

DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATIONS

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2008-09
DEPARTMENT: Communication Studies
TODAY'S DATE: 5-08

The following are guidelines developed by the above-named department to assist the candidate in meeting the tenure and promotion standards set forth in the *University Handbook*, Section XII. However, the *University Handbook* is the final authority on matters of tenure and promotion.

INTRODUCTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES

The Department of Communication Studies at Christopher Newport University focuses on an interdisciplinary approach to the study of communication, emphasizing rhetorical studies, critical/cultural studies, and interpersonal/organizational studies. In accordance with Section XII of the University Handbook, and relevant passages of Vision 2010, the department supports the following system for evaluating its faculty based on three criteria: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. These criteria are weighted according to a points-based system outlined in the remainder of the document, and weights are assigned in conjunction with the "Proposal for a New Schedule and Structure of Probationary Appointment Reviews" supported by the Faculty Senate and the Provost as of November 9th, 2007.

POINTS EVALUATION SYSTEM & WORKLOAD SPECIFICATIONS

The department recognizes that faculty members will differ according to position and academic rank. Thus, the following ratios will be used when evaluating a candidate's materials in a given period:

	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Second Year Review	70 pts.	15 pts.	15 pts.
Fourth Year Review	60 pts.	20 pts.	20 pts.
Tenure/Promotion Review (Associate)	50 pts.	30 pts.	20 pts.
Promotion Review (Full)	50 pts.	25 pts.	25 pts.

The department requires that all candidates achieve at least 80 points in the second year review to be considered for reappointment. In all other reviews, a candidate must accrue 100 points to be considered for reappointment/promotion. Points are based on the cumulative documentation of a candidate's work at the institution (e.g., in fourth year review, candidates count all prior three years toward the final total). Adjustments will be made when a candidate is hired with years granted toward tenure.

DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION & TENURE REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with the University Handbook, the department requires at least 4 years of service at the rank of Assistant Professor, and 5 years of relevant university experience before a candidate can apply for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In addition, the department requires the candidate demonstrate the following requirements to be considered for the **rank of Associate Professor**:

- demonstrate excellence in teaching through IDEAs showing considerable potential to continue teaching excellence,
- possesses a scholarly book or at least three published works of scholarship (which are peer reviewed and/or are part of a significant volume or collaboration) that demonstrate a clear and focused line of research, and
- perform competent departmental, college and university service with demonstrated results.

In accordance with the University Handbook, the department requires at least 7 years of service at the rank of Associate Professor, and 12 years of relevant university experience before a candidate can apply for tenure and promotion to the rank of Professor. In addition, the department requires the candidate demonstrate the following minimum requirements to be considered for the **rank of Professor**:

- demonstrate a continuous record of excellent teaching,
- possess at least three published works of scholarship obtained after promotion to associate professor (which are peer-reviewed and/or are part of a significant volume or collaboration) that demonstrate a clear and focused line of research, and
- perform substantial service appointments which lead to a record of significant leadership.

Candidates are responsible for addressing the ways in which they meet these criteria in their Eval 6 narrative. These are the *minimum* requirements in order to be considered for tenure and promotion. Completion of these minimum standards does not automatically ensure a successful review, as in accordance with the University Handbook, the department seriously considers the “extent to which minimum qualifications are exceeded” as part of final decisions on retention and promotion.

TEACHING

When evaluating teaching, the department values not only the completion of teaching requirements, but demonstrating department & university collegiality and positive student responses to teaching as important elements. Our primary means of assessment for teaching effectiveness is completed IDEA forms, although additional materials related to teaching are also accepted toward a candidate’s total number of points earned in any given review period. We are concerned with effective measures of student learning across all curricular areas. There are two important caveats related to points obtained for teaching. First, points within the additional teaching components section count per semester, not per course (thus, if a candidate teaches three sections of the same course, s/he cannot count an innovate assignment across that course three times, only once; similarly, a candidate who teaches multiple sections of First Year Seminar cannot count each section as one point).

Second, the department takes rigor seriously when evaluating student responses to teaching. Students may assign higher numeric values to teaching that resulted in a higher final grade. Thus, any instance where student response may be influenced by the distribution of grades in a particular course should be addressed by the candidate within the narrative of the Eval 6 (e.g., if one is teaching an honors course, or a course with all majors, and the overall GPA is high, the candidate should demonstrate how assessment materials were appropriate and expectations were exceeded by a majority of the class). Should the candidate fail to address potentially problematic areas, the peer review committee may opt to adjust points generated from student response to the next subsequent level.

The following are the point allocations for IDEA scores in the *Second Year Review only*:

Excellence in Teaching

Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 4.5 =	12 pts.
Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 4.0 =	9 pts.
Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 3.5 =	6 pts.
Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 3.0 =	3 pt.

The following are the point allocations for IDEA scores in *all other review periods*:

Excellence in Teaching

Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 4.5 =	4 pts.
Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 4.0 =	3 pts.
Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 3.5 =	2 pts.

Each Course with IDEA Adjusted Average Summary Evaluation Score Over 3.0 = 1 pt.

In any review period, candidates may offer the following additional documentation of teaching effectiveness and improvement:

Additional Teaching Components

Changes to a Course Previously Taught based on Student Feedback	=	2 pts.
Creation/Execution of Innovative Assignments (beyond tests & papers)	=	2 pts.
Supervised an Independent Study	=	2 pts.
Was Nominated for a Teaching Honor/Award	=	1 pt.
Received a Teaching Honor/Award	=	2 pts.
Each Course Taught that was a New Preparation	=	2 pts.
Each Course Taught Fulfilling an A of I, FYS, or Basic Course	=	1 pt.
Each Course Taught within the Major	=	1 pt.
Service as a Guest Lecturer in a Course that is not one's own	=	1 pt.
Participated in Senior Research Assessment	=	1 pt.
Participation in Teaching Teams	=	1 pt.
Evaluations Received from Peer-Review of Teaching Activities	=	1 pt.

SCHOLARSHIP

The department recognizes its interdisciplinary nature, and as such, supports a wide range of activities that promote scholarship and professional development within the discipline. We value publications in journals that span relevant disciplines, and conference presentations at national, international, regional and local venues. The points allocated to scholarship are consistent, regardless of the year of review. Scholarship in progress (in press/to be presented) may be counted as part of the point total; however, during tenure & promotion reviews, at least two of the three published forms of scholarship must be obtained (in print). A candidate may count multiple instances within categories (e.g., 3 individual presentations counts for 9 pts., not just 3) where relevant.

The following are the point allocations for scholarship:

Publications

Scholarly Book	=	20 pts.
Edited Book	=	15 pts.
Text Book	=	10 pts.
Peer-Reviewed Journal Article	=	7 pts.
Book Chapter in an Edited Volume	=	5 pts.
Non-Peer Reviewed Publication (invited)	=	2 pts.

Involvement in Professional Conferences

Individual Presentation (competitive papers only)	=	3 pts.
Participated in a Panel or Session (without full paper)	=	1 pt.
Served as Reviewer for a Division, Interest Group or Caucus	=	1 pt.
Served as Planner for a Division, Interest Group or Caucus	=	3 pts.
Attended Professional Development Event (workshop, pre-conference)	=	1 pt.
Sponsored a Student Paidiea Presentation	=	1 pt.
Sponsored a Student National or Regional Presentation	=	2 pts.

Other Activities

Served as an Editor for a Peer-Reviewed Journal	=	10 pts.
Reviewed a Submission for a Peer-Reviewed Journal	=	1 pt.

Reviewed a Book Proposal for a Publisher	=	1 pt.
Grant Received (External)	=	5 pts.
Grant Received (Internal)	=	2 pts.
Was Nominated for a Scholarly Honor/Award	=	1 pt.
Received a Scholarly Honor/Award	=	2 pts.

SERVICE

The department places a high value on service rendered to both the university and the department, as well as any service provided to the community and Commonwealth related to one's professional identity. The points allocated to service are consistent, regardless of the year of review. Candidates who complete subsequent years of service within a given review period (e.g., serve as an advisor for a student organization for three years consecutively) may count points for that service in each year in was rendered.

The following are the point allocations for service:

Advising

Advisor to a Student Organization	=	5 pts.
Master Advisor	=	5 pts.
First Year Student Advising (for each session)	=	2 pts.
Advising within the Major (for every 10 students)	=	1 pt.
Letters of Recommendation Provided (for every 10)	=	1 pt.

University Service

University-Wide Committee Chair	=	5 pts.
University-Wide Committee member, elected	=	5 pts.
University-Wide Committee Member, appointed	=	3 pts.
University-Wide Sub-committee Chair	=	2 pts.
University-Wide Sub-committee Member	=	1 pt.
Peer-Group Committee Chair	=	3 pts.
Peer-Group Committee Member	=	1 pt.
Search Committee Chair	=	5 pts.
Search Committee Member	=	2 pt.
Departmental Representative at University Event (Open House, etc.)	=	1 pt.

Departmental Service

Chair of the Department	=	20 pts.
Internship Coordinator	=	5 pts.
Senior Capstone Coordinator	=	5 pts.
Assessment Coordinator	=	5 pts.
Basic Course Coordinator	=	5 pts.
Web Page Coordinator	=	5 pts.
Department Representative for Departmental Function	=	2 pt.
Other Services to the Department	=	2 pt.

Community or Commonwealth Service

Activity Related to Professional Role (e.g., presentations to local organizations, workshops, letters to the editor)	=	2 pt.
Sustained Community Service Activity (e.g., contributing to making connections between CNU & local community)	=	5 pts.

OTHER

The department recognizes that there may be special circumstances in any review process. If a candidate believes there are special circumstances to consider during any review period, s/he must approach the department chair about these circumstances, and clearly address them in the Eval 6 narrative. Special circumstances cannot be used as a justification for failing to meet requirements, however, they may be used to redistribute points in specialized circumstances (e.g., a candidate receiving a sabbatical [thus no

teaching evaluations, but substantial scholarly output produced] could result in shifting points from teaching to scholarship; a candidate who publishes in a highly selective outlet can provide a case as to why a particular publication could be valued for more points as a result of the acceptance/rejection rates).