

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure Guidelines  
Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences**

**May 2020**

The following document serves as guidelines and expectations for tenure and promotion in the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences (SPHSC) to provide a clear process for career advancement for SPHSC Assistant Professors.

ALTHOUGH the College of Arts & Sciences' outlines "Promotion Considerations" (<https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-considerations>) and Chapter 24 of the University of Washington Faculty Code provides guidelines for tenure and promotion (<https://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>), it is imperative to develop department-level expectations for tenure and promotion to ensure transparency and equality around the expected products.

Please note that these guidelines are a living document. Approximately every five years, SPHSC tenure-stream faculty will review this document and either vote to affirm its content, or revise its content and vote on the revision.

The process leading up to promotion is outlined on the College of Arts and Sciences website (<https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-and-tenure-procedures>). The process specific to Speech and Hearing Sciences Department is outlined here. During the 5th year (or by nomination by self or by Mentor Committee for an earlier date), the applicant submits materials to the Mentor Committee. The Mentor Committee reviews promotion and/or tenure eligibility and submits a report to the Chair. The Chair solicits outside external letters through consultation with the Assistant Professor and with the Mentor Committee. The Assistant Professor gives a public lecture on his/her research program. The Chair compiles materials and posts materials to faculty who are superior in rank for review. The faculty meet, discuss eligibility and vote. The appointment packet forwarded to upper campus for review and approval

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure is a university commitment to a lifetime career. It is predicated on three standard metrics used across the university: research, teaching, and service. Each of these three standards will be addressed below in the context of expectations of SPHSC.

## **1) Research**

The quality and quantity of research is measured by several factors including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Independent line of research.** The Assistant Professor should have a unique line of research inquiry that is independent from their doctoral advisor and/or post-doctoral mentor, and work that goes beyond their doctoral dissertation research. Independence is often evident in senior (first or last) authored peer-reviewed publications and peer-reviewed conference presentations. Also, independence is evident in peer-reviewed papers and/or peer-reviewed conference submissions without the doctoral and/or post-doctoral mentor listed. That said, if the mentors are included as co-author, a brief explanation describing the relative contributions of each author would be helpful. For example, a mentor may be the principal investigator of a large data set and the Assistant Professor requires access to and has used those data to answer unique questions.
- b. Publications**
  - i. Number:** There is not an expected number of publications necessary for promotion because the type of research conducted in our field can take a varying amount of time across the subdisciplines to produce important and publishable findings. The number of publications should reflect the specific line of research. For example, in the case where the research program requires an extended time to collect data, fewer and more impactful papers are appropriate compared to a research program that produces meaningful data quickly. A specific example of an extended timeframe is in behavioral treatment research where it can take several months to collect a single data point on a participant's response to treatment. In this case, it is plausible that a major paper describing the impact of treatment on behavior could take upwards of two to three years to produce meaningful and interpretable results. In cases in which publications do not require long-term data collection or analysis, or when the assistant professor has many colleagues

and is co-authoring studies, publications may be more numerous. In all cases, tenure review committees will review the entire research portfolio of the candidate to establish evidence of scholarly productivity worthy of promotion.

**ii. Venue:** Research findings in the speech, language and hearing sciences are disseminated in a wide range of peer-reviewed journals. The area and type of research dictates the most appropriate journal(s) for dissemination. The majority of publications should be in journals deemed rigorous by the academic committee and external reviewers. Additionally, it is important to note that topics essential to the Assistant Professors' research platform, such as tool development or pilot studies, may warrant publication in lesser known journals.

**iii. Authorship:** With regard to authorship, the field of speech and hearing sciences interprets the order as follows: First authored papers reflect independence and leadership. Co-authored papers reflect collaboration. The last author position is sometimes used to indicate senior author position. In order to avoid confusion regarding interpretation of authorship role, the Assistant Professor should clarify author contributions with the mentorship committee and through annotations on the CV.

**c. Funding:** Grant funding is not required at the time of promotion; however, evidence of attempts to garner external funding is required and is measured by grant submissions. Should a grant not receive funding, tenure committees will discuss why the grant was not funded and the next steps taken by the Assistant Professor. This evidence can be reflected in the academic committee's report and/or in the annual Chair's letter. For example, it is important to know the context around the grant submission and results of that submission. Tenure review committees consider grant submissions as evidence that a line of work has reached the point where a strong argument for funding can be made, and value junior faculty reaching this point. Therefore, multiple attempts to achieve funding are expected, even when the funding climate makes it difficult to be successful. Examples of acceptable grant funding mechanisms include, but are not limited to, internal UW grants, foundation grants and extra-mural grants (e.g. National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and Veterans Affairs).

- d. **Research mentoring:** Evidence of research mentoring is important for promotion and tenure. Research mentoring can occur at the undergraduate, masters, doctoral and postdoctoral levels. Successful research mentoring can result in products such as an undergraduate honors project, master's thesis, and publication/presentations of student projects. Research mentoring at a doctoral or postdoctoral level can include committee work and/or committee chair and can also result in fellowship applications. Being asked to serve as a graduate school representative (GSR) shows research mentorship activity. Mentoring a Ph.D. student is not required for promotion. However, evidence that the Assistant Professor is mentoring research at some level is expected.
- e. **Research reputation:** A growing research reputation in the field of speech and hearing sciences is evidenced by, but not limited to: invited lectures (accepted at university, local, state, national, or international levels); requests to review grants and/or manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals; requests to review conference submissions; invitations to participate in symposia, lead a symposium, chair a conference, or contribute to a conference organizing committee, and invitations to contribute a chapter to a book. Also, public service can be evidence for research reputation as it speaks to work contributing to the greater good. For example, a public intellectual column for a major media outlet, public books, treatment manuals, open-source stimulus websites, press calls to inquire about research projects or research results, etc., all represent evidence that a faculty member is considered an expert in a scholarly domain.

## 2) Teaching

Effective teaching is essential for promotion and tenure. SPHSC views teaching through the lens of transformation. That is, through value, work and consultation, an effective teaching practice can be developed. Evidence of pedagogical effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, positive peer feedback, positive student feedback, and response to pedagogical mentorship such as the UW Center for Teaching and Learning. It is important to note, given the gender, racial and age biases documented in student teaching evaluations, that peer teaching evaluations, the Chair's letter, and the Assistant Professor's own teaching statement may all be used to evaluate (and contextualize) pedagogical effectiveness. Further, in 2019, SPHSC adopted a peer teaching rubric as an attempt to equalize peer evaluations.

Classroom courses are weighted more heavily than small seminars or clinical teaching.

### 3) Service

Service is mandatory for promotion and signals that the Assistant Professor is engaged in the life of the department. That being said, SPHSC has a long-standing history of protecting Assistant Professors from excessive service duties that will detract from their research platform and teaching duties. Service is expected at the level of department, to the university and/or to the field. Examples of service in SPHSC includes participation on the diversity and inclusion committee, organization of the SHACS seminar series, and participation on the admissions committee or the student progress committee. One example of University-level service might be participation on the faculty senate or a human subject's division reviewer. Examples of service to the field can include reviews of journal manuscripts and/or grants, and conference committee work.

#### **Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion: Speech and Hearing Science, first established May 2020**

Department faculty approval: May 6, 2020 \_\_\_\_\_

Divisional Dean approval: May 15, 2020 \_\_\_\_\_

CAS College Council approval: June 1, 2020 \_\_\_\_\_