the faculty wish to meet to discuss a departmental topic, they shall inform the chair who shall call a meeting. Meetings shall follow Robert's Rules of Order.

9. **Faculty Selection of Senate Representative:**

Each year the faculty shall elect a representative to the Liberal Arts College senate.

## **Section II. Criteria and Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Bargaining Unit Faculty:**

The department Chair will annually evaluate the performance of Bargaining-Unit Faculty following the procedure outlined in the contract.

The Contract specifies the process by which Bargaining-Unit members will submit a report to the Chair and the Chair will evaluate their professional activities. The purpose of this bylaw is to establish (1) the means by which the Chair will weigh the different areas of activity, and (2) the criteria the Chair will use in evaluation.

Annual evaluations should recognize faculty for their successes in diverse areas of their professional lives. Thus in some years, teaching, scholarship or service may be weighted more highly than in others. The Communication Department adopts the following standard ranges of percentages for weighting each of the three professional areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching: weights may range from 40% to 75 %.

Scholarship: weights may range from 5% to 50 %.

Service: weights may range from 5 % to 50 %.

The three percentages must add up to 100%.

The Department Chair will evaluate each area of each faculty member's professional activity and assign an integer to that area, guided by the criteria stated below. The Chair will then assign to each area a percentage from the range above that gives the faculty member the maximum possible overall average.

The chair may assign a different weighting from that defined above in any of the following situations:

The faculty member has work assignments that differ from those of other faculty.

The Chair is imposing discipline pursuant to the contract.

The Chair is acting to correct a pattern of substandard performance extending for more than one year.

### **1. Annual Evaluation of Teaching**

#### **A. Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching**

In the following description "Teaching" includes course development and revision; preparation of course materials; presentation of course content; classroom management; advising, evaluating and mentoring students; supervising independent studies or internships; and maintaining currency in one's teaching area. "Course load" refers to the load assigned to each individual faculty member by the university. The actual number of courses taught may differ from one faculty member to another. In describing teaching, advising, and related activities, the adverb "effectively" refers on the one hand to demonstrable overall success in conveying appropriate information and building appropriate skills, and on the other hand to demonstrable effort in attaining such success. Thus, a faculty member may demonstrate the effectiveness of his or her teaching with evidence showing classroom success (e.g. positive student comments on evaluations, peer reviews of teaching by colleagues, recognition given to work completed by students in class), and (if needed) with evidence showing the kind and quality of effort he or she has made in meeting students' needs (e.g. a teaching journal or log, a portfolio of teaching materials, a discussion of special problems faced in a particular class).

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and advise students effectively.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively, and perform all three of the following, or any two of the following with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show significant evidence of success in teaching and advising
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested; e.g. advise honors students, supervise internships, work with independent-study students, etc.

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and perform all four of the following well or three of the four with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising, or the equivalent
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested; e.g. advise honors students, supervise internships, work with independent-study students, or the equivalent
- Develop new courses or significantly revise existing course content, pedagogy, or technology in a meaningful way, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and perform all five of the following well or four of the five with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising, or the equivalent
- Perform other teaching-related functions as requested; e.g. advise honors students, supervise internships, work with independent-study students, or the equivalent.
- Develop new courses or significantly revise existing course content, pedagogy, or technology in a meaningful way, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in the development and support of the teaching of other department faculty (especially of bargaining-unit faculty), e.g. by giving classes on pedagogical issues, by leading the way and helping others with classroom technology, by mentoring faculty who may be struggling with their teaching, by developing on-line courses that meet department needs and standards, or the equivalent

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in teaching will be given to any faculty member who does not satisfy the requirements for an Adequate evaluation or who does not provide the Chair the evidence required for the Chair's evaluation. Symptoms of Unsatisfactory teaching performance may include (but are not limited to)

- missed classes (without informing the department or without adequate explanation)
- missed advising appointments
- persistent and justified student complaints
- erratic classroom behavior

- failure to keep appropriate office hours and otherwise be available to students and advisees
- failure or refusal to provide the Chair contract-required information, materials, or notification that are teaching related
- failure to communicate effectively with students
- refusal to teach assigned courses in the faculty member's field
- failure to respond appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints
- irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with or in the presence of students in a university setting

Behaviors like those described may result in an evaluation of Unsatisfactory (if they are frequent and characteristic) or a lowered evaluation (from Meritorious to Adequate, for example).

## B. Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching

**Student Evaluations** The contract specifies the extent to which student evaluations are to be utilized. Faculty may provide additional evaluation material or may provide information explaining or responding to the student evaluations.

**Peer Evaluations:** Peer evaluations are required of all non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty. The Chair and the department Professional Development Committee will arrange for the peer evaluation of non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty. At least one peer evaluation will be done for each non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty member per year. The Chair and the committee shall establish a deadline which provides sufficient time for peer reviews. The PD committee will provide the Department Chair and the department P&T committee with a written report of peer evaluation of teaching for all probationary faculty and for any tenured faculty member who requests it. The peer evaluation will normally consist of review of course materials, student comments and the faculty member's summary statement on activities such as course revisions, etc. The numerical portion of the student evaluation of teaching will be reviewed for probationary faculty and for those tenured faculty who choose to submit them. A tenured BUFM's failure to submit the numerical portion of the student evaluation will have no negative effect on the review. The faculty member may also include any additional materials which reflect on teaching. Any faculty member may request a class visitation as part of the review. If a review of all materials submitted by probationary faculty indicates that there may be major problems in teaching, a class visitation will be arranged by one or more members of the PD Committee. A report on the class visitation will be included in the PD Committee's review. It will be forwarded, as a recommendation to the department chair for use in the annual evaluation and to the P&T committee for use in preparing any statement of progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

**Other Evidence:** Faculty may submit additional evidence to the department Chair. Supporting evidence may include (but is not limited to) the following:

- Selected syllabuses or other class materials (to demonstrate a particular classroom innovation, for example)
- A peer evaluation of teaching (for example, a colleague's report of a classroom visit)
- A written response to any peer evaluation
- A description of a particular section or a response to the student evaluations for a particular section (if the faculty member believes the evaluations for that section need to be put into context, for example)

- Additional student evaluation materials, including (but not limited to) a self-administered evaluation instrument, a mid-term evaluation, the numerical evaluations from the official university instrument, signed letter(s) from students in a particular course, etc.[1]
- Evidence showing student learning success, for example the results of a pre- and post-evaluation

The Chair may also gather evidence to be used as part of the evaluation of teaching. In such cases, the Chair will make all written records and/or summaries of evidence available to the faculty member.

## 2. The Evaluation of Scholarship

### A. Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarship[2]

The Communication Department values research and scholarship, and fully understands that real scholarship often bears fruit only after a researcher spends a considerable time preparing the ground. Thus, in determining merit in scholarship, the Chair should not only weigh publications but the time and effort of preparation. (Collaborative scholarship normally requires as much effort as single-author scholarship and should be evaluated accordingly.) In particular, the department encourages the Chair to look beyond the work of the single year to get a sense of the faculty member's overall performance as a scholar. Similarly, we encourage all faculty to give the Chair materials which will help him/her accurately judge merit using a broader perspective than that of a single year. However, higher levels of merit in scholarship, particularly the rankings of Outstanding and Extraordinary, will normally require publication of the kind described below.

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field
- Demonstrate that currency by at least one of the following: attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field
- Demonstrate that currency by at least one of the following: attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, submitting a paper for competitive review, or the equivalent
- Go beyond the demonstration of scholarly competence by delivering a paper or presentation at an academic conference, publishing one review, publishing or presenting applied scholarship, publishing a substantial professionally related article or commentary in a national or international consumer, trade or professional publication, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, publishing one or more short creative works, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field
- Demonstrate that currency by any two of the following, for example attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing

research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, publishing one or more reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, or the equivalent

- Go beyond the demonstration of scholarly competence by delivering a significant paper or a presentation at a significant academic conference, publishing one or more reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, publishing one or more short creative works, or the equivalent
- Demonstrate professional accomplishment by at least one of the following: by publishing an article in a peer-reviewed academic journal, publishing a chapter in a peer-reviewed academic book, publishing a longer creative work, receiving an award acknowledging excellence in a refereed paper competition, completing editing or co-editing a peer-reviewed academic book with a recognized university or academic press, revising and republishing a previously published book or textbook, revising and collecting previously published work in a single volume, publishing several significant professionally related articles in professional publications of national circulation, receive funding for a significant external grant, publish applied scholarship which makes a significant contribution to the field, or the equivalent.

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in scholarship, a faculty member must do at least one of the following fully or some partial combination of at least two of the following, or the equivalent, in addition to otherwise keeping at least an Adequate or Meritorious level of scholarly activity:

- Publish a peer-reviewed academic book
- Publish a professional textbook with a recognized publisher
- Publish two or more professional articles in peer-reviewed academic journals
- Publish two or more chapters in peer-reviewed academic books
- Publish a creative or professional work with a recognized publisher [3]
- Publish four or more articles in recognized and significant non-refereed journals
- Or the equivalent

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in scholarship will be given to any faculty member who cannot satisfy the requirements for an Adequate evaluation. Symptoms of Unsatisfactory scholarly performance include (but are not limited to) demonstrations of incompetence in matters of professional expertise, periods of four or more years without a professional publication of any kind, refusal to respond to mentoring or to develop a research plan (if requested), and so on.

## **B. Evidence for the Evaluation of Scholarship**

The department recognizes that scholarship effort is a continuing activity. Faculty may claim a work for the purposes of merit in more than one year. For example, an article may be reported in year one as being "in preparation" and in year two it may be "published". Only the published article may be used as evidence of activity above the "Meritorious" level.

As evidence of scholarship at the Meritorious level and above, the faculty member should submit the following:

- For all published works: a copy of the publication
- For all works listed as accepted but not yet published: a printed copy of the accepted manuscript or galley proofs of the printed publication
- For all conference papers: a printed copy of the manuscript

In addition, all faculty may (if they wish) submit a statement describing their research program and publication plans, as a way of placing in context the performance for a given year.

### 3. Evaluation of Service

#### A. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

Faculty service that is most valued should contribute to the overall mission of the department, college or university. Service includes but is not limited to committee service, leadership in existing university programs, and development of new programs and initiatives. The department also recognizes that service to the profession and the community is important.

Activity like the following will be typical of an Adequate level of service and will receive a score of 1:

- Serve on one or two committees at the department level and/or at the college or university level
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion
- Serve as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching
- Perform some community or professional service related to professional expertise

Activity like the following will be typical of a Meritorious level of service and will receive a score of 2:

- Chair an important department committee or serve on two or more important committees at the department, college or university level or the equivalent
- Serve on two or more other department committees and/or committees at the college or university level or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. in assisting with a search, in developing a new course, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion
- Serve as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching
- Perform some community or professional service related to professional expertise

In addition to an otherwise Meritorious level of service, activity like the following will be typical of an Outstanding level of service and will receive a score of 3:

- Lead a major aspect of the department's academic life beyond the regular activities of teaching, advising, and service; for example, lead a student organization, direct a departmental program, lead a search, chair an important and productive committee, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in an important aspect of college or university governance or organization; for example, chair a committee that rewrites and implements changes in general education, take a faculty leadership role, or the equivalent
- Take a leadership role in a state or national professional organization, or function in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal, or the equivalent

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in service, a faculty member must perform some combination of Outstanding activities in multiple areas of service or one exceptional

accomplishment in service; for example take a major leadership role in the university while heading a state professional organization.

#### **B. Evidence for the Evaluation of Service**

Faculty should submit to the Chair

- A list of all service activities performed during the year, arranged in order from the most important to the least important
- A description of all service activities performed that represent special commitment or effort beyond the norm
- Any testimonial letters received that describe a particular act of service and its effects
- Any other material that may support a claim to merit in service above that of Meritorious

### **Section III. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure of Bargaining Unit Faculty**

The following paragraphs describe the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Communication Department. Candidates for promotion and tenure may present accomplishments dating from before their hiring at Wright State University if the accomplishments are relevant to their case. Candidates for tenure already at the Associate Professor or Professor rank may present evidence from Wright State and/or from the previous place of employment.

All faculty are expected to show that they have been productive in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

#### **1. Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor (with tenure)**

Before becoming eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, an Assistant Professor will ordinarily accumulate at least five years of full-time college teaching experience. The criteria for tenured assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor shall be the same as for probationary faculty except that a tenured assistant professor shall not be adversely affected by not providing any material such as annual progress statements or peer reviews which are not required by the contract and may not be available.

##### **A. Teaching:**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show that he or she has advised and taught students successfully. Among other things, a successful teacher will do both of the following, or the equivalent:

- Establish and maintain high and appropriate standards of achievement in all classes
- Help students acquire the knowledge and strategies for meeting those standards

In addition, a successful teacher will do some or all of the following, or the equivalent:

- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly, including formal and informal advising, serving on honors project or thesis committees, working with independent-study students
- Develop new courses and/or significantly revise existing courses

- Integrate appropriate technologies into classes in a meaningful and useful way

### **Evidence of Successful Teaching**

6. Each candidate for promotion and tenure will produce a portfolio of teaching which will be an appendix to the promotion and tenure document. The portfolio of teaching will include a selection of evidence showing how the candidate has performed actions like those itemized above.
7. The department Chair and the PD Committee will arrange for the peer evaluation of teaching for all non-tenured bargaining unit faculty. Such peer-written letters will be placed in the candidate's portfolio of teaching.
8. The candidate may place additional testimonials, solicited or unsolicited, responses to peer-written letters, student evaluation comments, or other documents relating to his or her teaching in the portfolio of teaching.

### **B. Scholarship**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show that he or she has pursued a successful and effective program of ongoing scholarship. Scholarship can include traditional forms of research and publication as well as professional writing and creative efforts.[4] Scholarship may be collaborative.[5] At a minimum, success in scholarship sufficient for promotion and tenure will include the following, or a clear equivalent [6]:

- Four substantial articles, chapters or other publications in or accepted by reputable peer-reviewed academic journals or books[7]

Although scholarly publication is a goal, we recognize that not all significant faculty scholarship eventuates in publication. Candidates for promotion with tenure may further demonstrate their "successful and effective program of ongoing scholarship" by listing activity like the following, or the equivalent:

- Conference papers
- Research-related grant proposals
- Published reviews, notes, and other short articles
- Preparation of unpublished drafts
- Scholarly conference attendance
- Consulting

### **Evidence of Successful Scholarship:**

8. The candidate must provide copies of all publications.
9. Works accepted but not yet published, works not yet accepted for publication, conference papers, and works in progress (if they are claimed) must be provided to the PTR committee in typescript form.
10. The candidate will provide a list of four to seven potential outside reviewers qualified to evaluate the quality of his or her work. The PTR committee will solicit letters from three of these reviewers. If the PTR committee cannot find three appropriate and available reviewers from the candidate's initial list, the candidate will provide additional names, as requested, until the committee can find enough appropriate and available reviewers. Reviewers should be scholars qualified in the candidate's field(s). The PTR committee will use the reviewers' letters to help gauge the candidate's contributions to his or her field.

### **C. Service**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must show that he or she has performed appropriate service successfully and effectively. Success in service should include at a minimum the following, or their clear equivalents:

- Responding to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion
- Participating regularly in department faculty meetings
- Attending and participating in commencement ceremonies regularly as required by the contract
- Serving on two or more department committees
- Serving on one or more college or university committees or otherwise demonstrating involvement in service to the university outside the department

As part of the service itemized above or in addition to it, the department will recognize and especially welcome service activities that advance the department, college, university, or academic discipline, such as the following, or the equivalent:

- Chairing an important department committee
- Taking a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. in assisting with a search, in developing a new course, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
- Performing service for professional organization(s) locally, regionally, or nationally
- Performing community service related to professional expertise

#### **Evidence of Successful Service:**

Each candidate for promotion and tenure will list service accomplishments on the CV, which is a required part of the promotion and tenure document. The candidate may include any testimonials, solicited or unsolicited, relating to service as part of an appendix to the promotion and tenure document.

## **2. Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

Before becoming eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor, an Associate Professor will normally complete at least five years as Associate Professor. Time in rank alone will never be sufficient criterion for promotion to Professor, however.

The candidate for promotion to Professor must show that he or she has been productive and successful, at a level significantly beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor, in each of the three areas of faculty activity. The candidate must also show significant evidence of effective leadership in several areas of his or her professional life, leadership that has had positive effect upon the department, college, university, community, and/or profession of communication.

### **A. Teaching**

To be eligible for promotion to Professor a faculty member must show that in the area of teaching he or she has accomplished the following, or their equivalents:

- Maintained high and appropriate standards in classes
- Advised and taught students with great success overall
- Taken the lead in developing appropriate and effective teaching materials

- Taken the lead in developing and revising courses as needed
- Performed all other teaching-related duties responsibly and successfully
- Taught assigned service and GE courses responsibly and successfully

#### **B. Scholarship**

To be eligible for promotion to Professor a faculty member must show that in the area of scholarship he or she has accomplished the following, or its equivalent:

- Published a scholarly book, scholarly monograph, or at least four substantial scholarly articles, chapters, or other equivalent publications beyond the number required to achieve Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to Professor may further demonstrate their ongoing scholarship by listing activity like the following, or the equivalent:

- Conference papers
- Research-related grant proposals
- Published reviews, notes, and other short articles
- Preparation of unpublished drafts
- Conference attendance
- Consulting

The candidate will provide a list of five to seven potential outside reviewers qualified to evaluate the quality of his or her work. The PTR committee will solicit letters from three of these reviewers. If the PTR committee cannot find three appropriate and available reviewers from the candidate's initial list, the candidate will provide additional names, as requested, until the committee can find enough appropriate and available reviewers. Reviewers should be scholars qualified in the candidate's field(s). The PTR committee will use the reviewers' letters to help gauge the candidate's contributions to his or her field.

#### **C. Service**

To be eligible for promotion to Professor a faculty member must show that in the area of service he or she has accomplished the following, or their equivalents:

- Chaired an important department, college, and/or university committee with significant responsibilities
- Taken a leadership role in some crucial aspect of university work, e.g. in assisting with a search, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
- Performed service for professional organization(s) locally, regionally, or nationally
- Performed community service related to professional expertise

### **3. Criteria for Tenure Only**

To be eligible for tenure a faculty member already at the Associate Professor or Professor rank must demonstrate the level of accomplishments defined above for promotion to those respective ranks. The candidate may freely use evidence from Wright State and from previous positions, academic and non-academic where appropriate, to demonstrate ongoing effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. The department may vote to waive the requirement for a teaching portfolio. All candidates

must submit at a minimum a full CV describing in detail their teaching, scholarship, service, and other relevant academic experiences.

---

[1] As stated in the Contract, for non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty, the numerical portions of all student teaching evaluations are sent to the department Chair along with the written portions. The Chair will consider these numerical evaluations (along with any numerical evaluations submitted voluntarily by tenured bargaining-unit faculty) as part of the overall evaluation of teaching, keeping in mind the questionable validity of numerical evaluations.

[2] The department recognizes that its faculty represent not only traditional academic areas, such as rhetoric and public address, but also professional areas such as broadcasting and print journalism. In this document, "scholarship" refers to the publication of original research and scholarship in both print and electronic media. In assessing electronic scholarship, the Chair will be guided by the standards current in the profession for evaluating electronic media.

The criteria acknowledge that creative and applied efforts as well as the traditional refereed article, can be evidence of scholarship. Examples of those equivalencies are described in the promotion and tenure section of the bylaws and apply here.

[3] To satisfy this category, a work would have to demonstrate the faculty member's expertise, though not necessarily be directly related to the academic field. For example a 30-minute video documentary, a book of children's stories or a non-fiction book might qualify if accepted by a recognized publisher of such materials. A single story or a shorter video normally would not qualify.

[4] The term "traditional" here does not in any way exclude scholarship that may appear in on-line journals or other non-print-and-paper formats. Creative or professional writing shall be evaluated as the equivalent of research-based scholarship providing the work appears in reputable and selective publications with strong regional or national reputation and relates to the faculty member's departmental responsibilities. Examples of publications would include *American Journalism Review*, *Columbia Journalism Review*, *Communication World*, *Public Relations Strategist* or *Quill*.

[5] The department recognizes that collaborative scholarship normally requires as much effort as single-author scholarship and should be evaluated accordingly. A co-authored work will be counted as the equivalent of a similar single-authored work.

[6] "Equivalent" here refers both to the effort going into a work and the professional importance of the scholarship itself. Thus, a scholarly book might be the equivalent of four articles, an important edited book may well be the equivalent of two or more important and substantial articles; an article widely recognized as groundbreaking in a major field may well be counted as more than one article; an article in an important journal or professional magazine, although not technically "peer-reviewed," may be equally important. In addition, applied research reports, particularly if resulting from a significant grant, may count, if equivalent.

[7] "Substantial" here refers to work which (a) meets professional standards for depth and breadth of coverage, and (b) reflects current thought and practice within specific disciplines.