

## Department of Speech Communication

### Teaching and Service Expectations

#### Teaching Expectations

##### **1. New Course Development.**

Over time, all members of the department are expected to develop new courses and, often, teach in areas outside of their specific expertise. We try to limit the number of new course preparations for any faculty members in a given year, but each faculty member should expect to contribute to the overall program by teaching what is needed.

We expect most members of the department to contribute to the department's Senior Inquiry program by designing and teaching one or more "methods module" courses and to general education by designing and teaching courses that contribute to AGES.

##### **2. Pedagogical Development.**

All faculty members should try to improve their teaching and should document those attempts. Those attempts are a series of guided experiments. In documenting those experiments, we expect ourselves to be able to explain the origins of our guidance (for example, from short courses at our national conference, their own SOTL reading and research, participation in on-campus workshops and seminars, or off-campus teaching conferences).

##### **3. Classroom Execution.**

The department expects faculty to pay attention to and to learn from their pedagogical decisions. We expect generally high course evaluations and ongoing improvement over time. These developments can be documented through a variety of means, including standardized course evaluations and structured classroom observations by peers or other trained observers.

We assess courses taught for the first time differently from existing courses. New course development is risky business, and the first time teaching a course involves unusually high levels of experimentation and adaptation. We assess new courses based on demonstrated care in course design, the presence of structured opportunities for peer and student feedback through the term, a reflective response to that feedback and an end-of-term assessment.

##### **4. Teaching in non-credit bearing circumstances.**

Faculty members often teach in non-credit bearing situations, and those activities are both expected and valued. Examples of such activity are coaching debate, advising student radio or the communication honor society, guiding students through the process of revising and submitting their work for formal presentation, and directing student-centered institutes and programs. In all such cases, our department chair and the affected faculty members will work out a reasonable plan for evaluating that work.

##### **5. Teaching and Supervising Senior Projects.**

Each tenure-track faculty member is expected to contribute to the development of majors' research projects, both by serving as an advisor and as an ongoing resource for help with method-related issues.

The final two points overlap with service, and are mentioned in both sections.

## **6. Advising.**

Good advising is teaching. In designing a major course of study and in our Senior Inquiry program, advising goes far beyond checking for requirements to include checkpoints along the way to encourage student reflection. This is true, though to a lesser degree, in advising first-year students. Faculty members in the first year will not be asked to take on advising duties.

## **7. Teaching as Service.**

The Department faculty often are called upon to teach workshops and make presentations on communication skills. All members of the department are expected to share in that load. We make teaching presentations to classes of students in many disciplines, often regularly, and hold teaching workshops such as during Faculty Orientation. While this activity is service to the College, it is recognized as a teaching activity by the department.

### **Service**

#### **1. Service to the College: Committee work.**

In general the department expects its members to be involved in no more than one high commitment committee or activity per year (such as Gen Ed, EPC, ad hoc departmental committee member, or Self-Study), which might be complemented by no more than a couple smaller time commitment committees (such as Faculty Senate, Humanities Fund, and the like). Any request which exceeds those caps must be approved by the department chair. Faculty members in the first year will not be asked to take on committee work.

#### **2. Service to the College: Departmental Complementarity.**

The department's position is flexible in terms of how members can contribute; in short, we seek complementarity so that, on the whole, the department is contributing generously to the life of the College in multiple but not necessarily overlapping ways. Most members of the department are expected to share in admissions work, such as taking a turn representing the department on prospective student visit days. Some members may advise student organizations, accompany students to conferences, help train CAs, serve as first-year advisors, speak in convocations, or serve as panel respondents for student activities. While we offer few specific requirements, the overall expectation is that each faculty member is involved in and contributes to the life of the college.

#### **3. Service to the Community.**

We respect, encourage and, to the extent we can, support our faculty members' service to local, national and international communities. Faculty members who use their expertise to serve the community are modeling the values of leadership and service that we expect of our students and contribute to the College's reputation as a valued member of the community. The department's faculty as a whole has a compiled a record for significant engagement over time. Examples of such engagement include speaking to local community groups, such as The Stanley Foundation or the Rotary Club, teaching in CommUniversity, serving on local school boards or park boards, and offering training to local non-profit organizations.

Nevertheless, we do not require such engagement on the part of our colleagues since our on-campus time commitments and level of connection to the community vary so enormously.

## Expectations of Scholarship Department of Speech Communication

Scholarship in its many forms (i.e. discovery, integration, and learning) has been an important part of the tenure and promotion consideration in the Department of Speech Communication. Our faculty has authored and edited books, published in national and regional peer-reviewed journals, and presented at national, regional and state conferences. We maintain active research agendas and promote collaborative research with students.

In Speech Communication, we expect an active research program, presentation of that research at conferences, and attempts to publish. We celebrate a history of published research, but due to the low acceptance rates and preference of quality over quantity, we do not here specify a minimum number of publications.

The remainder of the document addresses four questions.

1. What forms of scholarship define the work of those in your department at their best?
2. What forms of peer review—including those beyond the Augustana campus—are appropriate for that work?
3. What other forms of professional development contribute to and enhance traditional scholarship?
4. What depth and range of achievement in scholarship should distinguish the work of Augustana faculty?

### 1. What forms of scholarship define the work of those in your department at their best?

Scholarship in the communication field includes original written research, presentation of that research in journals and at conferences, invited speaking opportunities, and consulting. We view the forms of scholarship in three tiers, ordered according to value and depth of original work.

Original Inquiry or Creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ papers accepted for publication in peer-reviewed international, national, regional and state journals</li> <li>◆ scholarly books, textbooks and book chapters</li> <li>◆ media productions, including audio or video projects created for community groups, radio or television stations, or educational film publishers</li> <li>◆ publications in competitive proceedings volumes</li> <li>◆ presentations of competitively selected papers at international, national, regional and state conferences</li> <li>◆ scholarly development for the classroom</li> <li>◆ scholarly development of arguments for national debate</li> </ul>
------------------------------	---

Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ writing published reviews of books</li> <li>◆ reviewing articles for publication</li> <li>◆ reviewing textbooks for publication</li> <li>◆ reviewing competitive papers for presentation at conferences</li> </ul>
Dissemination of Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ invited lectures and public speaking engagements</li> <li>◆ invited teaching at national debate institutes</li> <li>◆ invited participation on roundtable and panel discussions at international, national, regional and state conferences</li> <li>◆ interviews with media in areas of expertise</li> <li>◆ consulting</li> </ul>

**2. What forms of peer review—including those beyond the Augustana campus—are appropriate for that work?**

a. The most prestigious form of peer review for publication is that for refereed disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals, with national and international journals being most prestigious/selective, followed by regional and state journals. Books are not the norm for communication scholars, but similar to journals, the prestige would be judged mostly by the reach and reputation of the publisher.

b. A second form of peer review includes competitively selected papers and panels for international, national, regional and state conferences. At our national convention the acceptance rates vary significantly by division, but overall 59% of the papers and 70% of the panels (that utilize abstracts) submitted for review are accepted for presentation.

c. A third form of peer review is invitation, because of reputation and expertise, to present lectures, workshops, speeches, or to serve as a consultant. By necessity, the department would evaluate the level of review on a case-by-case basis. In the debate community, for example, being invited to teach in summer debate institutes is a significant activity that has no equivalent in other parts of our field. On the surface, such an invitation may seem less like peer review than is appropriate: in some cases, the prestige is at least on the level of competitively selected papers.

d. A fourth form of peer review would pertain to the creation of scholarly media productions. A media colleague may hold a primary or contributing role as producer, reporter, photographer, and/or editor in an original video or audio recording. An indicator for "prestige" for radio/television programming would be the distribution range (local, regional, national or some variation thereof) and length of program. For instance, someone might play a role in a single story that airs on WQPT or a 30 min. documentary special. If successful, this program could be sold to other regional stations or most prestigiously, distributed through the national distribution system (PBS). With radio, the prestige level is similar; the top tier might be a production that airs on or is distributed by NPR. Producing educational films, such as those associated with Media Education Foundation or Films for the Humanities & Sciences, would be on the same level as a book publication.

e. A final form of peer review involves recognition or awards from the scholarly community. The National Communication Association, for example, offers nationally-competitive awards for dissertations, articles, and books. The debate community has debate-specific awards both for debaters and for coaches, such as the Brownlee Award, Coach of the Year, and Top Critic awards.

### **3. What other forms of professional development contribute to and enhance traditional scholarship?**

Scholarly development for the classroom might best be understood in the intersection of teaching and research and should, we argue, be considered as a valuable contribution to traditional scholarship. A liberal arts school the size of Augustana by necessity requires faculty to teach courses that are not in areas of expertise. The field of Speech Communication is very internally diverse, with bodies of knowledge, theories, and research methodologies ranging from quantitative and qualitative social scientific observations of human interactions, to humanistic rhetorical textual studies, to critical/cultural studies of media producers, audiences, technologies and institutions. In Speech Communication, preparing to teach in an area not in one's expertise could require researching and synthesizing research in what amounts to an entirely new field. This immersion in new areas is not necessarily purely consumptive. The synthesis and analysis of various areas of study can be extremely beneficial to both teaching and scholarship. Its value should be acknowledged in the conversation of scholarship.

We believe that many nontraditional forms of scholarship and professional development can enhance our faculty's ability to be excellent teachers and researchers. Examples of such forms include some faculty development conferences, many of which have foci that extend beyond teaching or administration; serving as an officer in professional associations and interest groups; international development/exchange initiatives; teaching in foreign terms; and writing grants or otherwise pursuing funding opportunities. Contributing to a scholarly community also can spur reflective thinking and enhance research and course design, such as engaging in substantive contributions to discipline-specific listservs (e.g., CRTNET and H-Rhetor) and creating and moderating web pages and e-journals devoted to supporting class subjects.

### **4. What depth and range of achievement in scholarship should distinguish the work of Augustana faculty?**

In order to merit consideration from a positive tenure recommendation from the department, a junior colleague needs to have a strong, active research program. The hallmarks of a strong program are (1) coherence and planning, (2) a reasonable level of engagement, and (3) a creditable end-product.

To help us assess the level of coherence and planning, we expect our colleagues to provide the department chair with an annual letter report which articulates the focus or inquiry and provides a statement of immediate and longer-term scholarly goals. We expect the chair, as a representative of the tenured faculty, to provide a letter in response.

We believe that a reasonable level of engagement with our discipline would be reflected in the equivalent of one or more research presentations to professional meetings in the average year,

per guidelines in 2b. In addition to research presentations at conferences, other forms of engagement are acknowledged and valued, such as

- .. Collaborative independent research projects with students
- .. Research shared with/used to educate the lay community
- .. Public speaking engagements
- .. Consulting
- .. Reviewing of books
- .. Reviewing of papers for journals and conferences
- .. Significant course development in a previously unfamiliar field
- .. Research and professional development explicitly designed to enhance pedagogy
- .. SOTL conference and workshop attendance to develop programs associated with classroom teaching

In general, we believe that a creditable end-product would be the eventual submission of a significant statement to an appropriate external organization. Examples of activities which might qualify would be preparation and submission of a book-length manuscript, monograph, journal article, research project, book chapter, or major grant proposal.

The department looks at the totality of a candidate's record, with particular emphasis on a thoughtful process of engaged scholarship. The department does not specifically require publication for a positive tenure recommendation. Candidates should be aware, however, that some college resources are directly linked to publication as an outcome. In a recent communication, the Dean of the College noted the Faculty Welfare Committee's position that "some of the new resources the college provides as options for new faculty are linked to publication . . . [for example] the use of resources such a pre-tenure leave or startup funding [should] lead to active research programs and to publication or its artistic equivalent."

A note on procedure: our attempts to articulate our expectations began with attempts to understand and assess our field's norms. In order to reach that understanding, we (1) contacted the Communication programs at six colleges in Augustana's peer and aspirant groups. We asked for copies of their tenure standards. Only Luther College had a written statement; our guidelines follow their thoughtful structure. (2) We reviewed all published research on "research productivity" in the CMMC database and related statements by the National Communication Association. (3) The tenured faculty met on five occasions to discuss and draft this document; the full faculty met on two additional occasions to debate it.