

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES
STATEMENT OF
DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS AND PROCESSES FOR EVALUATION

Last updated: Summer 2021

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	
Function of This Document	3
Relationship of Faculty to Student Constituencies.....	3
Area of Specialty.....	3
Diversity of Faculty	3
Chapter 2: Statement of Departmental Evaluation Standards	
I. Teaching	5
II. Professional and Scholarly Development	7
III. Student Advising.....	8
IV. University and Departmental Service.....	9
V. Community Service.....	9
Chapter 3: Application of Evaluation Standards/ Additional Evaluation Standards for Department Chair and Director Of Forensics	
I. Definitions	11
II. Standards	12
Chapter 4: Evaluation Processes and Procedures	
I. Processes for Evaluation	18
II. Grievance Process	19

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Function of This Document:

The Department of Communication Studies acknowledges and endorses the general criteria and hierarchy of criteria for faculty evaluation established in the Faculty Code. This document is designed to clarify departmental standards, norms, and processes. Our goal is to ensure the highest caliber of teaching and ensure fairness in the evaluation process. It is to these ends that the following statement of evaluation standards has been adopted.

Relationship of Faculty to Student Constituencies:

The Department of Communication Studies has identified four major student constituencies: majors; minors or persons taking additional courses beyond the introductory level; persons taking single courses to fulfill a university core requirement; and persons involved in co-curricular activities sponsored by the department. The Department of Communication studies serves a variety of student constituencies, and faculty should recognize individual contributions to all students, regardless of their constituency.

Area of Teaching Specialty:

Within the department, faculty members will have an assignment for particular courses in the curriculum. That assignment should be regarded as a primary responsibility. Any evaluation should consider the contributions of the faculty or staff member to their area(s) of responsibility.

Diversity of Personnel

The department acknowledges and endorses the diversity of its instructional skills and methods. In this context, the department affirms the need for extensive, yet flexible standards for faculty evaluations. Several categories are designed to guide evaluations.

I. Tenure Line Faculty

A. Teacher/Scholar Faculty

B. Teacher/Administrator Faculty

1. Department Chair
2. Director of Forensics
3. Other Program Directors

II. Part-time and Visiting Faculty

All categories of faculty shall have their performance evaluated against appropriate criteria of the Departmental Evaluation Standards.

CHAPTER 2: STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION STANDARDS

I. TEACHING

The Department of Communication Studies recognizes excellent teaching as the fundamental goal to which all of its teachers aspire. We affirm that diversity in teaching serves the department, the discipline, and the university.

A. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

We find the following to be useful indicators of teaching effectiveness:

1. Course Design
 - a. Outlines, syllabi, and objectives should be prepared for each course and available for students and colleagues.
 - b. Course objectives should be explicitly grounded in the goals of the discipline.
 - c. Examinations, assignments, and projects should overtly lead to the fulfillment of course goals.
 - d. Course content should be appropriate for coordination with university and department goals and objectives.

2. Instructional Performance

Excellence in instruction should include a demonstrated ability and flexibility in different teaching modalities as appropriate to the area of specialty: classroom, coaching, and tutoring. Excellence in instruction includes appropriate adaptation to varying levels of student achievement and careful evaluation of student work.

3. Student Intellectual Growth

Consistent with the philosophy of a small liberal arts institution, the department places a premium on working individually with students and involving them in the discipline. Examples of teaching effectiveness in this area include research management, advising independent studies, student participation at conferences, original student projects, and other student work appropriate to the field and supervised by the faculty member.

4. Activities Outside the Classroom

Inherent in the philosophy of the department is a commitment to applying the discipline's theoretical and critical insights outside of the classroom. Demonstrated and reported ability in teaching the curriculum in venues which are co-curricular and/or extra-curricular may be included as evidence of teaching excellence. For example, these activities may involve mentoring students, sponsoring student organizations, coaching Forensics, and supervising conference participation. Evidence of curricular-related encounters outside the classroom may include student letters, evaluations, conference programs, newspaper or journal articles, and/or letters from colleagues with first hand knowledge of the faculty member's work

5. Student Evaluations

Because of concern that evaluation forms invite bias and do not predict student learning or achievement, the department affirms that they should be used with an awareness of potential limitations and in the context of multiple forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness (see above). Student evaluations will be considered within the scope mandated by the Faculty Code and Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria Guidelines.

6. Teaching-related Professional Development

Workshop attendance and seminar participation and application: In such sessions, faculty learn new materials which may lead to curriculum modifications or alterations in instructional practices.

B. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

The department views assessment by members of the department to be the most reliable means of assessing teaching effectiveness. Each of the candidate's courses will be observed by multiple departmental colleagues in line with the requirements mandated by the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria Guidelines. In addition, the department may consult letters from colleagues in other departments or from former students containing observations of the teaching performance in the classroom. Colleagues will also review student evaluations and other teaching-related materials in the file prepared by the candidate. These materials may include: outlines, syllabi, objectives, assignments, examinations, websites, observation of teaching performance written by colleagues from outside the department, self-evaluations, student self-reflections, and reports of curricular-related materials.

II. PROFESSIONAL AND SCHOLARLY DEVELOPMENT

Professional and scholarly development strengthens understanding of the history of the discipline and maintains a faculty member's currency with new developments in theory, methodology, and application. Departmental faculty are expected to demonstrate expertise and currency in those areas of the discipline in which they regularly teach, and they are expected to articulate a coherent theme that organizes their professional development activities.

A. Evidence of Professional and Scholarly Development

Many scholarly activities demonstrate expertise and currency in the discipline. Professional growth can take many forms, as suggested by the following three ordered tiers. Faculty are not required to present evidence of professional development from each tier. Rather, professional and scholarly development will be assessed holistically.

1. **Tier One:** Published, Original Scholarship Endorsed by Peers

The department affirms that the production of scholarship is the primary evidence of professional development.

Premiums will be placed on work that has been favorably endorsed by professionals within the discipline. For example, the following activities provide evidence of external recognition of a faculty member's professional contribution: publication of monographs, journal articles, book chapters, textbooks, handbooks, anthologies (as editor or contributor), journal editing, or published conference proceedings.

2. **Tier Two:** Other Forms of Scholarship including Conference Presentations

The department believes that professional development relies on regular contact with colleagues in the discipline. Work in this area can include the presentation of original research, refereed convention papers, presenting invited papers and research talks, or the creation, development, and/or sponsorship of workshops and seminars in which faculty are engaged in teaching new techniques or content areas to peers.

3. **Tier three:** Other evidence of significant professional and scholarly development may include direction of student research projects, consulting activities, research conducted for new course proposals, curricular review, or a new area of teaching responsibility, book reviews, serving as a reviewer or editorial board members for an academic journal or book series, and continued development of research skills via attendance and participation at workshops and training. The department also believes that professional development can be demonstrated via engagement with the public. Work that engages the public can include policy papers, white papers, media interviews and articles/blogs/op-eds, public presentations, talks, or facilitations, development of research-related websites, and engagement on social media that showcase the faculty member's expertise.

B. Assessment of Professional and Scholarly Development

The department views assessment by members of the department as the most reliable vehicle for assessment of professional and scholarly development. A variety of materials may be useful for evaluating professional and scholarly development and should be included in the candidate's file. These materials may include: monographs, essays, other publications, including book reviews, certificates of program participation, project proposals, websites, videos, portfolios, syllabi; lesson plans, correspondence, outside letters and community responses. In the case of co-authored work, the candidate should clearly articulate the nature of their contributions.

III. STUDENT ADVISING

The Department of Communication Studies affirms that faculty have an important role to play in advising students about academic and career choices. Advising takes place both through formal assignments and through informal contact with students in curricular or co-curricular environments.

While more specific statements of advisor and advisee responsibilities are articulated in the University Advisor's Manual, we find the following to be useful guidelines for evaluation of advising:

A. Evidence of Effective Student Advising

Effectiveness in student advising may be demonstrated by exhibiting an understanding of academic processes, an understanding of career options, maintenance of adequate advising records, and availability for student consultation.

1. Understanding of Academic Processes

Faculty should possess a thorough knowledge of university and department programs, goals, and philosophies. This knowledge should result in reasonable plans for student progress through university and department graduation requirements.

2. Understanding of Student Services Program

Faculty should demonstrate knowledge of career, counseling, skill development, graduate school, and academic advising programs available on campus. This knowledge should reflect an understanding that all faculty are not competent to counsel in all areas and should result in appropriate referral within or outside of the department.

3. Consultation

All faculty and teaching staff are expected to be available for student conferences at reasonable times.

B. Assessment of Effective Student Advising

The department views assessment by members of the department as the most reliable means of assessing advising effectiveness. Faculty members should provide materials relevant for peer review which may include number of advisees, availability for student conferences, student correspondence, and statements regarding helpfulness and guidance.

IV. UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

The Department of Communication Studies recognizes that a program is strengthened by the degree of ownership felt by the people who participate in it. The department, thus, encourages participation by faculty and teaching staff in service activities that enhance their professional performance. We recognize, however, that each individual need not participate in all areas of university service.

A. Evidence of Service

University service shall be exhibited by consistent contributions to the department and university. Many activities indicate sufficient service to the university: successful handling of departmental assignments (regular and ad hoc); participation in and contribution to the development of department programs, curriculum, policies, etc.; service on university committees and/or ad hoc committees as well as other university service appointments (eg., athletic liaison, club advisor, etc); Faculty Senate; participation in university programs (organizing guest lectures, presenting to university groups, advising campus organizations, participating in Admission programs, etc.). Attendance at university faculty meetings alone will not constitute evidence of service.

B. Assessment of Department and University Service

The department considers assessment by members of the department as the best mechanism for evaluating university and department service. Faculty and teaching staff should document their performance in department and university service. Participation and contributions to governance should be verified by letters or reports from appropriate colleagues.

V. COMMUNITY SERVICE

The department recognizes that relevant community service is related to professional qualifications and expertise. Where such service enhances a person's overall skills and abilities, and where it reflects positively upon the university and/or department, the department recommends consideration of community service in the evaluation process.

A. Evidence of Community Service

Community service should reflect the insight offered by the discipline's theoretical and critical methods. Many activities indicate excellence in community service, including but not limited to: service to professional organizations, participating in conference organization,

organizing a conference session, serving as judge or critic for a performance or contest in the community, and serving in a capacity in which knowledge or skill is clearly associated with the academic discipline (e.g. acting as parliamentarian for a service organization).

B. Assessment of Community Service

The department views peer review as the most reliable vehicle for evaluation of community service. The faculty member should make the case for relevant community service by providing appropriate materials, such as letters from community representatives, records demonstrating contributions to community activities, and evidence of the outcomes of service activities.

CHAPTER 3: APPLICATION OF EVALUATION STANDARDS/ADDITIONAL EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

Several categories of faculty are employed in the Department of Communication Studies. While all are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, application of other criteria vary depending upon the nature of the position and job description. The categories and specific criteria follow:

I. DEFINITIONS

A. Tenure-Line Faculty

Tenure-Line faculty members are those appointed to the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, who are eligible for reappointment and promotion to higher rank, and ordinarily are eligible for tenure consideration. A tenured appointment is continuous unless terminated for reasons specified in Chapter V of the Faculty Code. Within the category of Tenure-Line Faculty, there are two special cases, outlined below.

B. Teacher/Administrator Faculty

1. Department Chair

The Chair of Communication Studies is a tenure-line faculty member appointed by the Dean of the University after consultation with the department faculty. The chair commonly serves for three years and has a two-unit reduction in teaching load per year. In all reviews, the chair assignment should be evaluated since it is an important component of this faculty member's responsibilities.

2. Director of Forensics

The Director of Forensics is a tenure-line faculty member who administers the university's intercollegiate forensics program. The department believes that forensics is a uniquely valuable educational program for developing abilities of critical thinking, reflective judgment, and effective advocacy. Consequently, the one or more teaching units assigned for forensics responsibilities are not viewed as a reduction in teaching load. In all reviews, the forensics assignment should be evaluated since it is an important component of this teacher/administrator's responsibilities.

3. Other Program Directors

Faculty may be assigned administrative responsibilities for other departmental programs (internships, basic courses, academic programs, etc.). With the approval of the Dean of the University, one or more teaching units may be reassigned for these administrative duties. In all reviews, the program direction assignment should be

evaluated since it is an important component of the teacher/administrator's responsibilities.

C. Part-time and Visiting Faculty

The department may employ visiting faculty, normally to teach lower division courses or for sabbatical replacements. These positions are non-tenure line appointments and do not carry the possibility of promotion to another academic rank. Visiting faculty normally do not participate in departmental evaluations.

II. STANDARDS

A. Tenure-line Faculty (General)

As outlined by the Faculty Code, tenure-line faculty are subject to on-going evaluation within the department and periodic evaluation by the university. The department expects career tenure-line faculty to demonstrate excellence in all of the areas of evaluation specified in Chapter 2 of this document. In evaluating faculty for tenure and/or promotion, the department will follow the process specified in the Faculty Code.

B. Teacher/Administrator Faculty

1. Department Chair

The Chair of Communication Studies should satisfy each evaluation criterion—teaching excellence, professional and scholarly development, student advising, university and community service—at the same level of quality expected of their colleagues.

a. Administrative Responsibilities

The Department Chair fulfills a variety of roles. These include:

- 1) Serving as a representative of the department to the university administration.
- 2) Facilitating goal-setting and planning by initiating and furthering long-range programs, plans, and goals for the department; listening to and encouraging ideas to improve the department; and coordinating meetings to develop and/or review department goals.
- 3) Furthering professional growth of faculty members by encouraging use of effective teaching methods and materials; encouraging faculty research and publication; encouraging faculty participation in professional meetings; maintaining morale and reducing conflicts among the faculty; and being a sound role model as teacher, scholar, and professional.

- 4) Managing departmental personnel matters, such as recruiting, recommending, and evaluating faculty; assigning courses and departmental duties to faculty; encouraging, yet maintaining reasonable control over service, consulting, and other “overload” responsibilities by department faculty; and selecting, managing, and evaluating clerical staff.
- 5) Managing space, facilities, and equipment including allocation of such resources; encouraging safety in use of space, facilities, and equipment; and making arrangements for repair and upkeep.
- 6) Performing routine office activities, such as preparation of reports, scheduling, correspondence, purchasing of supplies, maintenance of student and other records, and up-dating catalog and admission materials.
- 7) Disseminating information regarding departmental and university matters to all departmental colleagues.
- 8) Managing the academic program by facilitating planning and review of curricular and co-curricular programs and course content; encouraging participation in interdisciplinary teaching and University Core; recruiting and working to retain students; supervising the advisement of students on academic and/or departmental matters; and encouraging and supporting desirable departmental student activities.
- 9) Proposing and administering departmental budgets.

b. Standards for Evaluation

The Department Chair should be evaluated based upon their ability to manage effectively the above responsibilities. Evaluations should consider ability to formulate goals and set priorities, organize projects, delegate responsibility, complete tasks in a timely manner, facilitate communication among department members and between the department and its various constituencies, and represent the department well in interactions with the University Community and professional colleagues in the discipline.

c. Assessment of Effectiveness

Peer review within the department is the primary source of evaluation of the effectiveness of the Department Chair. Because the range of the Chair’s duties may involve colleagues from across the campus, it is the burden of the Chair to document his or her effectiveness. Appropriate evidence for the evaluation include letters from non-faculty members, from other department chairs with which she or he has worked, and from other administrators who have worked directly with her or him.

2. Director of Forensics

The Director of Forensics should satisfy each evaluation criterion--teaching effectiveness, professional development, advising, university and community service--at the same level of quality expected of their colleagues. Due to the fact that the forensics program requires the Director to engage in program administration during the time when other faculty are able to engage in research, the amounts of teaching, advising, scholarship, and service may distinguish the forensics educator from colleagues. However, assessment of the Director of Forensics offers unique opportunities and requires unique delineations because, by definition, the Director's position is one which may often challenge the evaluation categories. The Director of Forensics creates spaces for intellectual development in an educational setting through tournament administration, tournament management, coaching, organizational obligations, and leadership activities. The department recognizes that the Director's professional service obligations create opportunities for teaching and professional and scholarly development. This model of academic life intertwines teaching, professional development, and forensics service. Elements of the Director's file may satisfy a unique combination of teaching effectiveness, professional development, and service simultaneously. The Director of Forensics must provide evidence of how their professional responsibilities simultaneously satisfy evaluation guidelines.

a. Teaching

The department recognizes that forensics teaching occurs in a variety of settings outside the classroom, ranging from informal tutorials to formal contests, and is often conducted during evening, weekends, and vacation periods. This component of the Director's teaching load should be evaluated on the basis of: observation by departmental colleagues; statements from peers at other institutions who can assess the director's competence in critiquing and evaluating their students, coaching at tournaments, tournament administrations, and demonstrated forensics knowledge; and student evaluations of forensics teaching effectiveness. Consideration of student evaluations for teaching effectiveness for forensics should attempt to account for the various roles and responsibilities the Director of Forensics must play in relationship to student program members including decisions on travel, scholarships, participation, and potential disciplinary actions. Forensics teaching effectiveness would also be demonstrated in curriculum development and coursework suitable to the specialties of the Director of Forensics. This coursework, as with the Directors' other teaching responsibilities, should be evaluated by standards of peer review outlined in Chapter 2, Section I of this document.

Forensics education enables students to develop such humanistic capabilities as research, analysis, critical evaluation of claims, and the construction and judgment of arguments on important social issues. Assessment of these capabilities offers a means of evaluating student development. Evidence of

effective forensics education may include: student evaluations; letters and testimonials from former students; faculty assessments of student-produced cases, argument briefs, practice sessions, and/or tournament performances; and letters or testimonials from peer forensics faculty assessing the educational features of the program.

Excellence in forensics teaching should be assessed in the context of the program's educational mission and in terms of the financial and material support provided to the program.

b. Professional and Scholarly Development

The Director of Forensics should be evaluated by the same standards for professional development as their colleagues, recognizing that evidence of professional development for the Director of Forensics may differ from evidence provided by other departmental colleagues. In addition to non-forensic professional development activities in the Communication Studies discipline (as specified in II A, 1-3), the department affirms that educational forensics provides opportunities for the Director of Forensics to demonstrate professional development. The Director of Forensics may demonstrate professional development in educational forensics through such traditional vehicles as publication in forensics journals; presentations at conventions, conferences, workshops, and similar forums on forensics topics; publication of instructional materials; and book reviews. The Director of Forensics may also demonstrate professional development by documenting the scholarly dimension of educational forensics which can include but is not limited to direct supervision of forensic squad research and active collaboration with forensic squad members in the development of arguments and case construction strategies used in public presentations (including actual debate rounds). The Director of Forensics may also demonstrate professional development by assuming leadership roles in the regional and national forensics community. Leadership in educational forensics can include but is not limited to activities that frame or extend the boundaries of forensics within the community (e.g. participating in topic and resolution development, organizing and participating in public forums that advance the goals of educational forensics, helping to redefine the standards for forensic education).

c. University and Community Service

Service functions of the Director of Forensics demand a greater portion of time than for the typical faculty member, often involving evenings, weekends, and vacation periods. Assessment of the Director of Forensics' service to the university and the community includes the unique and demanding service role of the position. Evaluations of the Director of Forensics should recognize the integration of service obligations as complements to teaching and professional development. Even though these service demands are extensive, the forensics educator should be provided the opportunity to participate in the normal service

functions of the typical faculty member in order to diminish isolation from collegial interaction. Service activities related to forensics are varied:

- 1) Administrative duties include: recruiting students, scholarships selections, arranging the logistics of travel, accounting for expenditures, budgeting, policy decisions regarding program activities, supervision and coordination of any assistants within the program, scheduling of student activities, hosting of high school and college tournaments, preparation of annual reports and publicity releases, and other public relations activities. The Director of Forensics also serves as chapter sponsor of the University's Pi Kappa Delta chapter.
- 2) Professional duties include: participation and membership in professional forensics organizations, and service on committees and in offices of those organizations.
- 3) Service within the University includes: coordinating public forums or demonstration debates, consultation of workshops for campus organizations or staff/student groups regarding speech skills, parliamentary procedure, hosting of on-campus events, etc.
- 4) Community service includes: organizing and presenting programs to groups in schools and in the community, judging high school forensic events, judging activities sponsored by civic groups, and consulting with various external public or private organizations.

Materials useful in evaluating service contributions include: statements from the administrative officials to whom the Director of Forensics reports or with whom s/he works and letters, testimonials and/or records documenting participation in activities specified above in Sections D2c 1, 2, 3 and 4.

In order to help in the assessment of all areas of responsibility--teaching, professional and scholarly development, advising, and service--the Director of Forensics should prepare an annual report regarding their work related to the forensics program.

3. Other Program Directors

Due to the nature of the assignment, tenure-line faculty with administrative responsibilities for programs within the department or other university programs may be distinguished from other colleagues with regard to expected amounts of teaching, advising, and service. These faculty members should satisfy each evaluation criterion—teaching, professional and scholarly development, advising, and service—at the same level of quality expected of their colleagues.

CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

I. PROCESS FOR EVALUATION

A. Faculty and Visiting Faculty

Departmental evaluation of faculty will be on-going and coordinated with university evaluations as specified in the Faculty Code. The Department Chair will evaluate teaching effectiveness, professional growth, student advising, and university and community service during the first year and second year reviews. In subsequent reviews, the following process will be used.

1. Obtaining Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

a. A process of in-class observation will be implemented. Visits will occur in line with the requirements mandated by the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria Guidelines. Student evaluations will be administered as mandated in the Faculty Code.

2. Obtaining Evidence for Other Evaluation Categories

Each faculty member shall keep records regarding their professional and scholarly activity, student advising, and university and community service.

3. For university evaluations specified in the Faculty Code, the department will use the following procedure:

a. The individual being evaluated will prepare a file, as described in the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria Guidelines. This file is due to the department chair (or an evaluation coordinator chosen to conduct the chair's evaluation) by the date specified in the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria Guidelines.

b. All tenure line department faculty who are participating in the evaluation will review the file and draft evaluation letters.

c. Tenure line department faculty who are participating in the evaluation will submit letters to the department chair/Head Officer (or evaluation coordinator in the case of a chair's evaluation) no later than one week prior to the date the file is due to be submitted to the Dean's office

d. Tenure line department faculty, excluding the member being evaluated, will then meet to discuss the case.

e. The department chair/Head Officer (or evaluation coordinator in the case of a chair's evaluation) will then complete the tasks as outlined and mandated in

the Faculty Code and Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria Guidelines. This summary, department letters, and the individual's evaluation file will then be forwarded to the Faculty Advancement Committee. A copy of the summary will be made available to the person being evaluated.

II. GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Should a faculty member have a grievance regarding departmental evaluation or reappointment, the faculty member shall follow procedures specified in the Faculty Code.