

**Department of Communication Studies
Clemson University**

Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

Approved by voting faculty on April 23, 2014.

Overview of Manual

This document, *Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion*, provides Communication Studies faculty with specific performance expectations in the areas of teaching, research and service, consistent with the department mission.

Department Mission

The Department of Communication Studies at Clemson University cultivates graduate and undergraduate students with the knowledge and **critical thinking** skills necessary to succeed not only in a professional or advanced academic environment, but also **in the larger society as engaged global citizens**. Faculty members have expertise in **diverse** areas of human communication processes, and the scholarship they pursue challenges and educates students at both abstract and applied levels. Coursework and interaction with faculty instill in students **broadmindedness, ethical sensibilities, rigorous thought processes** and genuine

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The senior lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performers who combine effective instruction with additional significant contributions to the mission of the University. To be appointed to senior lecturer status in the Department of Communication Studies, lecturers must meet all of the following criteria:

1. At least four full academic years of employment (regular nine-month annual appointment) as a full-time lecturer to the Department
2. Excellent teaching: measures of excellence in teaching may be documented by at least two of the following: student evaluations consistently average at least 4.0/5 with response rates averaging at least 75%; innovative, rigorous content as documented by assignment descriptions and course syllabi; positive assessments based on direct observation of teaching by Department Chair/Tenure and Promotion Committee representative. For more information, see *Appendix A: Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching*.
3. Significant service contribution: service that shows a commitment to the mission of the Department/College/University. Examples of significant service may include one or more of the following: service on department, college, or university committees beyond the basic course committee; coordination of creative inquiry/student engagement projects; serving as a faculty advisor to undergraduate students; serving as a mentor to graduate

teaching assistants; assisting with special events, projects, or other activities sponsored by the department, college, or university

4. Form 3 ratings of “Good” or better each year employed as a full-time lecturer in the Department

5. Other guidelines or policies as indicated in the *Faculty Manual*

Revised and submitted 9.26.13 by Karyn Ogata Jones, department chair

Approved by the faculty

Effective beginning Fall Semester, 2013

Annual Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

In the Department of Communication Studies, tenure-track faculty are evaluated in terms of teaching, research, and service, and it is the responsibility of each faculty member to make his or her best case for continued reappointment in the tenure track.

Demonstrated scholarly achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. In support of our department's mission to instill broadmindedness and curiosity, and the College's emphasis on creativity, we note that an openness to innovative forms of achievement is desirable. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable.

The process of reappointment is as stated in the Faculty Manual (Faculty Manual—December 2013 (v. 3), pp. 21-22):

The department chair shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The appropriate committee reviews each case in accordance with departmental procedures and policies, and renders a written recommendation.

The department chair does not participate in the deliberations of the committee, but may, upon request of the committee, serve as a resource for

the committee. In addition, the committee may, upon request of the chair, serve as a resource for the chair. The chair and the committee issue separate recommendations, free from coercion and interference from any parties. The department chair and the committee shall provide each other with a copy of their recommendations once both have been completed. The chair shall ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the dean. In cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

The chair shall forward to the dean both recommendations, the supporting evaluations, and the candidate's dossier. In cases in which there is a discrepancy in the rationale for retention, tenure, or promotion between a faculty member's peer committee and that of the department chair, that administrator shall make the dean aware of the discrepancy. The dean will meet with the chair and with the peer committee to discuss reasons for the discrepancy. A "Request for Personnel Action" form shall be attached to provide a record of the review at all administrative levels.

The dean reviews the complete file, makes a separate recommendation on the "Request for Personnel Action" form, and writes a report which includes a rationale for supporting or opposing the recommendations of the peer committee and department chair. The dean may establish committees within the college to provide assistance and advice in such reviews. The dean shall

promptly inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation and its rationale, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the Provost. If the dean's recommendation differs from those of the peer committee and/or the department chair, the differences shall be discussed with them prior to informing the candidate. Except in cases of penultimate year tenure review, the candidate is offered the opportunity to withdraw at this stage. In all other cases the complete file is forwarded to the Provost.

The Provost reviews the complete file and forwards a recommendation for final action to the President. If the Provost agrees with concurring recommendations of the peer review committee, the department chair, and the dean, he/she may simply indicate this and sign the "Request for Personnel Action" form. Otherwise, the Provost shall write a recommendation to the President, which includes a rationale in addition to completing and signing the "Request for Personnel Action" form. The Provost shall ensure that the affected faculty member is informed promptly in writing as to the final action.

The university shares with tenure-track faculty a system for organizing reappointment materials, such as CVs, teaching evaluations, copies of research articles, and so forth. It is important that all required materials be submitted for reappointment, including items such as previous reappointment letters, copies of Form 3 evaluations, letters verifying special recognitions, and other materials. It is also vital that all scholarly pursuits (e.g., publications, articles in press, conference

papers, grants) be represented in an accurate manner, reflecting how they were evaluated and selected.

When assembling reappointment materials, faculty members should make certain that content reflects positively on performance and that all information is accurate. The task is to make a cogent argument for continued reappointment, and that argument is best constructed with a parsimonious letter and CV indicating accomplishments and pursuits continued from the previous year, as well as inclusion of all required forms and existing letters.

Teaching

As explained in the *College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities Dean's Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, Reappointment and Post-Tenure Review*: “Clemson University takes great pride in its tradition of excellence in teaching. All faculty in the College of Architecture, Art and the Humanities must demonstrate at the minimum very good teaching in the classroom or studio. Faculty are also expected to be conscientious, professional and attentive in their interaction with students outside of the classroom.” The Department of Communication Studies subscribes to the guidelines of the college, but further encourages its faculty to strive for *excellence* in teaching.

At the department level, excellence in teaching is a fundamental requirement for continued service. Teaching evaluations are expected to be highly rated and with an average response rate of 75%. In addition to coursework, undergraduate and graduate advising is considered part of teaching responsibilities, which can be demonstrated through evidence including but not limited to successful completion of graduate and undergraduate honors theses by advisees, chairing or serving on thesis committees, and accomplishments of advisees. Other indicators might include unsolicited letters from students, teaching materials, in-class exercises, pedagogical innovations, teaching or advising awards, special achievements of former students, volume and quality of teaching and advising, grants or funding for teaching- or advising-related activities, new course creation, curriculum development, and scholarly journal

articles about pedagogy. While teaching abilities are sometimes overlooked at research universities, faculty who do not demonstrate excellence in the classroom at Clemson generally do not stand to be tenured and promoted. For more information, see *Appendix A: Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching*.

Research

As explained in the *College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities Dean's Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, Reappointment and Post-Tenure Review*: “All faculty members must have a sustained record of demonstrated accomplishment and continued promise in peer-reviewed research, scholarship and/or creative endeavors. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature in their professional disciplines on a national level.” The Department of Communication Studies subscribes to the guidelines of the college.

Regarding scholarly research, the Department of Communication Studies strives to be egalitarian in terms of epistemology, with faculty pursuing scholarship in a variety of traditions. Faculty members have agreed that the process of *blind peer review* is the most rigorous and equitable means of determining the significance of a program of scholarship. Whether one engages in qualitative or quantitative pursuits, recognized scholars who serve on editorial boards determine whether articles, books, and other submissions assist in advancing the knowledge base in communication. Such *blind peer reviewed publications* should make up the majority of evidence of a case for tenure. Additionally, one may also make a case for *editorial peer review publications* and *other publications* to count toward scholarly activity *to some degree*.

Furthermore, knowledge can also be advanced through in ways other than strictly defined publications. However, absent the familiar model of publication review, it is important for the candidate to present evidence of peer review in such projects.

Invited publications that do not travel through a process of blind or editorial peer review, such as newspaper stories, magazine articles, blog posts, or podcasts, require the candidate to make a clear case for their counting in the process of assessment to some degree, due to, for example, the prestige of the publication or the impact of the article. The department encourages faculty members to choose pursuits wisely.

Evidence of Research Productivity

In making the case for tenure and promotion after five years of service, faculty members will need to have assembled a program of scholarly research that six external reviewers—three chosen by the tenure candidate and three by the department—can examine and evaluate in a favorable manner. This is often accomplished through a careful blend of quantity and quality.

The Personnel Committee recognizes that publications carry differing levels of prestige and effort. For example, a blind peer-reviewed book published by a scholarly press could represent the equivalent of multiple blind peer-reviewed journal articles. An article published in a journal with acceptance rates in the single digits, for instance, is a significant accomplishment that would be weighted higher than a less competitive journal. Such publications not only build the reputation of the individual faculty member, but also build the reputations of the department and the larger university.

In addition to blind peer reviewed publications, other evidence for advancing scholarly knowledge can be considered, in various combinations, which will be

assessed by the Committee. It is the candidate's responsibility to make the case for the relevance of the evidence they submit. For example, a book chapter with editorial peer review still contributes to scholarship if from a reputable press, and could count towards total research productivity, although is weighted less than a blind peer reviewed chapter. Cases for research productivity could include, but not be limited to, evidence such as editorial product, editorial reviewed books, monographs, or book chapters, invited reviewed books, monographs, or book chapters; significant newspaper articles, and other publications.

Authorship

Sole authorship versus coauthoring varies across different areas of our field. While a case for tenure will make a holistic assessment of all evidence, here are some general guidelines:

- A candidate's publications should not be entirely coauthored. Evidence of scholarly impact and potential is demonstrated by having at least some sole-authored publications.
- Candidates are encouraged to describe their contribution to co-authored publications.
- There is no easy formula for calculating the equivalences of publications.

Sole author or first author on a team of two or three generally carries more weight than being a member of a team of five. However, if that team of five produced an article in an internationally recognized journal as part of a federally funded research grant (e.g., Journal of the American Medical Association, NIH) it could be viewed as on par with a sole authored piece in

an obscure journal.

- Expectations for sole authorship versus coauthorship in subareas of our field should also be taken into account.

Guidelines for Excellence in Research

I. Guiding Assumptions.

As members of the faculty have noted, our discipline has traditionally relied upon the quality of placement and number of publications when evaluating research productivity. The following criteria for evaluating faculty research are proposed in keeping with this tradition, as well as the value the Department has placed on epistemological egalitarianism, as evidenced in our Mission Statement. In this spirit, we also acknowledge that publications are the dominant, but not the sole indicator of research productivity or prestige, and indicate below ways to balance tradition with broadmindedness, creativity, and a forward-thinking awareness of emerging forms of scholarship. Note that, however, under no circumstances do vanity publications and for-pay conferences, journals, etc. count toward research.

II. Criteria for Evaluation.

1. Tenure-line faculty carrying an average 3-3 teaching load are expected to produce, on average, one scholarly publication per year or equivalent. Tenure-line faculty carrying an average 3-2 teaching load are expected to produce, on average, more than one scholarly publication per year or equivalent. Tenure-line faculty carrying an average 2-2 teaching load are expected to produce, on average, significantly more

than one scholarly publication per year or equivalent. Scholarly publications shall be defined as those that have gone through a process of blind peer review, contain theoretical and methodological development appropriate to the analysis, and published in a relevant regional, national, or international outlet in human communication or related fields. The quality of such blind peer-reviewed publications is evidenced by factors such as rejection rates, composition of editorial boards, prominence in field or subject matter, and other metrics the candidate may provide. Publishing in such scholarly outlets will allow faculty to participate in the "scholarly discussion" of our discipline and will advance the scholarly reputation of the Department and University.

2. While the average total number and nature of publications as stated in #1 above is a general goal for all faculty, the total number and nature of publications may vary based on the nature of the faculty member's assignment and program of scholarship and nature of research. For examples, see Dimensions of Research Program Quality.

3. Probationary faculty should strive to develop an identifiable program of scholarship that demonstrates a trajectory for success beyond the tenure-track years. This means that faculty should demonstrate original thought, as evidenced by sole and first-authorships, as well as collaborate with others at Clemson and other universities when appropriate.

4. The Department's Personnel Committee and Chair will conduct independent evaluations of probationary faculty research performance each year, offering feedback to each faculty member regarding his or her progress toward meeting expectations for producing quality research.

5. Six external referees will evaluate the research portfolio at the close of each faculty member's probation period (tenure and promotion review). Three of these will be selected by the tenure candidate and three will be selected by the Department Chair. All referees should be established scholars in communication research, as evidenced by their degree(s), appointment(s), or research, preferably in areas directly related to the faculty member's line of research. As external referees should provide objective assessments of the candidate's program of research, the tenure candidate may have worked directly, either as a student or research collaborator, with no more than one external referee at any time in the past. See the University Faculty Manual and Department Bylaws for additional expectations regarding tenure and promotion review procedures.

6. Probationary faculty are expected to balance independent programs of research and publication with teaching and service responsibilities. However, the service needs of the department may not always make an ideal balance possible, and assessments of teaching and research should take this into account.

III. Dimensions of Research Program Quality

The Department recognizes the evolving manners by which scholars can advance the knowledge base in communication, contribute to scholarly conversations, and build the reputations of the scholar, department, and university. Such broadmindedness reflects the same that we wish to impart in our students. We wish to be forward-looking and open to considering advances in the forms and modes of scholarly production. Blind, peer-reviewed scholarly publications should make up the bulk of

evidence of research productivity, but the candidate may also make the case for other forms. The following items could be appropriate equivalences for blind peer-reviewed journal articles:

- Longer-form scholarly publications, such as individually authored or edited books or journal issues, or monographs; all peer-reviewed and published by a reputable publisher
- Book chapters, peer-reviewed (if not blind) and published by a reputable publisher, scholarly books (individually authored or edited) published by a reputable publisher

External grant funding is not a publication, but does offer evidence of the quality of research and/or contribution to department and institution. In these or other cases, it is the candidate's responsibility to document the worth of the activity. This can be accomplished through evidence such as, but not limited to:

- Evidence of rigor: Editorial reviews, feedback, and revisions, correspondence, competitiveness of grant, etc.
- Evidence of prestige: Grants awarded, circulation or visibility of publication or venue, centrality of outlet to relevant discussions, etc.
- Evidence of impact: Reviews, reprints, citations, interviews, rankings, etc.

For example, a major newspaper article in the *New York Times* on a subject in the candidate's research, could be presented as a component of scholarly productivity, with supporting evidence that could include but not be limited to it being a prestigious outlet, with wide circulation, on a relevant topic, with input from editorial review, and referenced widely in social media. In general, the writing of textbooks

(i.e., books that reorganize and redistribute existing knowledge) by junior faculty is discouraged; to be considered research, any book must clearly illustrate original thought and advance knowledge in the discipline. Annual reviews by the Department's Personnel Committee and Chair should be instructive in this regard.

IV. Note on Course Reductions

If one receives a course reduction for research, this will increase expectations for research productivity. The Clemson University Faculty Manual states:

The normal faculty workload entails teaching and research assignments; service to the department, school, college, and the university; and/or other professional activities. The usual teaching assignment at Clemson University is 9-12 credit hours for each of the two regular semesters. The particular teaching assignment of an individual faculty member may, for a number of reasons, vary from department to department and even within departments. Departments with heavy faculty research obligations may in some instances reduce teaching loads and assign the hours so released to research. Released time may also be provided through funded research. Unusually heavy service assignments (e.g., committee work, administrative duties, advisory responsibilities, public service) may also lead to reduced teaching assignments, depending upon the staffing situation in a given department. In some instances graduate courses, off-campus courses, or unusually large classes may be considerations in workload decisions. (p. 71, August 2012 v. 2)

Service

As explained in the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities Dean's *Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, Reappointment and Post-Tenure Review*: “All faculty are required to contribute to the Clemson community by performing exemplary service at the departmental, college and university levels. Public service and service to national academic and professional organizations also plays a key role in the assessment of a candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure. Community service, where professionally relevant, will also be considered. The nature of service changes over time during a faculty member’s career and is dependent upon a faculty member’s role and position in the department. For example, a junior faculty member should be engaged in disciplinary service at the regional level, whereas a senior faculty member is expected to assume national leadership roles in professional organizations.” The Department of Communication Studies subscribes to the guidelines of the college.

Regarding service, all faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that are consistent with their rank and teaching requirements. The process largely takes care of itself, with department committees assembled at a certain point each year, with occasional requests for service from the college and university.

Disciplinary service is valued, and examples include serving on committees, reviewing papers for annual conferences, and so forth. Faculty in the tenure-track should always be cognizant of the time required of service activities, and whether certain pursuits might compromise time better spent elsewhere.

Attention should be given not only to the amount of service but also to the quality and impact of the contribution. Contextual issues such as teaching load, scope of assigned administrative responsibilities, and opportunities for service will be evaluated.

Guidelines for Evaluating Faculty Service

I. Guiding Assumptions. The following recommendations are made with the assumption that each faculty member will be required to document performance in each major area, and that qualitative determinations will be made based on the nature of the service (e.g., reviewing manuscripts for a major national journal or conference will "count" more than the same activity done at the local or regional level). Service contributions should be appropriate to the needs of the department as well as individual expertise.

II. Definitions of Service. Service may include but is not limited to the following definitions in each area.

A. To internal publics of the Department, College, and University:

- Organizing / participating in professional development and other events for our graduate students
- Serving on committees (relative to nature of position)
- Participation in co-curricular activities
- Sponsorship of student organizations
- Participation in fundraising/development/outreach activities, approved by the Department Chair in advance

- Conducting/planning workshops, colloquia, trainings

B. To external publics in the Discipline, add to the above:

- Editorships, reviewing manuscripts, chairing panels
- Outside reviewer for tenure files
- Leadership roles in disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations

C. To external publics in the community and professional service: To be considered service for the purpose of evaluating faculty performance, any community service must be related to providing consultation on matters involving communication (i.e., be related to our profession). Examples could include providing pro bono communication consulting or services for community organizations, participating in relevant educational events, or teaching communication skills and knowledge to community members. Extensive community or professional service will not be considered an adequate substitute for service to our internal publics or to the Discipline.

III. Methods Used to Evaluate Service. Service requirements depend on the nature of the position, individual expertise, and seniority, with the nature of service expectations increasing in scope and significance to reflect development of individual faculty over time. Service expectations should be determined collaboratively among the Department Chair, Personnel Committee, and faculty member. All senior (tenured) faculty are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of service to both internal and external publics as stipulated in FAS goals; significant disciplinary service is expected of all senior (tenured) faculty. Service performance will be evaluated annually by the Department's Personnel Committee and Chair and

through the tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review processes, and individual service expectations will be documented in individual faculty's annual FAS goals. Faculty will be expected to document effectiveness in service and short- and long-term service goals in their FAS as well as in a cover letter submitted with annual reappointment application materials.

IV. Collegiality and Professional Behavior

When assessing a candidate for tenure, promotion, or reappointment's collegiality and professional conduct, the Department of Communication Studies' Personnel Committee will reference the standards set forth in the Clemson University Faculty Manual's section IX-E "Professional Responsibility Toward Colleagues" (August 2012 v.2). In addition, The Department of Communication Studies recognizes the importance of informed debate, assertiveness, and critical thinking in professional communication and systems of shared governance. Our definition of collegiality is not intended to discourage disagreement over questions of departmental policy and procedure, nor should it occlude reasoned dissent.

Post-Tenure Review

Departmental guidelines are currently under development. Meanwhile, please see for reference:

- College of Art, Architecture and Humanities Dean's Guidelines for Tenure,

Promotion

- *University Faculty Manual* policies on promotion and salary determination

(currently Part IV, Section I, p. 26-27)

- *University Faculty Manual*, Appendix G: BEST PRACTICES FOR POST-

TENURE REVIEW

Concluding Note

As indicated earlier, this document, *Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion*, seeks to provide Communication Studies faculty with specific performance expectations in the art of teaching, research and service. Should questions arise regarding procedures for annual reappointment, tenure and promotion, faculty members should contact the department chair or the chair of the department Personnel Committee.

Appendix A: Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching

The following table identifies the six characteristics the department deems necessary to achieving excellence in teaching along with strategies for achieving such excellence and concrete sources of measurement of such excellence.

| Goal | Strategy | Measurement |
|---|---|--|
| I. To demonstrate effective instructional design skills, instructors must: | 1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current theories & methods in practices related to teaching areas | A. Review of course materials (syllabus, assignments, goals / objectives, grading criteria) B. Student feedback C. Self reports |
| | 2. Promote & encourage connections among knowledge, attitudes, & skills | A. Review of course materials (syllabus, assignments, goals / objectives, and grading criteria) B. Self reports |
| | 3. Indicate rigorous & fair grading standards | A. Review of course materials (syllabus, assignments, goals / objectives, and grading criteria) B. Review of grade distributions C. Self reports |
| II. To demonstrate effective classroom management skills, instructors must: | 1. Promote & encourage connections among knowledge, attitudes & skills | A. Student feedback B. Peer observations C. Self reports |
| | 2. Foster open and supportive educational climates | A. Student feedback B. Peer observations |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | C. Self reports |
| | 3. Demonstrate well- organized instructional skills | A. Student feedback B. Peer observations |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| III. To demonstrate effective course management skills instructors must: | 1. Return graded materials promptly | A. Student feedback |
| | 2. Keep students informed of progress in course | A. Student feedback |
| | 3. Submit final grades according to University deadlines | A. Registrar reports |
| | 4. Adhere to course requirements as written in syllabi | A. Student feedback |
| | 5. Respond to student communication in a timely manner | A. Student feedback |
| IV. To provide effective counsel outside the classroom, instructors must: | 1. Be available to students outside of class | A. Student feedback |
| | 2. Provide accurate & timely advising related to student progress in coursework | A. Student feedback |
| | 3. Maintain an attitude of concern toward students | A. Student Feedback B. Peer observations C. Self reports |
| V. To provide quality academic advising (if applicable), instructors must: | 1. Assist in developing educational goals and objectives | A. Student feedback via advising surveys |
| | 2. Be accessible to advisees in a | A. Student feedback |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | timely manner | via advising surveys |
| | 3. Maintain an attitude of concern toward students | A. Student feedback via advising surveys |
| | 4. Provide accurate information about course and registration requirements | A. Student feedback via advising surveys |
| VI. To contribute to a culture of collaborative, collegial learning, instructors must: | 1. Collaborate with faculty to implement service learning projects in coursework where appropriate | A. Review of course materials (syllabus, assignments, goals / objectives, grading criteria) B. Peer observations C. Self Reports |
| | 2. Collaborate with faculty to conduct research projects in coursework where appropriate | A. Review of course materials (syllabus, assignments, goals / objectives, grading criteria) B. Peer observations C. Self Reports |
| | 3. Collaborate with faculty to share pedagogy and research to bolster student learning | A. Review of course materials (syllabus, assignments, goals / objectives, grading criteria) B. Peer observations C. Self Reports |