

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI KANSAS CITY
PROMOTION & TENURE GUIDELINES
Department of Communication Studies

The Department of Communication Studies Promotion and Tenure Committee will consist of tenured members of the department excluding the department chair who may not participate as a committee member. The committee is charged to review all candidates annually for promotion and/or tenure and to make recommendations to the chairperson. The committee is obliged to adhere to the department's statement on promotion and tenure and to the University, campus, and College regulations, policies and procedures concerning promotion and tenure.

Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson

The chairperson of the committee will be appointed by the department chair at the beginning of each academic year from among the tenured members of the department. His/her responsibilities are to call meetings, preside over deliberations, supervise voting, see that all materials pertinent to each case under review are assembled for the committee members, select appropriate external peer reviewers and draft a recommendation on each case to be submitted to the department chair. The department P&T committee will not deliberate on any case until all materials, including all external reviews, have been received.

The committee recommendation together with a written commentary and supporting documentation, the tally of votes, and Part Two of Recommendation for Tenure and/or Promotion, signed by the committee chair, should be completed and on the department chair's desk in accordance with the established campus timetable for promotion and tenure.

Department Chair

The chair is responsible for transmitting the recommendations, Part Two of Recommendation for Tenure and/or Promotion, his/her own recommendation, and all supporting documentation to the dean of the College of Arts & Sciences. If there is a difference of opinion between the committee and the chair, the P&T committee and the chair will meet to discuss their differences. If no common opinion is possible, the chair will forward all materials described above to the dean. The chair is charged with informing the candidate of the recommendations.

Annual Evaluation

It is the responsibility of the candidate to assemble materials to be considered by the department P&T committee. The candidate should work with the chair to insure that the materials submitted are consistent with University, campus and department guidelines.

Third-Year Review Process

During the third year, all untenured assistant professors will undergo a formal evaluation of their progress toward tenure. The P& T committee will review materials submitted by candidates and evaluate their progress toward tenure. A written evaluation will be submitted to the chair. In turn, the chair will also review the materials, discuss them with the candidate, and write an evaluation of progress.

If, in the opinion of the P& T committee and the chair, the candidate is not making sufficient progress in research and scholarship or if the candidate is insufficient in teaching, a terminal contract should be issued at the end of the third year.

Candidate for Promotion and Tenure

It is the responsibility of the candidate to assemble materials to be considered by the department P&T committee. The candidate should work with the chair to insure that the materials submitted are consistent with University, campus and department guidelines.

Appeals Process

Upon notification of a negative recommendation a candidate shall have fourteen days from the date of written notification to prepare a rebuttal which may include new materials for consideration. The P&T committee will evaluate the rebuttal package and forward its findings to the department chair. The chair will forward all materials to the dean.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to associate professor shall have demonstrated potential for development of a national reputation in their discipline. The recommendations for promotion to associate professor and award of tenure will be considered together and no later than the mandatory year for the tenure review. It is not possible to list a simple numerical number of publications, grants, scholarly presentations or media productions as a guideline for promotion. It is expected that an assistant professor will show on-going growth in research and productivity. An acceptable performance of classroom instruction is required for promotion.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The distinction between associate professor and professor is largely one of scholarly maturity and degree. Candidates for promotion to full professor will have clearly established a national reputation in their discipline and have a clear record of on-going research and publication. An acceptable performance of classroom instruction is required for promotion to full professor.

Scholarship

Research Publication

Scholarship is intended to contribute to the growth and clarification of knowledge in a discipline. It includes research that leads to publication, oral presentations at professional organizations, development of funded research projects and/or production of media materials. Each candidate for promotion will be expected to show continuing professional growth in research, scholarship, and productivity. The department will consider the following as research and scholarship:

1. Articles published in refereed journals. Each article will be evaluated on its individual merits rather than on prima facie evidence of publication in specific journals. The department will make every effort to assess the quality of published materials through the use of both internal and external referees.
2. Articles or chapters in books will be considered in the same manner--on their individual merits.
3. Research monographs and textbooks will be considered as evidence of research. As with all other published materials each book or textbook will be considered on its merits using internal and external referees.
4. Oral presentations at national professional meetings are evidence of research. Those professional meetings with an organized system of peer review will be given more weight than those organizations with accept papers without refereed review. Papers presented at regional, state and local professional organizations may also be considered.
5. Publications based on dissertation research will be considered on their own merits. It is expected that candidates will develop research activity beyond their dissertation.
6. Newspaper articles, book reviews, and essays in non-academic periodicals are evidence of scholarly activity. They are not the equivalent of published articles.
7. Funded grants are an example of research and scholarship.
8. Acceptance of items 1 through 4 above as part of a professional, computerized data base, may also be considered, provided that a hard copy of such items is made available to the committee.

Creative Production

In the areas of radio and television, creative production of media materials is considered as scholarship. As with print publication, creative production is intended to contribute to the growth and clarification of knowledge in a discipline. Creative production includes radio or television productions which are broadcast on national

media, which are presented at professional organizations, lead to funded productions or are recognized by the leading professional organizations in radio and television as having special merit. The department will consider the following as creative production:

1. Radio or television programs that are broadcast over a national media outlet. Both public and private media would be considered
2. Narrative or dramatic productions original or a creative adaption
3. Documentary productions
4. Experimental productions
5. Animation and/or computer graphics productions

These materials, in addition to being broadcast, could be entered into regional, national or international competition for peer an refereed evaluation.

Teaching

- I. GENERAL CRITERIA*
 - A. Student Evaluations
 - B. Peer Evaluations
 - C. Course Preparation
 - D. Related Activities
 - E. Self-Appraisal

*Equal weight will be assigned to each criterion on the overall evaluation of teaching.

II. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

- A. Criteria
 1. Faculty-approved evaluation forms will be administered in all courses instructed each semester.
 2. The evaluation shall cover the traditional criteria of assessment including student perception of course content, overall class atmosphere, and clarity/organization.
 3. These criteria are spelled out on the departmental form with which faculty should familiarize themselves.
- B. Procedure

1. Consistent with University categories of teaching effectiveness, student evaluations of teaching will be interpreted within the following categories of excellence:
 - a. Excellent = 90% and above score on summed items
 - b. Good = 80% and above on summed score of items
 - c. Average = 70% and above score
 - d. Poor = 60% and above score

Note: Percentage figures represent statistical interpretation of summed score on all evaluation items (e.g., 8.1 on a 9.0 scale or 4.5 on a 5.0 scale would equal 90 percent).

2. Student evaluations may be mediated by factors other than teaching effectiveness (i.e., level of course difficulty, perceived grade in course, difficulty of graded assignments). The department shall include these and other possible mediators as agreed on by the faculty and designate the mediators to be tested on an annual basis. The chair/review committee shall take into consideration the effect of these mediators on an individual faculty member's evaluation.
3. Written comments on teaching effectiveness, although more difficult to translate into a numerical index, will be given equal consideration in assessing teaching effectiveness. The following criteria are to be employed in translating written comments:
 - a. Consistency among students' comments (i.e., 50%)
 - b. Minority comments shall be considered when a significant trend is evident among comments (i.e., 25%).
 - c. Failure of half the students to provide written comments shall be interpreted as lack of student interest and thus a reflection of teacher effectiveness.
4. The assignment of one of the four labels to teaching effectiveness will be based on the computer average of all evaluation items and will not reflect individual items alone. However, the chair or duly appointed review committee may single out particular item as exemplary of an instructor's effectiveness (as may the instructor of his/her self-appraisal). Assigning labels to teaching effectiveness will consider all criteria collectively or separate labels may be assigned to each criterion.
5. Assessment of numerical ratings will be evaluated in light of significant mediators and written comments will be qualified through percentage of students providing a particular response.

III. PEER EVALUATION

A. Criteria

1. Course Content
 - a. Does it reflect current theory and research
 - b. Is it correlated with text readings
 - c. Is the instructor's opinion separated from fact
 - d. Is the content accurate and complete
2. Class Atmosphere
 - a. Is class discussion promoted
 - b. Do students appear free to express their own opinions or challenge the instructor's
 - c. Are students encouraged to interact with one another
 - d. Is the instructor able to generate enthusiasm
3. Clarity & Organization
 - a. Purpose of course and lectures clearly stated
 - b. Is instructor able to synthesize discussions and lecture materials
 - c. Are units of the course clearly tied together
 - d. Do lectures demonstrate logical coherence--are main points clearly developed, are key points emphasized so as to facilitate note taking
 - e. Is instructor able to define difficult terms
 - f. Is instructor able to contextualize content with examples or application to social and personal issues
 - g. Are assignments clearly explained

B. Procedure

1. Each instructor will be evaluated by no less than two faculty with backgrounds relevant or familiar with the instructor's area of teaching.

2. During the first two years of initial appointment at the University, no less than two reviews from each of the two evaluators will be conducted.
3. During all other three-year periods of appointment, no less than two reviews from at least two evaluators will be conducted.
4. Reviews shall consist of class visitations and inspection of relevant teaching materials (e.g., tests, syllabi, class activities, lecture outlines).
5. Additional reviews may be requested by the chair/review committee and the instructor if such reviews are deemed essential to a fuller evaluation of the instructor's teaching effectiveness.
6. At least half of the reviews may be conducted without advanced notice to the instructor.
7. The review process will consider criteria previously outlined and those to be outlined under IV, V, and VI.
8. Each evaluator shall prepare a written reaction within one week after each review. Copies of the review will be forwarded to the chair and the review committee and to the instructor.
9. The instructor may forward a written reaction to the review to the chair to be placed in his/her permanent file prior to the annual review process.

IV. COURSE DEVELOPMENT & PREPARATION

A. Criteria

1. Copies of class activities
2. Copies of course syllabi
3. Refinements to course structure/content
4. Lecture/laboratory handouts, manuals and other teaching aids
5. Innovative or experimental pedagogies utilized
6. Documentation of literature reviews and reviews of textbooks contributing to the overall design of a course

B. Procedure

1. The instructor may document these criteria in several ways (e.g., content revisions as listed on syllabi from one semester to the next, updated lecture outlines, copies of class exercises and examinations).

2. Instructors may provide a rationale and philosophy underlying their classroom methods as well as demonstrate how these methods reflect underlying goals
3. Since feedback is an essential component of teaching and condition of learning, the instructor shall demonstrate the quality of feedback he/she provides on both graded and ungraded assignments (e.g., Xerox Copies of graded term papers).

V. RELEVANT ACTIVITIES

A. Criteria

1. New course proposals
2. Independent study direction
3. General advising
4. Teaching overloads
5. New course offerings
6. Thesis direction/advisement
7. Curriculum development
8. Continuing education courses
9. Teaching awards/recognition
10. Teaching workshops attended

B. Procedure

1. These criteria will be weighed toward qualitative rather than quantitative output (e.g., independent study offerings should reflect teaching effectiveness similar to that expected in formal course work, including entry requirements used to select students, demonstration of guidance offered the student, and adherence to grading criteria).
2. All related activities will be judged on the basis of their contribution to departmental goals and needs and demonstration of their contribution to improving instructional effectiveness.

VI. SELF-APPRAISAL

A. Criteria

1. Documentation of course preparation
2. Reactions to student evaluations and/or reactions to evaluation of chair/review committee
3. Documentation of validity of course content (e.g., timeliness to social issues, based on most recent theory and research)
4. Statement of teaching philosophy and underlying rationale for teaching methods
5. Statement of relevant activities and their contribution to the department, the University, to one's profession, and to overall improvement in teaching

B. Procedure

1. Each instructor shall be solely responsible for organizing and forwarding to the chair a written self-appraisal of teaching effectiveness, as outlined in the above stated criteria.
2. Chair/review committee shall acknowledge receipt of written appraisal and clarify to the instructor its role or contribution in the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness with attention to discussing discrepancies between the instructor's and their assessment.
3. The instructor may attach a written reaction to the chair's/review committee's assessment of the self-appraisal.

Service

As defined here, service means meeting the responsibilities to the University community, the urban community, and the larger professional and scholarly communities of which we are part by virtue of our residence, training, and participation. Service to the University includes those activities essential for the University to fulfill its primary duties of teaching and scholarship. These include membership in departmental, College, campus-wide, and University-wide committees. Service to the urban community may be indicated by participation in workshops, conferences, advisory or governing boards; creation of off-campus non-credit programs, or disseminating information to the general public. Professional service contributes to the vitality of professional associations and enhances dialogue among scholars. Among such service activities are membership in the committees of offices of professional associations,

organization of colloquia or panels, editorial service for professional journals, and review of texts and/or articles for publishing houses or periodicals.

Evidence of all such service must be established by documentation. Wherever possible, evaluations should be obtained from sources outside the department.

Relative Weighing of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

While teaching and scholarship are of primary importance in promotion and tenure cases, a record of service is also necessary. A candidate for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate accomplishment in each of the three areas.