

May 15, 2019

**Guidelines and Standards Relating to Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual
Evaluation**

Department of Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology

College of Health and Public Service

University of North Texas

Denton, Texas, USA

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble	p. 3
II.	Guidelines and Standards for Tenure and Promotion.....	pp. 4 - 13
A.	Consideration for Promotion/Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor	pp. 5 - 7
1.	Teaching (referenced to Appendices A through D).....	p. 6
2.	Research and Scholarship (referenced to Appendices E & F).....	pp. 6 - 7
3.	Service (referenced to Appendices G & H).....	p. 8
B.	Consideration for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	p. 8 - 11
1.	Teaching (referenced to Appendices A through D).....	p. 9
2.	Research and Scholarship (referenced to Appendices E & F).....	pp. 9 - 10
3.	Service (referenced to Appendices G & H).....	p. 11
C.	Consideration for Promotion of Lecturer-Track Faculty (cross referenced to the same appendices as for the tenure-track faculty)	p. 11-13
1.	Guidelines and Standards for Lecturers at All Ranks	pp. 11 - 12
2.	Evaluations for Lecturer Promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer.....	p. 12
III.	Guidelines and Standards for Annual Review of Faculty and Post-tenure Review (needs to be referenced to all appendices)	p. 13

Appendices

Appendix A: Scope of Teaching Activities and Documentation of Teaching Quality....	pp. 14 - 18
• Scope of teaching activities	
• Dual, combined standard for teaching excellence	
o Evidence that faculty member remains current in content of teaching expertise	
o Evidence that faculty member maintains high quality of teaching	
Appendix B: Rubric for Annual Performance Review of Teaching and Instructional Activities	pp. 19 - 21
Appendix C: Form for Faculty Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching.....	pp. 22 - 23
Appendix D: Form for Faculty Peer Evaluation of Clinical Teaching.....	pp. 24 - 25
Appendix E: Independence, Innovation, Quality and Impact of Research and Scholarly Activity: Standards/Expectations, Scope and Documentation.....	pp. 26 - 31
Appendix F: Rubric for Annual Performance Review of Research and Scholarly Activity.....	pp. 32 - 33
Appendix G: Scope of Service Activities and Documentation of Service.....	p. 34
Appendix H: Rubric for Annual Performance Review of Service Activities.....	pp. 35 - 37

I. Preamble

The Department of Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology (ASLP) in the College of Health and Public Service (HPS) at the University of North Texas (UNT) prepares undergraduate and graduate students for academic, clinical, and basic and applied research careers focused in the discipline of audiology and speech-language pathology. Both disciplines are united together in ultimate service to clinical populations of all ages who live with disorders. Our preparation of students to work in these fields in service to clinical populations is accomplished in the context of a major public research university, where students and faculty collaborate with our local and global communities in the creation, integration, application and dissemination of knowledge, toward an enriched and sustainable future for the people of our state, nation and world.

In its determination to excel in the selection and development of faculty, and to foster faculty excellence in support of its mission, ASLP has established the following guidelines and standards for use in evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion, and for use in annual evaluation of faculty performance. These guidelines and standards are in accordance with and subordinate to those issued by the Texas State Board of Regents, UNT, and HPS. Each faculty member is expected to review and become familiar with the UNT (Policies 06.004 and 06.005) and HPS policies and procedures, as well as the ASLP Charter, and Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (RPTC) guidelines for reappointment, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, annual evaluations, and merit determinations.

These guidelines and standards are designed to shape the expectations of persons seeking promotion within the department, the expectations of persons seeking both promotion and tenure within the department, and the expectations of persons who have achieved the highest possible level of promotion within the department. The department recognizes that the same concurrent standards are applied both to the process of review for promotion and tenure and to the process of annual review. Given the value the department places on sustained faculty excellence, the current document is built on the principle that the global departmental standards of faculty excellence guide the long-term promotion and tenure process, which in turn guides the short-term annual merit review process in a top-down fashion. As a corollary to this principle, the department acknowledges that short-term annual merit reviews may not necessarily be a valid indicator of the long-term, holistic level of faculty excellence as related to promotion and tenure in a bottom-up fashion.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarly activity and service, as defined in the current document. Moreover, as members of the departmental community, faculty are called upon and enjoined to interact in a spirit of mutual respect and collegiality, with integrity, honesty, and regard for academic freedom.

II. Guidelines and Standards for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty type determines the performance areas to be evaluated by the department.

- For tenure-track faculty members, the department evaluates the following three areas in the granting of promotion, or the granting of both promotion and tenure: (1) the quality of teaching; (2) the quality, quantity and impact of scholarly activities; and (3) the significance of service.
- For non-tenure-track, lecturer-track faculty members, the department evaluates the following two areas in the granting of promotion: (1) the quality of teaching; and (2) the significance of service.

In all cases, outstanding performance in one domain (teaching, scholarly activities, or service) will not compensate for lack of excellence in any other domain or domains, during consideration for promotion or for tenure and promotion. In a parallel fashion, performance in each of the three domains (teaching, scholarly activities, and service) is evaluated separately during the process of annual merit review.

In putting forth this document, the faculty recognizes that some activities may blend or combine the areas of teaching and student learning, research and scholarly activity, and service. For example, the faculty member may design and implement service learning into coursework, thus mentoring students in applied research or service provision. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documentation and rationale for the primary category of activity (teaching, research/scholarship, or service) under which any blended or combined cross-area activity is categorized, for consideration by those evaluating the activities of the faculty member. It is the complementary responsibility of the entities evaluating the faculty member to communicate to the faculty member and to each other when clarification is required.

ASLP affirms responsibility for establishing and communicating criteria requisite for reappointment, for promotion, and for promotion and tenure, at the department level. The ASLP RPTC, a committee whose constituency is defined by the ASLP Charter, evaluates faculty member dossiers and forwards its analyses and recommendations to the ASLP chair. The ASLP chair then reviews the RPTC's evaluation and recommendations and prepares the chair's written evaluation and recommendation regarding the candidate. The chair then forwards the RPTC's written evaluation and recommendations along with the chair's written evaluation and recommendations regarding the candidate to HPS.

Specifics of the promotion and tenure process are the same for all faculty, regardless of faculty type:

- The ASLP chair holds responsibility for communicating promotion and tenure guidelines, procedures, and criteria to new faculty members, ensuring that all faculty members have a working knowledge as well as copies of the current promotion and tenure guidelines and policies of ASLP, HPS, and UNT (Policies 06.004 and 06.005). Faculty members are responsible to contact the chair or another appropriate administrative entity if the faculty member has any questions regarding the current content of the relevant administrative documents or where these current documents may be located.

- The department requires all candidates for promotion, or for promotion and tenure, to submit their documentation in accordance with deadlines established by the department in accordance with UNT and HPS deadlines. The ASLP RPTC may be unable to evaluate candidates who fail to comply with the deadlines established by the department. Faculty members are responsible to contact the chair or another knowledgeable administrative entity if the faculty member has any questions regarding the procedures and deadlines associated with the review process.
- HPS then conducts an independent evaluation. The process continues through the office of the UNT provost.

A. Consideration for Promotion/Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor

Consistent with the promotion and tenure policy of the university (UNT Policy 06.004), assistant professors seeking tenure, promotion, or both can choose to be evaluated under the promotion and tenure standards that were in place at the time of hiring or the promotion and tenure standards in place at the time of application. The candidate will notify the department chair in writing of the standards by which they wish to be evaluated by the end of the first academic year of employment at UNT. Tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor places a strong emphasis on excellence across all three areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service.

Faculty are advised to consult with official UNT policy (UNT Policy 06.004) regarding the timeline for promotion to associate professor.

The process of review for tenure and promotion for junior tenure-track faculty begins during the probationary period.

- Specifically, the department conducts in-depth evaluations of untenured, tenure-track faculty members during their probationary years. All tenured faculty within the department vote on satisfactory progress of the probationary, tenure-track faculty member at the time of the third-year review, and then each year after that. The process begins when the candidate for promotion and tenure submits the required documentation to the RPTC ; the RPTC evaluates the materials, makes recommendations, collects tenured faculty votes, and then, provides the ASLP chair with a written report describing the committee's evaluation and recommendation. This written report must be signed by all members of the RPTC. Thereafter, the department chair completes an independent assessment and recommendation of the candidate in writing. The department chair then meets with the candidate to discuss the independent assessments and recommendations of both the RPTC and the chair, and to provide the candidate with a copy of the RPTC report. Candidates may sign the documentation in agreement or may dissent and write a rebuttal, in keeping with university policy.

1. Teaching

The assistant professor in ASLP who is seeking promotion, or promotion and tenure, to the rank of associate professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching. To demonstrate excellence in teaching, assistant professors must provide evidence that they remain current in their area(s) of teaching expertise and that they have achieved high standards of quality of instruction across the scope of teaching activities that is expected of assistant professors. Appendix A details the nature of the evidence that is provided by the faculty member to demonstrate excellence in teaching, as well as the scope of activities that constitute teaching activities.

For tenure-track assistant professors who are seeking promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor, the department acknowledges that the scope of teaching activities will most likely consist primarily of department-assigned teaching, whether this be classroom-based courses, clinical teaching, or both. While department-assigned teaching activity may be increasingly supplemented by non-assigned teaching activities as the assistant professor advances in the tenure track, it is not expected or required that assistant professors engage with students in non-assigned teaching venues for purposes of promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor.

The department recognizes that teaching quality is best defined as a process, and not a product, as outlined in Appendix A. Assistant professors are typically developing courses for the first time, when short-term quantitative metrics of teaching quality may or may not be high. Thus, when evaluating the quality of an assistant professor's teaching, the department values documentation of an upward-sloping trajectory of teaching quality metrics during the pre-tenure period, especially when initial metrics of teaching quality may be relatively low. The department also values documentation of the steps taken by the assistant professor to remain current in their area(s) of teaching expertise and to continuously augment course quality. This may include the assistant professor's description of how student and peer teaching evaluations, and access to the evidence base of the field, are being referenced when adjusting and augmenting course content and design in support of teaching quality.

As detailed in Appendix A, all faculty, including assistant professors, are invited and encouraged to supply a wide range of metrics to document teaching quality for purposes of promotion and tenure that may include, but are not limited to, student course evaluations, teaching philosophy, and peer evaluations of teaching. Likewise, the entities reviewing the teaching activities of the faculty for purposes of promotion and tenure are held responsible to consider the full scope of the faculty member's teaching activities.

2. Research and Scholarship

Assistant professors who wish to be considered for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor must demonstrate the ability, sustainability and commitment necessary to produce and disseminate a major body of work, one that will establish them as an up-and-coming presence in their field, either nationally or globally as recognized by authorities in the field. As detailed in Appendix E,

all tenure-track faculty members in the department, including assistant professors, are expected to actively engage in a coherent program of research and scholarship that reflects: (1) independence of scholarly thought and innovation on the part of the faculty member; and (2) high quality and high impact within the field of scholarship.

In order to be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure, tenure-track assistant professors in ASLP are expected to meet or exceed each of the following three basic standards.

- **Research and scholarly publication:** Publish the equivalent of ten peer-reviewed works of research or scholarship. The ten works of research publications must include 7-8 peer-reviewed journal articles, at least five of which should be first-authored or first-authored-equivalent. Equivalency of number of publications and equivalency of first authorship are defined in Appendix E. Peer-reviewed publications will be ranked using criteria in Appendix E.
- **Research and scholarly presentation:** Deliver the equivalent of five peer-reviewed presentations at international, national, regional, or state conference/meeting venues. At least two of these presentations must be first-authored, and at least two of these presentations must be delivered at a national or international conference/meeting venue.
- **Research and scholarly grant activity:** Provide evidence of active submission of intramural and extramural research grants in support of the candidate's programmatic line of research. At least one of these grants must be funded, with the candidate as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, investigator, or contractor; the portion of the research and scholarship activities on the grant attributable to the faculty member must be documented to represent a major contribution to the discipline; and the grant must be demonstrated to support the programmatic research and research productivity of the faculty member.

Holistic assessment of research productivity may provide a more representative picture of overall research and scholarship of a candidate relative to departmental standards, in support of tenure and promotion decisions, as compared to a set of individual indices. In all applications for promotion and tenure, the candidate is strongly advised to provide an additional over-arching and holistic narrative description of the coherence of the faculty member's body of research and scholarship, which description should also document how the body of research and scholarship reflects independence of scholarly thought, scholarly innovation, high quality, high impact and sustained presence within the field. Furthermore, special emphasis should be placed on how this programmatic line of work and scholarship aligns with additional core values of the department; these include transdisciplinary and collaborative research, and research mentorship of students.

Guidelines for documentation of research and scholarship for all tenure-track faculty members, as they additionally document standards and core values of the department, are provided in Appendix E.

3. Service

The assistant professor in ASLP who is seeking promotion, or promotion and tenure, to the rank of associate professor must demonstrate excellence in service. As for service activities, the department reviews contributions of the candidate to the department, college, university, discipline, profession, and community. Although the department requires service from all faculty members, it does recognize the importance of limiting untenured tenure-track faculty members' service activities. The number and significance of the service activities tend to increase as faculty advance toward tenure, and may include committee chair activities. At minimum, the candidate for promotion to associate professor must serve on at least two charter committees at the department level, be involved in recruitment and retaining students, and advise students or other faculty in any capacity.

Details of the scope, documentation, and evaluation of service activities is provided in Appendices G and H.

B. Consideration for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Consistent with the promotion and tenure policy of the university, associate professors seeking promotion will be evaluated under the promotion and tenure standards that are in effect at the time of application. Faculty are advised to consult with official UNT and HPS policies regarding the timeline for promotion to professor.

Consideration for promotion to the rank of professor typically does not include a decision regarding tenure (since tenure will have already been awarded at the time of promotion to associate professor), but in the rare instances when both promotion to professor and tenure are under simultaneous deliberation, these decisions will be made concurrently. The standards for documentation and evidence in support of promotion to professor are the same as those in support of tenure and promotion of assistant professor to associate professor tenure-track faculty.

Promotion to, or tenure at, the rank of professor places a strong emphasis on excellence across all three areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Appointment or promotion to the highest rank on the tenure track (professor) should be reserved only for those who have demonstrated sustained achievement. Candidates must have demonstrated excellence in teaching, and obtained national and/or international recognition for their sustained, high quality accomplishments in research. Additionally, candidates must have demonstrated a robust combination of service activities in the department, college, university, and show contributions in professional service that includes a state, national or international presence.

1. Teaching

The associate professor who is seeking promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching. To demonstrate excellence in teaching, associate professors must provide evidence that they remain current in their area(s) of teaching expertise and that they have achieved high standards of quality of instruction across the scope of teaching activities that is expected of associate professors. Appendix A details the nature of the evidence that should be provided by the faculty member to demonstrate excellence in teaching, as well as the scope of activities that constitute teaching activities.

For associate professors who are seeking promotion to the rank of professor, the proportion of non-assigned teaching activities (such as research mentorship activities of undergraduates and graduates, or invited lectures in extramural venues) may be expected to increase based on the growing reputation and expertise of the faculty member. While this is not required for promotion to professor, it bolsters the case of the candidate for promotion to professor, especially when teaching extends to extramural national and international venues. Given that the faculty member may teach classroom courses that they have taught before, they may tap previously untapped or creative methods for updating of faculty expertise as it is incorporated into teaching, for updating course content, and for experimental course re-design and re-structuring over time in support of student learning. The department values documentation of an upward-sloping trajectory of such non-required or creative teaching quality metrics during the post-tenure period.

As detailed in Appendix A, all faculty, including associate professors, are invited and encouraged to supply a wide range of metrics to document teaching quality for purposes of promotion that may include, but are not limited to, student course evaluations, teaching philosophy, and peer evaluations of teaching. Likewise, the entities reviewing the teaching activities of the faculty for purposes of promotion and tenure are held responsible to consider the full scope of the faculty member's teaching activities and the gestalt of documentation the faculty member provides, in commitment to a holistic and valid evaluation process.

2. Research and Scholarship

Associate professors who wish to be considered for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate a continuous, sustainable, and highly productive program of research and scholarship that is recognized by authorities in the field. Thus, they are expected to continue and exceed departmental expectations for research and scholarship associated with their prior promotion to associate professor. As detailed in Appendix E, all tenure-track faculty members in the department, including associate professors, are expected to actively engage in a coherent program of research and scholarship that reflects: (1) independence of scholarly thought and innovation on the part of the faculty member; and (2) high quality and high impact within the field of scholarship.

It is the expectation of the department that an associate professor seeking promotion to professor should have produced an additional body of work comparable to the pre-tenure research and scholarly activity documented for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor. In order to be promoted to the rank of professor, associate professors in ASLP are expected to meet or exceed each of the following three basic standards of research and scholarly activity.

- Research and scholarly publication: Publish the equivalent of twenty peer-reviewed publications during the course of the candidate's career, and these publications must include 14-16 peer-reviewed journal articles. At least ten of the twenty should be completed since promotion to associate professor, and at least five of these publications since the time of promotion to associate professor should be first-authored or first-authored-equivalent. Equivalency of number of publications and equivalency of first authorship are identical to the standards for promotion from assistant to associate professor, as defined in Appendix E.
- Research and scholarly presentation: Deliver the equivalent of ten peer-reviewed presentations at international, national, regional, or state conference/meeting venues during the course of the candidate's career. At least five of these should be completed since promotion to associate professor. At least four of the ten presentations must be first-authored, and at least four of the ten presentations must be delivered at a national or international conference/meeting venue.
- Research and scholarly grant activity: Provide evidence of active submission of extramural research grants in support of the candidate's programmatic lines of research during the course of the candidate's career. At least two of these grants must be funded, with the candidate as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, investigator, or contractor; the portion of the research and scholarship activities on the grant attributable to the faculty member must be documented to represent a major contribution to the discipline; and the grant must be demonstrated to support the programmatic research and research productivity of the faculty member.

Holistic assessment of research productivity may provide a more representative picture of overall research and scholarship of a candidate relative to departmental standards, in support of promotion decisions, as compared to a set of individual indices.

In all applications for promotion, the candidate is strongly advised to provide an additional overarching and holistic narrative description of the coherence of the faculty member's body of research and scholarship, which description should also document how the body of research and scholarship reflects sustained independence of scholarly thought, scholarly innovation, high quality, and high impact within the field. Furthermore, special emphasis should be placed on how this programmatic line of work and scholarship aligns with additional core values of the department; these include transdisciplinary and collaborative research, and research mentorship of students.

Guidelines for documentation of research and scholarship for all tenure-track faculty members, as they additionally document standards and core values of the department, are provided in Appendix E.

3. Service

The associate professor in ASLP who is seeking promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate excellence in service. As for service activities, the department reviews contributions of the candidate to the department, college, university, discipline, profession, and community. The department requires service from all faculty members, however, the number and significance of the service activities markedly increase after tenure. For purposes of promotion, the department expects extra-departmental and extra-mural service activities during the time in rank as associate professor, which may include an increased number of committee chair positions and executive-level positions, relative to service activities during the time in rank as assistant professor. This must include service in national or international venues that enhances the national and global reputation of UNT.

Details of the scope, documentation and evaluation of service activities is provided in Appendices G and H.

C. Consideration for Promotion of Lecturer-Track Faculty

Consistent with the promotion and tenure policy of the university, non-tenure track, lecturer-track faculty seeking promotion will be evaluated under the promotion and tenure standards that are in effect at the time of application.

The review process for promotion within the lecturer ranks is identical to that described for tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty. (See the introduction to Section II of the current document).

1. Guidelines and Standards for Lecturers at All Ranks

In ASLP, lecturers hold faculty positions at one of three ranks—lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer, and, with a few notable exceptions, have the same rights, responsibilities, and voting privileges as tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty. Lecturers serve ASLP through academic (classroom) and clinical teaching, and service activities. Some lecturers participate in research activities, which will be recognized as service to the profession. ASLP evaluates lecturers for reappointment, merit raises, and promotion in essentially the same manner that it evaluates the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Specifically, the Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC) and ASLP chair evaluate lecturers' performance in the areas of teaching and service when making decisions and recommendations about reappointments and merit raises; the RPTC and ASLP chair assess and appraise the performance of lecturers seeking promotions to the ranks of senior and principal lecturer. Per the department charter, lecturers are ineligible for membership in the RPTC and for voting on reappointment and tenure decisions.

The department requires excellence in teaching (clinical, academic, or both) and service of all lecturers. ASLP defines "excellence in teaching and service" similarly for lecturers and tenure-track faculty (review Section II of this document, as referenced to Appendices A through D, G, and H). A noteworthy difference between lecturers and the tenure-track faculty is that most ASLP lecturer positions include clinical teaching along with academic teaching. As a result, the department expects lecturers engaged in clinical teaching to demonstrate clinical expertise through additional measures such as supervising and treating a variety of clinical cases, consultations about cases with other professionals, presentations, podium, and poster sessions at professional meetings, clinical evaluations of their students, advising students, student mentoring, or placement of students. The department's annual evaluation procedures, reappointment, merit raise, and promotion procedures are the same for lecturers and tenure-track faculty (refer to Section III).

The expectations for senior lecturers and principal lecturers include those described for lecturers, with the understanding that the faculty at those ranks must exhibit continued excellence in the areas of teaching and service. In addition, the department expects senior lecturers to show evidence of excellence such as clinical, academic or service program development, recruitment and mentoring of students, peer-reviewed presentations, or educational/clinical grant writing related to academic or clinical teaching. Furthermore, for principal lecturers, the department requires evidence of sustained excellence in teaching, innovation and leadership in service and robust involvement in professional organizations.

2. Evaluations for Lecturer Promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer

Lecturers seeking promotion from the rank of lecturer to senior lecturer and from senior lecturer to principal lecturer must satisfy the same criteria for teaching and service as outlined for tenure-track faculty seeking promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate professor to professor, respectively (Sections II-A and II-B of this document, as referenced to Appendices A through D, G, and H). Specifically, lecturers seeking promotion to senior lecturer must show evidence of clinical- and academic-teaching quality as indicated by evaluations of at least a median "commendable" rating on the *Faculty Peer Evaluation* forms (see Appendices C and D); active involvement in committees including department, college, university committees; committee or board membership in professional organizations at the local, state, or national level; and development or leadership of at least one clinical or teaching initiative (e.g., clinical programs, new clinical protocols, support group, community service event, sponsorship of student organization, and/or professional presentations). Candidates seeking promotion from senior to principal lecturer must demonstrate evidence of clinical- and academic-teaching quality as indicated by evaluations of at least a median "excellent" rating on the *Faculty Peer Evaluation* forms (see Appendices C and D); active involvement in department, college, or university committees; board or committee membership in professional organizations at the local, state, or national level; development or leadership of at least two clinical or teaching initiatives (e.g., clinical programs, new clinical protocols, support group, community service event, sponsorship of student organization, and/or professional presentations); and/or engage in intra-department and interdisciplinary collaborations in teaching and service.

III. Guidelines and Standards for Annual Review of Faculty

As is the case for considerations of promotion and tenure, faculty type determines the performance areas to be evaluated by the department for the purpose of annual performance evaluations. For tenure-track faculty members, the department annually evaluates the following three areas: (1) the quality of teaching; (2) the quality, quantity and impact of scholarly activities; and (3) the significance of service. For non-tenure-track, lecturer-track faculty members, the department evaluates the following two areas: (1) the quality of teaching; and (2) the significance of service.

The department conducts annual performance reviews of faculty of all ranks with respect to their performance in the areas of teaching, service, and when applicable, of scholarly activities, across a three- year window. The department PAC, a charter committee of faculty members from the tenure-track faculty and lecturer ranks, holds responsibility for evaluating faculty members' performance in the three aforementioned areas. In each area, the committee members assign scores to reflect the level of each faculty member's productivity, quality of work, and effectiveness. Committee members base their scoring on rubrics developed in the department (Appendix B, F, and H). The department, department chair, college, and university use these scores when making decisions regarding reappointment, merit raises, promotion, and tenure. Unsatisfactory performance based on the ASLP rubrics in any area (research, teaching, service), constitutes cause to consider the need for a professional development plan (PDP). When this occurs, the PAC Chair and ASLP chair will, first, discuss the situation and, then, consult with the dean of HPS to either formulate a remedial plan or take other actions as needed.

The workloads in the aforementioned areas that faculty individually negotiate with the department chair at the outset of the academic year serve as the basis for weighting faculty performance across the content areas. Specifically, the PAC averages the percent value of the workload associated with each of each of the primary areas across a three-year window to determine a mean value for that content area for the calendar year under evaluation. The department then multiplies the weights in each of the areas for each faculty member by the performance scores for the respective areas.

Post-tenure Review: Tenured faculty members are evaluated annually by the departmental PAC in each of the three areas of performance. Unsatisfactory performance occurs whenever a tenured or tenure-track faculty member receives an unsatisfactory score of below 3.0 in teaching, research/scholarship or service. Subsequently, the faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory annual review will be referred to UNT Policy 06.052, and will be provided with the PDP jointly prepared by the department chair and RPTC. The faculty member who will have up to two calendar years to achieve the outcomes identified in the PDP.

Appendix A

Scope of Teaching Activities and Documentation of Teaching Quality

Scope of teaching activities

ASLP recognizes a faculty member's involvement in any and all types of teaching activities: intra-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and trans-disciplinary teaching; intramural and extramural teaching; and individually-taught and team-taught pedagogical activities. The department acknowledges that the scope of teaching activities may be different for different kinds of faculty; that the scope of teaching activities may change over time for any given faculty member; that the evidence of teaching quality may vary by type of teaching activity; and that the challenges of each type of teaching may be different. Thus, both faculty members and those who evaluate the teaching are expected to take these factors into consideration, with reference to different types of faculty at different stages in the promotion and tenure process. Teaching and instructional activities may include but are not limited to:

- department-assigned teaching activities, which typically count toward the faculty member's teaching workload, such as:
 - assigned teaching of classroom courses, in which groups of students are taught together during a regular class period, and for whom the faculty member may offer additional small-group and individual study-help sessions to support student learning;
 - assigned teaching in the form of clinical supervision and clinical mentorship of students, for whom the faculty member may offer additional small-group or individual meetings with students outside of clinic sessions in support of student learning;
- teaching activities that are not department-assigned and typically do not count toward the faculty member's teaching workload, would still be encouraged and recognized. The faculty member will be acknowledged according to the role played in these non-department assigned activities. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document if their mentorship role included serving as:
 - Chair or Co-Chair of (a) an independent study with a high school student from the UNT Texas Academy of Math and Science; (b) an undergraduate or graduate independent study; or (c) an undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation. Such mentorship activities are formally documented through enrollment of the student-mentee in independent study, special problems, thesis or dissertation credits listed under the faculty member's name;
 - Note that enrollment in special problems courses under the faculty member's name for purposes of accommodating past administrative registration errors (e.g. if a student wrongfully enrolled in only two credits in a seminar course instead of the required three credits) will be considered as part of the faculty member's original instructional activity.
 - Committee member of an undergraduate thesis or graduate thesis or dissertation where the activity includes mentorship typically provided by a committee member such as reviewing and providing feedback on documents, and participating in written and/or oral examinations.

Note that optional meetings with students who are seeking support in designing and conducting the student's own lines of mentored, independent research or scholarship, but for whom the faculty

member's activities do not currently fall or will not fall in the future under one of the main bulleted categories above (such as discussion with research assistants and research volunteers on the faculty member's research team about the student's research interests), will be considered as service activities for purposes of faculty review. (See Appendix G.)

At minimum, the faculty member must document the full scope of all teaching activities that occurred during the period under review. ASLP recognizes that all teaching activities, both those required as part of the faculty member's workload and those that are not assigned by the department hold potential to reflect excellence in teaching. Required documentation for annual reviews is outlined and automated in part on the university-wide faculty information system. To meet departmental requirements for basic information on scope of teaching, the faculty member include the following information both for the promotion and tenure process and for the annual review process, unless already documented by FIS:

- teaching philosophy
- teaching methods to assess critical thinking and problem-solving.
- course names and numbers, including mention of any repeated teachings of a course or teaching of more than one section of a course, during the period under review, as a reflection of the relative diversity of teaching content areas;
- the content areas supervised during any clinical teaching for the period under review;
- the title of any mentored teaching activity (honors contract, independent study, thesis, or dissertation), and the names of the students mentored;
- the pedagogical level of the students being taught (undergraduate or graduate);
- the number of students under the tutelage of the faculty member across all teaching venues (classroom course, clinical supervision activity or mentorship activity)
- each course syllabus for all courses and course sections over time

Additional documentation of the scope of teaching-related activities may include, but is not limited to:

- discussion of teaching approach in the faculty essay, such as descriptions of teaching methods (e.g. methods to assess critical thinking and problem-solving) and teaching philosophy.
- evidence of student support and remediation outside of and beyond class or direct supervision sessions (e.g., developing and implementing remediation plans, providing additional instructional materials or study-help sessions, or supervising additional clinical experiences)
- a description of consultations with peers who teach similar course content
- a description of teaching-related activities or curricular development, including those that may have been supported by intramural or extramural grants for teaching enhancement or teaching initiatives
- a description of faculty continuing education activities related to the content of teaching, which may include independent readings, workshops, seminars, and continuing education
- a description of faculty continuing education activities related to the process of teaching, which may include independent readings, workshops, seminars, and continuing education
- materials exemplifying unique course design or grading procedures
- documentation of new course development or extensive course revisions

- highlights of non-standard courses that may have required special/extraordinary design and organization, or study of unconventional/non-standard topics, such as blended sections (online and face-to-face instruction), online sections, or special problems courses
- pedagogical products and materials associated with teaching that are authored by the faculty member, such as textbooks, textbook chapters, workbooks, student exercise sets, peer-reviewed published articles on pedagogy in the field, or presentations on pedagogy and basic or advanced curricular content within the field

Dual, combined standard for teaching excellence

Excellence in teaching, as defined by ASLP, encompasses both of the following: (1) the faculty member must remain current in his or her content area(s) of teaching expertise in support of the content and design of the faculty member's teaching activities; and (2) the faculty member must maintain high standards of quality in teaching activities. Both the currency of the faculty member's teaching-related content expertise and the quality of teaching, mentorship and instructional activities must be evidenced, to achieve standards of excellence in teaching.

The department recognizes that teaching excellence is best defined as a process, and not a product. Short-term, isolated metrics of currency of expertise and quality of teaching for purposes of annual review may belie degree of long-term, active development of the faculty member's expertise and long-term, active development of teaching quality in support of sustained teaching excellence that is considered holistically for the promotion and tenure process.

As noted in the section on scope of teaching activities in Appendix A, each type of teaching activity may present with its own approach and its own challenges to the faculty member to remain current in his or her area(s) of expertise and to continuously develop and strive for high-quality teaching. The faculty member is responsible for defining the quality of their teaching relative to the challenges inherent in the teaching approach they use. For example, large course sections may represent challenges different from small course sections; online or hybrid courses may represent challenges different from in-person courses; new course preparations may represent challenges different from repeated course teachings; and classroom courses represent challenges different from clinical supervision or thesis mentorship. *Yet, despite differences in the scope of teaching venues and their relative challenges, the faculty member holds ultimate responsibility to maintain expertise in their teaching content area(s), to strive for and attain high quality in teaching, and to document evidence for their teaching activities accordingly. Likewise, the entities reviewing the teaching activities of the faculty, both for purposes of promotion and tenure and for purposes of annual review, are held responsible to consider the full scope of the faculty member's teaching activities and the gestalt of documentation the faculty member provides, in commitment to a holistic and valid evaluation process.* To this end, the current Appendix A and the accompanying Appendices B, C, and D together provide details to guide and set the standards for the review process regarding teaching activities for promotion/tenure and annual review.

Evidence that faculty member remains current in content of teaching expertise. It is expected that all faculty remain current in their area(s) of expertise and apply this to their teaching. Evidence that course content remains up-to-date must be provided by the faculty member and is evaluated accordingly. An

overview of this evidence may be highlighted in the faculty essay. Detailed evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- documentation of the coherence and comprehensiveness of content of newly designed courses as reflected in the course syllabus and materials, whether this be a course that is new to the faculty member, new to the department or both;
- documentation of the coherence and comprehensiveness of the content of clinical teaching (clinical supervision) in a clinical area new to the faculty member;
- documentation of incorporation of the faculty member's current research lines and research findings into course content
- documentation of the inclusion of the research and evidence base that supports the content and design of classroom courses and clinical teaching;
- documentation of incorporation of new and updated editions of course textbooks into a course;
- documentation of faculty participation in continuing education activities, either formal or informal, across teaching content domains;
- documentation that the faculty member has obtained reviews of and input to their course content from other faculty peers, intramural or extramural, who are experts in the content of the course;
- adjustments of and additions to previously-taught course content over time, in response to new developments in the field, as reflected on the course syllabus, in course materials, or both; and
- comments on student course evaluations related to students' appreciation of the inclusion of current, cutting-edge content in their courses.

Evidence that faculty member maintains high quality of teaching. It is also expected that faculty maintain high standards of quality in teaching. It is the position of ASLP, in keeping with the position of HPS, that: (a) results of student course evaluations alone do not constitute sufficient evidence of teaching quality; and (b) that numerically high student course evaluations are not the *sine qua non* of evidence of high-quality teaching, as there are multiple indicators of teaching quality that may converge from the perspectives of multiple entities as part of the holistic picture of overall teaching quality. Thus, degree of quality of teaching is evaluated based on the preponderance of evidence of teaching quality as a whole, rather than being evaluated on the basis of only one or a few pieces of evidence.

For the promotion and tenure process, teaching quality is assessed as outlined in the main section of the current document, in the sub-section corresponding to the faculty type under review. For the annual merit review process, teaching quality is assessed as outlined in Appendix B.

The evidence of teaching quality falls into two categories: required evidence and additional optional evidence. Required metrics of teaching quality that must be included as part of the dossier for review for promotion and tenure, and for annual review, are:

- results of peer assessments of teaching associated with the period under review, following departmental guidelines as outlined in Appendix C and D.
- complete results of university-administered student course evaluations for all courses in the period under review, without exclusions

- Quantitative overall summative rating of each course
- Quantitative overall challenge and engagement index of each course
- Complete set of qualitative comments submitted by students

Additional documentation of teaching quality and efforts to augment teaching quality may include, but is not limited to:

- description and documentation of steps taken in effort to improve course quality, e.g. documentation of innovative teaching methods and course design, documentation of methods to develop and assess students' critical thinking and problem solving.
- evidence of student support and remediation beyond office hours (e.g., developing and implementing remediation plans, and providing additional instructional materials and clinical experiences resulting in enhanced learning of difficult concepts); often these efforts are fundamental for student retention.
- discussion in the essay of mitigating factors that may have impacted other metrics of teaching quality
- discussion in the essay of how student feedback and peer assessments of teaching were incorporated into course re-design, to improve course quality
- examples of course materials that reflect uniqueness, innovation, or rigor in course design
- an overview or summary of the required peer assessment and student course evaluation results, in the faculty essay, which may include meta-commentary on patterns in these data
- evidence based on keynote addresses for which the primary purpose is continuing education, as may be determined in part by the nature of the audience for the keynote
- documentation of teaching eminence recognition, such as teaching award nominations and teaching awards
- description of updates to course content, in support of teaching quality
- description of updates to course design, in support of teaching quality
- evidence intramural or extramural grants for teaching enhancement or teaching initiatives, which may include a description of the teaching activities that the funding supports
- indicators of mentorship outcomes, such as: theses and dissertations completed by mentored students; student pursuit of research careers; post-graduate professional placements related to mentorship activities; and other research products, awards, and successes of mentored students
- metrics of course rigor and student engagement, which may include the distribution of final course grades earned by students in the course
- metrics of course teaching outcomes, such as group pre-post testing or course group performance on nationally standardized testing
- evidence of teaching-relevant books, book chapters, workbooks, and peer-reviewed publications.
 - Note: If the publication is produced as part of the faculty member's research on pedagogical or curricular topics in the field, such publications must be documented under research activities, and evidence must be provided that this is indeed research-related in keeping with HPS standards, e.g. data collection required IRB approval. See Appendix E.

APPENDIX B

Rubric for Annual Performance Review of Teaching and Instructional Activities

Rating Score: 4.5 – 5.0

Qualifier: Superior

Characteristics: Evidence of superior classroom teaching and mentoring that exceeds departmental expectations. The candidate must demonstrate a performance profile that meets the criteria in the first four areas below, and in at least two of the remaining areas below:

1. On the university-administered student course evaluations for all courses taught. The Summative median score above 4.3 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is highest.
2. On the university-administered student course evaluations, the Challenge and Engagement Index above 5.0 on a 7-point scale in which 7 is highest.
3. One or more peer reviews for each evaluation period indicates a median rating of greater than 4.3 (on a 5-point Likert scale) on the department classroom observation rating form.
4. Candidates' self-assessments and appraisals teaching performance that describe innovative teaching methods, methods to assess critical thinking and problem solving, and evidence that course content is up-to-date, with an end result of an upward-sloping trajectory of teaching quality indicating successful efforts to improve teaching.
5. Evidence of teaching honors and awards bestowed by the university and professional organizations or nominations for teaching awards.
6. Evidence of keynote addresses and other invited professional presentations.
7. Evidence of intra- and extramural funding for teaching initiatives.
8. Evidence of student mentorship, such as directing research projects, involving students in classroom teaching, readying students for leadership positions, and awards.
9. Evidence of books, book chapters, workbooks, and teaching-related peer-reviewed publications.
10. Engaging in student support and remediation beyond office hours (e.g., developing and implementing remediation plans, providing additional instructional materials, and supervising additional clinical experiences.

Rating Score: 4.0 – 4.4

Qualifier: Excellent

Characteristics: Evidence of excellent classroom teaching and mentoring that often exceeds departmental expectations. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in first four areas below, and in at least two of the remaining areas below:

1. On the university-administered student course evaluations for all courses taught. The Summative median score above 4.0 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is highest.
2. On the university-administered student course evaluations, the Challenge and Engagement Index above 4.5 on a 7-point scale in which 7 is highest.

3. One or more peer reviews for each evaluation period indicates a mean rating of greater than 4.0 (on a 5-point Likert scale) on the department classroom observation rating form.
4. Candidates' self-assessments and appraisals teaching performance that describe innovative teaching methods, methods to assess critical thinking and problem solving, evidence that course content is up-to-date and efforts to improve teaching.
5. Evidence of teaching honors and awards bestowed by the university and professional organizations or nominations for teaching awards.
6. Evidence of keynote addresses and other invited professional presentations.
7. Evidence of intra- and extramural funding for teaching initiatives.
8. Evidence of student mentorship, such as directing research projects, involving students in classroom teaching, readying students for leadership positions, and awards.
9. Evidence of books, book chapters, workbooks, and teaching-related peer-reviewed publications.
10. Engaging in student support and remediation beyond office hours (e.g., developing and implementing remediation plans, providing additional instructional materials, and supervising additional clinical experiences).

Rating Score: 3.5 – 3.9

Qualifier: Commendable

Characteristics: Evidence of good classroom teaching and mentoring that meets departmental expectations. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in three of the first four areas below, and in at least two of the remaining areas below:

1. On the university-administered student course evaluations for all courses taught. The Summative median score above 3.5 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is highest.
2. On the university-administered student course evaluations, the Challenge and Engagement Index above 4.5 on a 7-point scale in which 7 is highest.
3. One or more peer reviews for each evaluation period indicates a mean rating of greater than 3.5 (on a 5-point Likert scale) on the department classroom observation rating form.
4. Candidates' self-assessments and appraisals teaching performance that describe innovative teaching methods, methods to assess critical thinking and problem solving, evidence that course content is up-to-date and efforts to improve teaching.
5. Evidence of teaching honors and awards bestowed by the university and professional organizations or nominations for teaching awards.
6. Evidence of keynote addresses and other invited professional presentations.
7. Evidence of intra- and extramural funding for teaching initiatives.
8. Evidence of student mentorship, such as directing research projects, involving students in classroom teaching, readying students for leadership positions, and awards.
9. Evidence of books, book chapters, workbooks, and teaching-related peer-reviewed publications.
10. Engaging in student support and remediation beyond office hours (e.g., developing and implementing remediation plans, providing additional instructional materials, and supervising additional clinical experiences).

Rating Score: 3.0 – 3.4

Qualifier: Acceptable

Characteristics: Evidence of acceptable classroom teaching and mentoring that meets departmental expectations. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in two of the first four areas below, and in at least two of the remaining areas below:

1. On the university-administered student course evaluations for all courses taught. The Summative median score above 3.0 on a 5-point scale in which 5 is highest.
2. On the university-administered student course evaluations, the Challenge and Engagement Index above 4.0 on a 7-point scale in which 7 is highest.
3. One or more peer reviews for each evaluation period indicates a mean rating of greater than 3.5 (on a 5-point Likert scale) on the department classroom observation rating form.
4. Candidates' self-assessments and appraisals teaching performance that describe innovative teaching methods, methods to assess critical thinking and problem solving, evidence that course content is up-to-date and efforts to improve teaching.
5. Evidence of teaching honors and awards bestowed by the university and professional organizations or nominations for teaching awards.
6. Evidence of keynote addresses and other invited professional presentations.
7. Evidence of intra- and extramural funding for teaching initiatives.
8. Evidence of student mentorship, such as directing research projects, involving students in classroom teaching, readying students for leadership positions, and awards.
9. Evidence of books, book chapters, workbooks, and teaching-related peer-reviewed publications.
10. Engaging in student support and remediation beyond office hours (e.g., developing and implementing remediation plans, providing additional instructional materials, and supervising additional clinical experiences.

Rating Score: Below 3.0

Qualifier: Unsatisfactory, needs improvement.

Does not meet departmental expectations, needs intervention and additional training.

Appendix C

UNT Department of Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology

Faculty Peer Evaluation: Classroom Teaching Observation Rating Form

Note: Peer reviews will be conducted by associate or full professors or faculty outside the department as designated by the Personnel Affairs Committee. Untenured faculty will be evaluated by tenured faculty in one course per academic year. Tenured faculty will be evaluated by full professors in one course over any given three-year period. The evaluation will be documented with the ASLP Faculty Peer Evaluation Teaching form (see Appendices C and Appendix D).

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Number of Students Present: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____

Instructions: Listed below are teaching content areas. Respond to each of the statements below by circling the number that most closely corresponds to your observation.

5 = Excellent

4 = Very Satisfactory

3 = Satisfactory

2 = Needs Improvement

1 = Poor

NA = Not Applicable

I. Importance and Suitability of Content

1. The material presented is important for this group of students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. When appropriate, appropriate citations were provided to support statements.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. A sufficient amount of material was included in the teaching activity.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Content represents current thinking in this discipline.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Material is relevant to course objectives and assigned readings.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

II. Organization of Content

1. Prepared for class and used time efficiently.						
2. Stated the purpose of the teaching activity.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Arranged and discussed the content in a systematic and organized manner.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Asked questions periodically to determine student comprehension.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

5. Provided examples to clarify abstract and difficult ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. Summarized the main ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

III. Presentation Style

1. Rate of speech was neither too fast nor too slow.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Maintained eye contact with the class.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Listened carefully to student comments and questions.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Demonstrates command of subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. Uses instructional aids to facilitate important points.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. Demonstrates appropriate classroom management techniques to ensure class productivity.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

IV. Clarity of Presentation and Class Activity

1. Defined new terms, concepts, and principles.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Used relevant examples to explain major ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Used clear and simple directions and examples.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Provided occasional summaries and restatements of important ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Used alternative explanations, when necessary.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

V. Questioning Ability

1. Asked questions and used other classroom assessment techniques to determine student understanding.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Repeated questions and answers, when necessary, so everyone involved in the activity can hear.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Received student questions respectfully.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Asked a variety of types of questions (rhetorical, open and closed ended).	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Addresses questions to volunteer and non-volunteer students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

VI. Establishing Positive Learning Environment

1. Greeted students.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Used questions to gain student attention.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Encouraged student questions and contributions.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Engaged students in teaching activities.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Adapted from Braskamp & Ory (1994)

Median Rating: _____

Comments:

Appendix D

UNT Department of Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology

Faculty Peer Evaluation: Clinical Teaching Observation Rating Form

Note: Peer reviews will be conducted by associate or full professors or faculty outside the department as designated by the Personnel Affairs Committee. Untenured faculty will be evaluated by tenured faculty in one course per academic year. Tenured faculty will be evaluated by full professors in one course over any given three-year period. The evaluation will be documented with the ASLP Faculty Peer Evaluation Teaching form (see Appendix C and Appendix D).

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Number of Students Present: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____

Observation of (circle one):

Student Meeting Group Meeting Therapy Session Diagnostic Evaluation

Instructions: Listed below are teaching content areas. Respond to each of the statements below by circling the number that most closely corresponds to your observation.

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Agree

3 = Neutral

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

NA = Not Applicable

1. Supervisor was prepared and organized for clinical teaching activities.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Supervisor encouraged student independence, while providing direct clinical instruction and guidance commensurate with the student clinician's level of clinic training.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Supervisor used non-direct patient care time efficiently.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Supervisor maintained active engagement throughout the supervisory activity.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Supervisor communicated and collaborated with student clinician to ensure evidence-based clinical procedures and best practices are understood and used.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

6. Supervisor offered and/or provided ongoing feedback regarding student's performance.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
7. Supervisor's explanation of clinical methods, strategies and approaches were clearly and effectively communicated during supervisory activities.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
8. Supervisor effectively responded to student clinician's questions, confusions and/or need for clarifications during supervisory activity.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
9. Supervisor asked questions to ensure student clinician is actively participating, understanding and integrating knowledge and skills.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
10. Supervisor engaged the student clinician by inviting student input, opinions and added professional information during supervisory activity.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
11. Supervisor's interaction reflected a genuine concern and tailoring of information to student's clinical education level, clinical advancement and her/his personal clinical strengths and abilities.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
12. Supervisor offered evidence-based methodologies to ensure best practices by the student clinician.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
13. Supervisor guided the student clinician in developing a well-organized plan for clinical activities.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Supervisor clearly specified expectations of the student clinician.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
15. Supervisor was on time for clinical teaching activities.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Median Rating: _____

Comments:

Appendix E
Independence, Innovation, Quality and Impact of
Research and Scholarly Activity:
Standards/Expectations, Scope, and Documentation

Standards/Expectations

Tenure-track faculty members in the department are expected to actively engage in a coherent program of research and scholarship that reflects: (1) independence of scholarly thought and innovation on the part of the faculty member; and (2) high quality and high impact within the field of scholarship. For tenure-track probationary faculty, this program of research should be sustainable, and for tenured faculty, this program of research and scholarship should be sustained.

The department recognizes that, in the disciplines and sub-disciplines of Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, transdisciplinary and collaborative research activity is the norm; steady progress in building transdisciplinary research collaborations and emergence of research products from these collaborations are highly valued in advancing the scientific enterprise. Transdisciplinary and collaborative research may include research conducted in collaboration with industry, public or private organizations, communities or any combination thereof. Candidates for promotion and tenure are encouraged to document and describe how establishment and advancement of key intra- and trans-disciplinary research collaborations serve to advance the programmatic and coherent development of their lines of research as it contributes to the discipline. Special cases of authorship order should also be documented by the faculty member, such as: order of authorship in which the head and leader of a collaborative or mentored research team purposefully chooses a position of last authorship as a professional nod to the contributions of the team as a whole; or order of authorship that is purposefully alphabetical, to denote the equal significance and importance of the contribution of each authored member of the research team.

In alignment with the teaching mission of the university and in recognition of the importance of mentoring future generations of researchers in their scholarship, research mentorship of students is prioritized and afforded extra weight in tenure and promotion deliberations accordingly, in certain cases. Specifically, publications with student co-authors are afforded extra weight, counting as 1.25 publications instead of 1.00 publication in publication counts. This would include earned research co-authorship by both current students and former students that contributed to the research. Students mentored in research may be at any stage in their academic career and from any discipline related to the research program of the mentoring faculty member. Mentored students may include but are not limited to high-school students in the UNT's Texas Academy of Math and Science (TAMS), undergraduate students, master's students, clinical doctoral students (e.g. AuD students) and research-based doctoral students (e.g. PhD students). Likewise, expectations of weighting of order of authorship as a metric of research independence of the faculty member may be adjusted to accommodate important contributions of mentored student authors, which may include presentations

and publications emanating from a student's research and scholarship on independent studies, theses, and dissertations. In all cases, the faculty member is responsible for documentation of adherence to ethical standards for co-authorship, including when students are co-authors with faculty on publications. Ethical definitions of the basis for earned authorship, as defined by professional organizations of the discipline such as the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association and the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, will set the standards for earned authorship for each co-author on published works, regardless of student status or non-student status of potential co-authors. The faculty member is responsible for documentation of adherence to these ethical standards when students are co-authors with faculty on publications.

Coherence of programmatic research is paramount in promotion and tenure deliberations and should be described as part of the faculty essay. The department acknowledges that co-authored publications may deviate from a faculty member's programmatic lines of research in service to mentorship of students in research, which should be taken into account: Mentorship of student independent studies, theses, and dissertations may result in student publications with a faculty member on a topic that is peripheral to the faculty member's programmatic line or lines of research and scholarship. This seeming reduction of the coherence of the faculty member's programmatic research and scholarship should not be counted against the faculty member when consider the faculty member's merits for promotion.

Scope

ASLP recognizes a faculty member's involvement in any and all types of research and scholarly activity. Scholarly publications and scholarly presentations and research and scholarly grant activity fall into the scope of research and scholarly activities, as specified in Sections II-A-2 and II-B-2 of the current document.

The department further recognizes that excellence in research and scholarly activities is a process of excellence that is mirrored in products of excellence over time. A trajectory of growth in development of a coherent research program over multiple years may serve as a more sensitive prognostic of eligibility for promotion and tenure, as compared to raw numerical indicators of quality or impact in any given year. Assessment of faculty research and scholarship must take into consideration that scholarship and programmatic research naturally builds in a step-wise fashion, which natural progression may vary from field to field, or from sub-field to sub-field, for example: research and scholarship disseminated through presentations and peer-reviewed conference proceedings may be further consolidated and disseminated through subsequent publication in peer-reviewed journals, scholarly book chapters or books; previous presentations and publications may be integrated together and more widely disseminated for increased impact through invited presentations and publications on specialty topics of critical interest to the field; theoretical frameworks under development during earlier phases of published experimental research in journals may be integrated and achieve even greater impact in shaping advancements in the field through journal-based scholarly reviews, meta-analysis and scholarly theoretical treatises in books and book chapters; grant support awarded based on successful past research may in turn support future research.

Each publication is entered as one publication into publication counts, as a reflection of research and scholarly impact. Exceptions to this count must be justified by the faculty member relative to departmental standards and the realities of the scholarly enterprise. For example, publications with students as defined under “Standards/Expectations” above may be weighted as 1.25 publications. As another example, scholarly books which are highly valued in certain sub-disciplines may arguably represent the productivity and scholarly impact of 1-3 journal articles depending on the list of authorship, the prestige of the press, and type of book as documented by the faculty member. Scholarly activities may be associated with research that is quantitative, qualitative or both quantitative and qualitative. The department recognizes that quality and impact of research and scholarship on advancements in the field is determined by the fit of the design of the research and scholarship to the topic under investigation, and not by the type of design per se. For example, well designed case studies and multiple baseline designs may be better suited to multi-factorial clinical intervention research than would large-n experimental designs; large-n designs may be best suited to experimental research that call for systematic manipulation of small numbers of factors to advance theoretical modeling; meta-analysis or systematic literature review may be instrumental in shaping the future advancements within a discipline which is at a scientific turning point in its history; scholarly books and chapters in scholarly books written by experts in a particular field serve to frame theory and methodology in support of advancements in the field at large; and survey data and epidemiological studies may advance research engagement of populations of interest and advance applied research with key clinical populations.

For promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure, tenure-track assistant professors in ASLP are expected publish the equivalent of ten peer-reviewed works of research or scholarship, at least five of which should be first-authored or first-authored-equivalent. The ten works of research publications must include 7-8 peer-reviewed journal articles. Associate professors seeking promotion to professor should have produced an additional body of work comparable to the pre-tenure research and scholarly activity documented for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor. For promotion to the rank of professor, associate professors in ASLP are expected to publish the equivalent of twenty peer-reviewed works of research or scholarship, and at least ten of these should be completed since promotion to associate professor. At least ten of the twenty publications should be first-authored or first-authored-equivalent. The twenty publications must include 14-16 peer-reviewed journal articles.

Additional publications to meet the equivalency of ten peer-reviewed publications for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, and twenty peer-reviewed publications for promotion to the rank of professor may include but are not limited to:

- research-focused book chapters
- scholarly books
- conference proceedings
- web-based research database contributions, especially those whose significance is bolstered by international dissemination and uptake and vetted through grant funding
- scientific inventions or creations, which may include devices or clinical tools that are products of the research process, as reflected in patents and copyrights.

Grant support is essential to the research enterprise and deserves special consideration and documentation in promotion and tenure deliberations. Given the nature of the research enterprise in our respective fields and sub-fields, research-based grant and/or contract support is essential for successfully conducting programmatic lines of research and provides additional evidence of the candidate's commitment to and success in development of a body of programmatic research. Indeed, the increasingly transdisciplinary and collaborative nature of the scientific enterprise often requires complementary contributions of a team of researchers across a variety of administrative research roles, which may include roles of principal investigator, co-principal investigator, investigator and contractor. *While sheer monetary amount on any given grant may often be positively associated with successful development of programmatic lines of research, the department acknowledges that this is not always the case in our associated fields of scholarship.* Indeed, certain lines of programmatic, transdisciplinary and collaborative research and research mentorship may require less overall funding in support of high-quality, high-impact research, as compared to other lines of research. Extramural grants that are awarded following a process of peer-review by in-field colleagues may serve as one indicator of the quality of a faculty member's programmatic line of research. In comparison, intramural research grants or foundation grants are not typically vetted through peer-review by in-field colleagues, yet they often provide seed funding or funding for piloting, in support of future extramural, peer-reviewed grants, or they may fully support a programmatic line of research if sufficient in size for that particular line of research. *Ultimately, the faculty member must provide evidence of research productivity resulting from any research grants, regardless of grant amount and regardless of whether awards are based on peer-review by in-field peers.* Research productivity resulting from grants should (1) contribute to the faculty member's programmatic line of research, (2) provide pilot data for larger grants, and longer-term (3) result in journal publications, book publications, published contributions of well-designed databases made accessible to the larger research community in support of scientific advancements in the field. It is also acknowledged that certain funding agencies may require that research publications resulting from support of their agency must appear in free, publicly accessible venues; in these cases, publication mandates of the funding agency must be taken into consideration when discerning the quality and impact of the associated research venue, as free and publicly accessible venues may differ from for-profit publication venues in associated quantitative metrics of research quality and impact.

Documentation

The faculty member is expected to submit documentation of research and scholarly activities for promotion and tenure considerations and for annual merit reviews. In practical terms, all elements of the promotion and tenure dossier, promotion dossier, or the annual activities report (as required and administrated by the UNT office of the provost through the Faculty Information System or other administrative mechanisms) hold potential to document the faculty member's adherence to departmental standards for promotion, tenure and promotion, and annual review. This documentation may include but is not limited to a faculty personal statement, curriculum vitae, and other elements within the dossier.

Faculty members are encouraged to provide documentation of each of the following categories, in keeping with departmental standards:

- independence of scholarly thought, innovation, quality and impact.
- the sustainable or sustained nature of the scholarly activities over time.

Independence of scholarly thought. Evidence of independence of scholarly thought must be submitted by the faculty member for promotion and tenure reviews and annual merit reviews. An overview of this evidence may be highlighted in the faculty essay. Detailed evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- descriptions of the over-arching coherence of the faculty member's programmatic lines of research
- documentation of order of authorship on publications that reflects leadership in the research enterprise. Typically, this is reflected as first-authorship. For unique cases of first-author equivalence, when the faculty member's name is not literally placed in the first position yet still reflects a unique and robust contribution, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document that fact, e.g., in instances of alphabetically authored trans-disciplinary research as noted earlier in the current Appendix E.
- evidence as primary investigator (PI) or co-PI status on a grant or contract
- publications in venues of high relevance and specificity to a specific sub-field or specialty area

Scholarly innovation. Evidence of innovation of research and scholarly activities must be submitted by the faculty member for promotion and tenure reviews and annual merit reviews. An overview of this evidence may be highlighted in the faculty essay. Detailed evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- descriptions in the faculty essay of the unique contributions represented by the faculty member's programmatic line(s) of research, in wording accessible to the educated layperson
- evidence of unique contributions to transdisciplinary and collaborative research efforts

High quality. Evidence of high quality of research and scholarly activities must be submitted by the faculty member for promotion and tenure reviews and annual merit reviews. An overview of this evidence may be highlighted in the faculty essay. Detailed evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- documentation of peer review of scholarship
- evidence of scholarly contributions that are solicited or invited by groups and leaders in the field

High impact. Evidence of high impact of research and scholarly activities must be submitted by the faculty member for promotion and tenure reviews and annual merit reviews. An overview of this evidence may be highlighted in the faculty essay. Detailed evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- documentation of the number of publications and presentations; as noted earlier in the current Appendix E, special cases of weight of counts of publications may apply (student co-authored publications or scholarly books)
- journal impact value, circulation rate, acceptance rate or other citation indices (e.g., SCImago Journal Rank -SJR indicator)

- publications in venues of high relevance and specificity to a specific sub-field or specialty area
- indices of the breadth of scholarly dissemination, such as dissemination in high-quality national and international venues, which may be documented in part by the global representation of expertise in edited books
- indices of the breadth and depth of scholarly adoption and uptake by others in the discipline, such as citation indices for publications
- evaluations provided by conference attendees

Sustainable or sustained nature. Evidence of the sustainable nature of scholarly activities (for probationary tenure-track faculty) or of the sustained nature of scholarly activities (for tenured tenure-track faculty) must be submitted by the faculty member for promotion and tenure reviews. An overview of this evidence may be highlighted in the faculty essay. Detailed evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- descriptions of the programmatic and coherent nature of the gestalt of the faculty member's research and scholarly activity over an extended period of time, as realized through the faculty member's publications and presentations
- documentation of extramural, foundation, and intramural grant awards in support of research, since these are typically awarded based on past research and support future research
- evidence of research productivity and impact resulting from any research grants (e.g., publications, presentations, database contributions).

Notably, a cross-section of multiple dimensions of quality and impact of research and scholarship may be consolidated and reflected as unitary indices of tiered departmental ratings of publication venues, especially for journal publications, albeit not exclusively so. Such ratings may be especially helpful as converging evidence of research quality and impact.

- On December 13, 2018, the UNT Library Scholarly Impact Service (SIS) team recommended that the department and its faculty rank the quality and impact of journals in quartiles using multiple metrics, because faculty in Audiology & Speech-Language Pathology publish in a wide variety of publication venues that use different types of metrics. Based on the above recommendation, the department will use the ranking in quartiles published in resources such as <https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php> (search by journal name, e.g., Speech and hearing journals, neuroscience journals, etc.) to assess the quality and impact of a journal publication. If a journal venue is not on the resource site, the faculty member must provide information about the quality of the journal by providing equivalency with one of the metrics used in the resource (e.g. H-index).
- Journal rankings will be updated and adopted by the department on an annual basis, based on the changes provided by the resource or resources suggested by the UNT Library, in a flexible and dynamic fashion, and will be made available to faculty through a departmental mechanism separate from the promotion and tenure document; journal rankings will not be fixed or specified within the departmental guidelines and standards relating to promotion, tenure and annual evaluation as this would require annual updates of the promotion and tenure document, which would be neither feasible nor desirable.

APPENDIX F

Rubric for Annual Performance Review of Research and Scholarly Activity

Note: Rating standards are based on the assumption that the typical research workload averages 40% of the total workload of tenure-track faculty.

Rating Score: 4.5-5.0

Qualifier: Superior

Characteristics: Consistently exceeds the departmental expectations

- Superior record of multiple publications. An average of more than two publications per year.
- The publications are mostly highly-ranked journals according to current department standards
- External funding.
- Delivered more than one regional, state, national and international presentations a year on average.

Rating Score: 4.0-4.4

Qualifier: Excellent

Characteristics: Consistently exceeds the departmental expectations

- Excellent record of multiple publications. An average of two publications per year.
- The publications are mostly highly-ranked journals according to current department standards
- External funding.
- Delivered one regional, state, national and international presentations a year on average.

Rating Score: 3.5-3.9

Qualifier: Commendable

Characteristics: Consistently meets and often exceeds the departmental expectations

- Good record of multiple publications. An average of more than 1.5 publications per year.
- The publications are mostly highly-ranked journals according to current department standards
- External or internal funding.
- Delivered one regional, state, national and international presentations a year on average.

Rating Score: 3.0-3.4

Qualifier: Acceptable

Characteristics: Consistently meets the departmental expectations

- Good record of multiple publications. An average of 1.5 publications per year.
- The publications are mostly highly-ranked journals according to current department standards

- External or internal funding.
- Delivered one regional, state, national and international presentations a year on average.

Rating Score: Below 3.0

Qualifier: Unsatisfactory, needs improvement.

Characteristics: Does not meet departmental expectations in all areas of research. Frequently does not meet minimum departmental expectations, no evidence of improvement in scholarly activities

- Published an average of one or less than one article per year
- Delivered less than one regional, state, national and international presentations a year on the average.
- Did not attain internal/external funding

APPENDIX G

Scope, Documentation and Evaluation of Service Activities

Scope

For both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, the department reviews contributions to the department, college, university, discipline, profession, and community.

Examples of activities include serving as department chair, directing undergraduate or graduate programs, and serving as a member of or chairing, committees, conferences, councils, Faculty Senate, task forces, and working groups. Examples of service to the profession include serving as an editor of a journal, an editorial consultant for a journal, or a reviewer for state, national or international journals. External service may also include serving as a faculty liaison for a student professional organization as well as service on committees or boards of directors for local, state, national, or international professional organizations.

Other examples include advising and recruiting students, developing programs, mentoring faculty and students, sponsoring student organizations, consultations, presenting service workshops and service lectures, providing clinical services, as well as serving as journal editor, ad-hoc reviewer for journals and books, grant reviewer, and holding office in local, state, national, and international organizations.

Documentation

To evaluate candidates' service, the RPTC Committee and ASLP chair consider faculty members' documented activities, outcomes, external judgments, eminence measures, and self-assessments and appraisals.

Evaluation

For purposes of promotion and tenure, as well as for purposes of annual review, the department assesses contributions in service by evaluating responsibilities, requirements, rigor, and products associated with the service and the candidates' position or role in the service activity. External judgments in the form of written correspondences from participants, clients, sponsoring organizations, colleagues, administrators, and external reviewers may help the department evaluate the quality of the candidates' service. Eminence measures—such as honors and awards, invited presentations, holding office or administrative positions within the department, college, university, and professional organizations—also contribute to the department's evaluation of the quality of service. For post-promotion faculty, degree of national or international service is also considered. In addition, the department considers candidates' self-assessments and appraisals of their performance.

For purposes of annual reviews, the departmental Personnel Affairs Committee assigns scores using a rubric (Appendix H) to reflect the significance of each faculty member's service. To demonstrate excellence in the area of service, candidates must show a robust combination of service activities that are consistent with their faculty rank as defined in Sections II-A-3, I-B-3 and II-C in the current document.

APPENDIX H

Rubric for Annual Performance Review of Service Activities

Rating Score: 4.5-5.0

Qualifier: Superior

Characteristics: Consistently exceeds departmental expectations associated with faculty rank; excellent quality and high-quantity service. Measurable impact on the department, college, university, community, and professional community.

Evidence may include but not limited to:

- formal recognition of extraordinary service by the university, college, unit, or professional group;
- president of a state/national/international organization;
- service as an officer of the UNT Faculty Senate;
- extraordinary committee service (quantity and quality) to the university, college, or unit;
- extraordinary service (quantity and quality) to public organizations;
- significant external, non-research fund raising;
- directing a successful accreditation application process (including SACS accreditation efforts);
- designing and initiating a new degree program;
- service as editor of a refereed journal;
- service as president of a regional/state organization or major officer of a national/international organization;

Rating Score: 4.0-4.4

Qualifier: Excellent

Characteristics: Frequently exceeds departmental expectations associated with faculty rank; high-quality and high-quantity service. Impact on the department, college and university. Service for community and professional community.

Evidence may include but not limited to:

- service as a member of the UNT Faculty Senate;
- excellent committee service (quantity and quality) to the university, college, or unit;
- excellent service (quantity and quality) to public organizations;
- organizes external non-research fund raising;
- directs a clinic or a program successfully
- service as an editorial board member of a refereed journal;
- service as an officer of a state/national/international organization;
- service on several major committees or task forces
- service as the chair of the Charter committee(s)
- service as the chair of the faculty search committee(s)
- service on external review team to evaluate grant proposals for research, training or demonstration projects (such as NSF, NIH, or ASHA)

Rating Score: 3.5-3.9

Qualifier: Commendable

Characteristics: Often exceed departmental expectations associated with faculty rank; quality service to the department, and at least one of the following: college, university, community, and professional community.

Evidence may include but not limited to:

- service as director of a center or institute involved in external fundraising
- service as editor of newsletter for a professional organization
- service to public organizations
- service as unit/area coordinator
- exceptional consulting related to one's discipline
- design and initiation of new academic concentration
- development and implementation of innovative student recruitment program
- service as faculty sponsor of a student organization requiring consulting/supervision
- service on university or college review team to evaluate grant proposals for research, training or demonstration projects;
- service as manuscript reviewer for multiple manuscripts for two or more journals.
- coordination of a cooperative agreement with community college/public agency/business & industry

Rating Score: 3.0-3.4

Qualifier: Acceptable

Characteristics: Meets departmental expectations associated with faculty rank; service to the department as well as college or university

Evidence may include but not limited to:

- regular attendance at and participation in departmental faculty meetings
- service and active participation on at least two departmental committees, task force, or other service-related assignment in the department
- service as minor officer or committee chair in an organization
- service as paper discussant or session chair at a conference
- service on two or more minor committees or task forces as a committee member
- service on public commissions or advisory
- service as an ad hoc manuscript reviewer for a refereed journal.
- development/presentation of professional programs or workshops;
- consulting related to one's discipline
- serving on a community board/committee related to one's professional discipline

Rating Score: Below 3.0

Qualifier: Unsatisfactory relative to faculty rank, needs improvement

Characteristics: Frequently does not meet minimum departmental expectations, minimal effort to accept service activities, service is of low quality, no evidence of improvement in service activities.