

JACA
1(1997): 10-23

A National Survey of Tenure and Promotion Standards in Communication Departments

PHILIP EMMERT
STEVEN A. ROLLMAN

AMONG the most important decisions in the academic world are those of promotion and tenure. The importance of these decisions is underscored by the controversy that accompanies them. The conflict surrounding these, as well as merit decisions, is usually focused on the criteria for making these determinations. The conflict typically centers on the emphasis to be placed on the categories of research/scholarship/creative activities, teaching, and service.

Tucker (1984), points out that some academic departments treat faculty performance in teaching, scholarship, and service equally, with no greater weight assigned to one activity than another. Many faculty would suggest that such a practice could be most unfair. If, for example, situations in which a faculty member is assigned a "full-time" teaching load and is still expected to serve on committees and to be a productive scholar, essentially this is the equivalent of asking the professor to do his or her scholarship and service as a kind of "overtime." On the other hand, some would argue that all professors have, as a part of their appointments, responsibility to their discipline and to the academic community at large "to give something back" to the community from which they obtained their education and on which they draw for their teaching, regardless of their formally assigned teaching load.

The Communication Arts and Sciences are not immune to these conflicts. Young (1987) points out that the ways in which teaching, scholarship, and service are evaluated, as well as the weight given to each in an overall faculty evaluation, vary. Several articles (Buell, 1990; Buzza, 1990; Emmert, 1981; Emmert, 1986) suggest wide variations in the relative emphasis placed on teaching, scholarship, and service by departments in the Communication Arts and Sciences. Specifically, a reading of these articles suggests a trend toward a greater emphasis on scholarship with a decreasing concern for teaching and service.

It is apparent that too little empirical verification of these trends is available to say with much certainty what is expected of faculty to achieve promotion and tenure in the Communication Arts and Sciences. It is also evident that communication professors are evaluated relative to faculty from other disciplines on their own campuses, as well as compared with faculty from their own and other disciplines nationally. If faculty in the Communication

Arts and Sciences are to be successful in their efforts to secure tenure, achieve promotions, and apply for jobs at new campuses, they will need to "measure up" at least to the standards of their own discipline as currently practiced nationally.

In addition to an awareness of the weighting of teaching, scholarship and service, faculty also need to know what activities "count" for each of these evaluation categories. Is consulting "teaching," "service," or "scholarship?" The answer to this question seems to vary. Should an untenured assistant professor spend his or her time presenting papers at conferences? Rosenfeld et.al. (1990) found that, relative to tenure and promotion decisions, publishing an article in even the lowest-regarded national or regional journal is of comparable importance to the presentation of a paper at the most highly regarded of our international, national, and regional conferences. There appears to be a need for information about what "counts" for each of these three evaluation categories and "how much" is expected in each category to earn promotion and tenure.

It is hoped that this survey will provide baseline data for the use of faculty planning their activities, and for department heads, tenure and promotion committees, and upper level administrators as they develop standards for their departments and colleges. Specifically, the present study is intended to answer the following questions concerning current practices in promotion and tenure decisions in the Communication Arts and Sciences:

- How do teaching loads differ across departments offering the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees?
- What is the emphasis on and percentage of time assigned to the evaluation categories of teaching, scholarship, and service?
- What activities count as evidence of effective teaching, scholarship, and service in the evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion?
- What are the differences in expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service in programs that offer the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees?
- What activities are seen as evidence of competence in more than one category?
- Are there differences in perceptions of single author versus co-authored publications by persons making tenure and promotion decisions?
- What are the typical annual expectations for faculty in terms of scholarship and service?

METHOD

In mid 1993 surveys were sent to the chairpersons of every department in the Speech Communication Association Directory that included in its title the words communication, speech or rhetoric. This resulted in 627 mailings to departments with such diverse names as Communication, Communications, Communication Arts, Communication Studies, Human Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Oral Communication, Rhetoric, Speech, Speech Communication, as well as to departments that included any of these names in conjunction with others.

The survey listed thirty-nine professional activities. For each, respondents were asked to rate the significance of the behavior on a 0-4 scale (0= no significance, 4=great significance) as evidence of competence, as viewed by their departments, in *each* of the three categories of teaching, scholarship and service. In addition, the survey inquired about typical teaching load, the relative weight of single versus co-authored publications, the typical percentage of time assigned to each of the three categories (teaching, scholarship and ser-

vice) for assistant, associate and full professors, and the typical number of committee assignments, journal articles, convention papers, and books expected for promotion to associate professor and professor. Because colleges and universities are scheduled according to various calendars, (i.e., quarters, semesters, trimesters) the survey instrument called for responses based on the academic year. It was felt that this would permit reasonably fair comparisons across schools regardless of the calendar they follow.

RESULTS

The surveys were returned by 169 department chairpersons representing a variety of types and sizes of institutions. Ninety of the responding departments offered only undergraduate degrees, a master's degree was the highest a student could earn at 58 of the departments, and 21 offered a doctorate.

Teaching Load

Teaching loads differ according to the type of program offered by the department. An analysis of variance was run and the $F(5.958[2,164], p < .003)$ was significant. Departments offering the bachelor's degree require faculty to teach an average of 6.89 courses per academic year. Departments offering the master's degree require faculty to teach an average of 6.41 courses per academic year. Finally, departments offering the doctorate require faculty to teach 5.10 courses per academic year. For all programs, the average number of courses taught by faculty per academic year is 6.5.

Emphasis and Percent of Assigned Time Within Categories

The percentage of time assigned to each of the three evaluation categories vary according to the degrees offered by the programs (See Table 2). Programs offering the bachelor's degree range from 62-64% of faculty time assigned to teaching, 20-22% assigned to scholarship, and 15-17% assigned to service, depending on the rank of the faculty member. Programs offering the master's degree ranged from 52-57% of faculty time assigned to teaching, 29-31% assigned to scholarship, and 15-18% assigned to service, depending on the rank of the faculty member. Programs offering the doctorate ranged from 41-43% of faculty time assigned to teaching, 40-45% assigned to scholarship, and 12-18% assigned to service, depending on the rank of the faculty member.

A repeated measures design with rank as a within factor and degree as a between factor was applied to these data. Three repeated measures (one for scholarship, one for teaching and one for service) were run using the MANOVA program in SPSS. These analyses confirm a significant difference in the teaching loads among departments that offer the bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees. The largest teaching expectations are found in bachelor's programs and the smallest in doctoral programs with master's programs falling between the other two ($F[2,135] = 13.65, p < .001$). Additionally, there is a significant difference in teaching loads assigned to faculty in various ranks with assistant professors having the heaviest loads, associate professors next, and full professors the lightest teaching loads ($F[2,270] = 12.94, p < .001$). There was no significant interaction between degree and rank on percentage of time assigned to teaching.

The same analysis of time assigned/expectations for scholarship activities revealed a significant difference across degree programs, with bachelor's programs requiring the least scholarship, master's programs the next greatest amount, and doctoral programs the most scholarship ($F[2,134] = 23.09, p < .001$). There were no significant differences across ranks or for degree by rank interaction in the expectations for scholarship.

Finally, the analysis showed no significant differences in service expectations of programs offering different degrees. A significant difference was found, however, across

ranks, with the greatest service expectations existing for associate and full professors and the lowest service expectations for assistant professors ($F [2,268] = 17.29, p < .001$). There was no significant degree by rank interaction in the analysis.

Categorized Faculty Activities

Items that were rated above the midpoint (2 on a 0-4 scale) in the three categories of teaching, scholarship, or service were considered to be of importance. (see Table 1)

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

Activities for which faculty appear most likely to receive credit relative to their teaching activities include receiving positive teaching evaluations from students and/or peers (items 2 and 3). Two other activities rated barely above the midpoint (2) on the scale in all three types of programs are having a significant impact on curriculum development (item 7) and supervising independent projects or student internships (item 8). One activity included under the category of teaching by departments offering the bachelor's degree is demonstrating effectiveness in academic advising and career counseling (item 6). Ratings of this activity by master's and doctoral programs are not above the scale midpoint.

Indicators of Scholarship

Activities rated above the scale midpoint relative to scholarship for all three types of degree granting programs include publishing articles in regional and national journals (items 10 and 11), serving as an editor or editorial board member for a regional or national journal (items 13 and 14), publishing books (item 21), and presenting papers at regional and national meetings (items 23 and 24). In addition, only bachelor's programs rate the following activities above the scale midpoint relative to scholarship: present papers at local or state meetings (item 22), serving as a panel member at professional meetings at the national level (item 33), chairing/organizing programs or short courses presented at national conferences (item 27), completing post-graduate study beyond the appropriate degree required to hold current position (item 20), and serving as an editor or editorial board member for a state journal (item 12). Doctoral programs rated the activity of acquiring outside funding or resources that directly support activities of the department, college, or university (item 30) above the scale midpoint relative to scholarship.

Indicators of Service

Activities rated above the scale midpoint relative to service for all three types of degree granting programs include regularly serving and/or chairing department, college and/or university committees (items 15 and 16), development of on-campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of the department, college, or university (item 29), and holding office in regional and national communication organizations (items 38 and 39). Bachelor's and master's programs rated the following activities above the scale midpoint relative to service: advising or supervising co-curricular activities for which one receives no released time (item 5) and acquiring outside funding or resources that directly support activities of the department, college or university (item 30). As mentioned in the previous section, doctoral programs rated this last activity (acquiring outside funding or resources. . .) above the scale midpoint relative to scholarship rather than service. Finally, only master's programs rated the following item above the scale midpoint relative to service: working as a consultant on the national level (item 19).

Faculty activities that no programs rated above the scale midpoint relative to any of the standard categories of evaluation were: attending courses or workshops (item 1), advising or supervising co-curricular activities for which one receives released time (item 4), working as a consultant on the local, state, or regional level (items 17 and 18), chairing or orga-

nizing programs or short courses presented at local, state or regional conferences (items 25 and 26), designing and developing computer programs that are distributed beyond the university (item 28), serving as a panel member at professional meetings at the local, state, or regional level (items 31 and 32), serving as judge, critic, or reviewer at the local, state, regional, or national level (items 34, 35, and 36), and holding office in a state communication organization (item 37).

Activities Significant in Multiple Categories

A number of behaviors listed on the survey instrument received scores indicating that they were seen as providing evidence of competence in more than just one category. In no case was a behavior judged to demonstrate competence in all three categories, but 18 of the 39 behaviors received overall mean scores above 1.0 in two categories. Those items were 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 20, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36 (see Table 1).

Single Author vs. Co-authored Publications

More than half of the respondents in all three types of programs (59%) indicated that they typically assign more weight to single author publications than to co-authored publications. This varied by type of program, with doctoral programs indicating they followed this policy the most (75%), bachelor's programs next most (60%), and master's programs the least (52%).

Scholarship and Service Expectations

The last question on the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate the expectations per year they have relative to the scholarly activities of publication of journal articles, presentation of convention papers, and the publication of books. The question also asked respondents to indicate the expected yearly service on committees. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test was performed to determine if there were differences in these expectations relative to teaching load and type of degree offered in the program. MANOVAs were performed separately for expected promotion to associate professor and professor for the activities of committee service, journal article writing, convention paper presentation, and book publishing as dependent variables. The degree offered by the program and teaching load were the independent variables.

The only activities producing significant results were the publication of journal articles for the decisions concerning promotion to both associate and professor rank and, additionally, the presentation of convention papers for the decision concerning promotion to full professor rank. For the activities of article publishing, book publishing, journal article publishing, and serving on committees relative to the decision to promote to associate professor rank the overall MANOVA was significant ($F[4,33] = 23.066, p = .000, \text{Wilks' lambda} = .263$). This overall significance was the result of the effect of the degree offered by the program on the number of journal articles expected per year ($F[2,36] = 3.889, p = .030$). For the same four activities relative to the decision to promote to professor rank the overall MANOVA was significant ($F[4,44] = 26.770, p = .000, \text{Wilks' lambda} = .291$). This overall significance was the result of the effect of the degree offered by the program on the number of journal articles expected per year (Professor Rank: $F[2,47] = 8.430, p = .001$). Respondents from bachelor's programs indicated the lowest expectations relative to number of journal articles per year (associate professors, .81; professors, .88). Respondents from master's programs indicated expectations between the other types of programs relative to number of journal articles per year (associate professors, 1.04; professors, 1.29). Respondents from doctoral programs indicated the highest expectations relative to number of journal articles per year (associate professors, 1.58; professors, 1.91) (see Table 3). This overall significance was the result of the effect of the degree offered by the program on number of

journal articles expected per year ($F[2,36] = 3.889, p = .030$) and the number of convention papers expected per year ($F[2,47] = 4.090, p = .023$). Bachelor's programs indicated the lowest expectations relative to number of convention papers per year (associate professors, 1.09; professors, 1.13). Master's programs indicated expectations between the other types of programs relative to number of convention papers per year (associate professors, 1.27; professors, 1.50). Doctoral programs indicated the highest expectations relative to number of convention papers per year (associate professors, 1.43; professors, 1.83) (see Table 3).

The results concerning expectations of committee service were non-significant. In terms of committee assignments, all types of programs expected both associate and full professors to serve on 1-2 committees per year. Results concerning book publishing expectations were also non-significant. The expectations relative to the number of books per year were .17 for associate professors. For professors, the expectations relative to number of books per year ranged from .23 to .28 (see Table 3).

DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest some interesting conclusions. First, the primary differentiating characteristic from one communication program to the next relative to promotion expectations regarding scholarship is the highest degree students can earn in the program. This difference (see Table 3) is most acutely present in the decision to promote to the rank of professor, in which the difference between bachelor's (.88) and doctoral (1.91) programs is 1.03 journal articles per year. Though smaller, the difference between bachelor's (.81) and doctoral (1.58) programs in the decision to promote to the rank of associate professor is .77 journal articles per year. For promotion to each of these two ranks, master's programs indicated expectations between bachelor's and doctoral programs. For promotion to the rank of professor the expectations regarding the presentation of convention papers varies from 1.13 in bachelor's programs to 1.83 in doctoral programs, or a difference of .70 papers per year. Expectations in master's programs, again, fell between bachelor's and doctoral programs.

This is not a totally unexpected finding, as graduate programs are typically thought of in terms of scholarship for students. Likewise, to teach in such programs would only naturally imply greater involvement in scholarship by the faculty, both as models for graduate students, as well as to stay on the "cutting edge" of the discipline. This does mean, however, that faculty who do not wish the greatest involvement in scholarly activities should not seek positions in doctoral programs – and possibly not even master's programs.

Another implication of this study is that scholarship (in the form of journal articles, convention papers, and books) is a significant part of every faculty member's appointment, at the rank of assistant professor and above. To be promoted to the ranks of either associate professor or professor means that one must be a productive scholar. When the expectations for articles, papers, and books needed for promotion to associate professor in bachelor's programs are added together, the total is a theoretical yet meaningful (.81+1.09+.17) 2.07 "scholarly contributions" to one's discipline per year. This would mean, on average, a dozen scholarly contributions to the discipline during the typical probationary period of six years to achieve promotion from assistant to associate professor and 2.24 per year, or about thirteen and a half more contributions for a total of 25.5 "scholarly contributions" for promotion to the rank of professor in programs that offer the bachelor's degree. Following the same logic for master's programs, the number of scholarly contributions to the discipline would be 2.48 per year, or 15 contributions for promotion to the rank of associate professor and 3.05 per year, or 18 more contributions for a total of 33 "scholarly contributions" for promotion to the rank of professor. Again, this logic for doctoral programs would suggest that the number of scholarly contributions to the discipline would be 3.18 per year, or about

19 for promotion to the rank of associate professor and 4.02 per year, or 24 more contributions for a total of 43 "scholarly contributions" for promotion to the rank of professor. While there is variation according to the type of degree offered within programs and from school to school, it is apparent that scholarship is a major aspect of every faculty member's appointment.

A third conclusion to be drawn from this study is that departments in the Communication Arts and Sciences (or possibly the colleges and universities in which they exist) do not adjust their expectations for scholarly productivity and service relative to teaching loads as much as they should. The MANOVA conducted in this study showed no significant effect of teaching load on the expectations for committee service, journal articles, convention papers, or books. Although the MANOVA showed no significant results, the one-way analysis of variance discussed earlier, in which differences in teaching load was significant among different degree programs, suggests the possibility that teaching load may contribute somewhat to the effect on scholarship expectations the MANOVA detected relative to degrees offered by programs. Also, it is likely true that service on committees is far more in conflict with teaching and scholarly activities in bachelor's programs than in master's and especially doctoral programs because the service expectations do not appear to take into account the higher teaching loads in departments without graduate programs.

The results of this study should provide a basis for faculty to plan their own activities. It also should provide some norms for administrators and colleagues to use in making faculty assignments and evaluating colleagues for promotions. A note of caution, however, should be sounded. These results are obviously based solely on those respondents who returned the survey instrument. Whether or not department heads in departments that stress scholarship are more likely to fill out questionnaires is open to debate. If that is so, then these results could be biased in the direction of emphasizing scholarship more than the discipline does. The authors, never-the-less, feel that the results of this survey, since they are so consistent with other literature and comments of colleagues at conferences, reflect actual practices in our discipline. Certainly, this study should be done again in five or ten years to document any changes in expectations. Likewise, this kind of study should be conducted in other academic disciplines to develop a larger information base for colleges and universities to use in their tenure and promotion processes.

Another implication of this study is that, given the relatively large standard deviations (see Table 2) obtained relative to teaching assignments/expectations in the bachelor's and master's programs, it may be that those who teach in these kinds of programs should realize that there is a wide variation from school to school in terms of the emphasis placed on teaching. This appears to be much less the case in programs which offer the doctorate.

Finally, this study should be followed by additional research that correlates expectations reported here with the records of faculty actually granted or denied promotion or tenure. Do we do what we say we do? We should not depend on anecdotes, myth, and rumor to determine standards for promotion. This study represents a step toward defining these standards more objectively.

TABLE 1
 MEAN SCORES FROM 0-4 SCALE INDICATING IMPORTANCE OF BEHAVIORS
 IN EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

	B	M	D	All	TEACHING			SCHOLARSHIP			SERVICE								
					B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All			
For results reported below:	B =	M =	D =	All =															
	Departments whose highest degree offered is a bachelors degree	Departments whose highest degree offered is a masters degree	Departments whose highest degree offered is a doctorate	Means of all departments															
	(n = 90)	(n = 58)	(n = 21)	(n = 169)															
1) Attends courses or workshops	1.97	1.62	1.33	1.77	1.57	1.03	.57	1.26	.32	.36	.14	.31							
2) Receives positive teaching evaluations from students	3.67	3.71	3.67	3.68	.34	.26	.24	.30	.18	.05	.05	.12							
3) Receives positive teaching evaluations from peers	3.26	3.14	2.86	3.17	.81	.36	.19	.58	.37	.07	.00	.22							
4) Advises or supervises co-curricular activities for which one receives released time	1.42	1.45	1.19	1.40	.32	.17	.00	.23	1.90	1.93	1.43	1.85							
5) Advises or supervises co-curricular activities for which one receives no released time	1.24	1.34	1.10	1.26	.21	.21	.00	.18	2.74	2.47	1.66	2.51							
6) Demonstrates effectiveness in academic advising and career counseling	2.08	1.91	1.67	1.97	.20	.14	.19	.18	1.93	1.59	1.00	1.70							
7) Has significant impact on curriculum development	2.10	2.24	2.14	2.15	.86	.40	.19	.62	1.94	1.45	1.10	1.67							

	TEACHING			SCHOLARSHIP			SERVICE					
	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All
8) Supervises independent projects or student internships	2.30	2.29	2.24	2.29	.54	.36	.05	.42	1.24	.71	.43	.96
9) Publishes articles in state journals	.70	.29	.19	.50	2.51	2.12	1.38	2.24	.19	.17	.14	.18
10) Publishes articles in regional journals	.76	.36	.10	.54	3.07	3.21	2.81	3.08	.20	.16	.00	.16
11) Publishes articles in national journals	.78	.38	.14	.56	3.71	3.84	3.95	3.79	.21	.16	.00	.17
12) Evaluates scholarly work as editor or editorial board member for a state journal	.51	.19	.00	.34	2.08	1.64	1.33	1.83	1.03	1.24	.95	1.09
13) Evaluates scholarly works as editor or editorial board member for a regional journal	.54	.21	.00	.36	2.47	2.09	2.00	2.28	1.17	1.64	1.33	1.35
14) Evaluates scholarly works as editor or editorial board member for a national journal	.53	.22	.00	.36	2.99	2.60	2.52	2.80	1.31	1.97	1.81	1.60
15) Regularly serves on department, college and/or university committees	.31	.16	.00	.22	.16	.14	.00	.13	2.97	2.91	2.52	2.89
16) Regularly chairs department, college and/or university committees	.20	.19	.00	.17	.16	.12	.00	.12	3.20	3.50	2.86	3.26
17) Works as a consultant on the local or state level	.42	.34	.05	.35	.89	.57	.14	.69	1.56	1.60	1.24	1.53
18) Works as a consultant on the regional level	.43	.33	.05	.35	1.06	.67	.14	.81	1.69	1.78	1.48	1.70

	TEACHING			SCHOLARSHIP			SERVICE					
	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All
19) Works as a consultant on the national level	.49	.43	.05	.41	1.24	.81	.33	.98	1.92	2.05	1.52	1.92
20) Completes post-graduate study, beyond the appropriate degree required to hold current position	1.32	.88	.38	1.05	2.08	1.31	.90	1.67	.33	.14	.00	.22
21) Publishes books	1.11	.59	.62	.87	3.47	3.45	3.67	3.49	.32	.14	.00	.22
22) Presents papers at local or state meetings	.69	.40	.00	.50	2.22	1.91	1.10	1.98	.44	.31	.38	.39
23) Presents papers at regional meetings	.72	.40	.00	.52	2.69	2.59	2.10	2.58	.42	.47	.19	.41
24) Presents papers at national meetings	.77	.40	.00	.54	3.04	3.03	2.62	2.99	.51	.47	.19	.46
25) Chairs or organizes programs or short courses presented at local or state conferences	.79	.36	.33	.59	1.58	1.10	.38	1.27	1.08	1.33	.95	1.15
26) Chairs or organizes programs or short courses presented at regional conferences	.86	.41	.43	.65	1.72	1.31	.48	1.43	1.17	1.60	1.10	1.31
27) Chairs or organizes programs or short courses presented at national conferences	.94	.52	.43	.73	2.00	1.59	.52	1.67	1.33	1.83	1.19	1.49
28) Designs and develops computer programs that are distributed beyond the university	.82	.47	.52	.66	1.80	1.41	.71	1.53	1.06	.88	.81	.96

	TEACHING			SCHOLARSHIP			SERVICE					
	B	M	All	B	M	All	B	M	All			
29) Develops on-campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of the department, college, or university	.97	.67	.10	.75	.99	.66	.00	.75	2.23	2.41	2.05	2.27
30) Acquires outside funding or resources that directly support activities of the department, college, or university	.54	.62	.52	.57	1.37	1.74	2.43	1.63	2.14	2.16	1.24	2.04
31) Serves as a panel member at professional meetings at the local or state level.	.53	.24	.14	.38	1.58	1.26	.86	1.38	.93	1.03	.57	.92
32) Serves as a panel member at professional meetings at the regional level	.56	.28	.14	.41	1.82	1.60	1.05	1.65	1.00	1.24	.71	1.05
33) Serves as a panel member at professional meetings at the national level	.58	.28	.24	.43	2.08	1.90	1.52	1.95	1.12	1.40	.76	1.17
34) Serves as judge, critic, or reviewer on a local or state level	.50	.21	.00	.34	1.33	.76	.43	1.02	1.22	1.21	.95	1.18
35) Serves as judge, critic, or reviewer on a regional level	.52	.22	.00	.36	1.54	1.05	.52	1.25	1.40	1.62	1.24	1.46
36) Serves as judge, critic, or reviewer on a national level	.57	.28	.00	.40	1.79	1.33	.81	1.51	1.61	1.98	1.33	1.70

	TEACHING			SCHOLARSHIP			SERVICE					
	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All
37) Holds office in a state communication organization	.28	.12	.00	.19	.81	.45	.10	.60	1.94	1.93	1.48	1.88
38) Holds office in a regional communication organization	.29	.12	.00	.20	.92	.57	.24	.72	2.21	2.69	2.52	2.41
39) Holds office in a national communication organization	.30	.12	.00	.20	1.09	.62	.38	.84	2.60	3.33	3.19	2.92

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGES OF TIME ASSIGNED TO CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

	TEACHING			SCHOLARSHIP			SERVICE					
	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All	B	M	D	All
Assistant Professor	64(18)	57(18)	43(7)	59(18)	20(13)	30(15)	45(9)	26(16)	15(9)	15(8)	12(7)	15(8)
Associate Professor	63(17)	54(18)	41(7)	57(17)	20(13)	29(14)	41(12)	26(15)	17(8)	16(9)	17(11)	17(9)
Professor	62(17)	52(18)	41(7)	56(18)	22(13)	31(15)	40(12)	27(15)	17(9)	18(10)	18(10)	17(9)

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviation.

TABLE 3
YEARLY EXPECTATIONS FOR PROMOTION

	TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR			TO PROFESSOR		
	B	M	All	B	M	All
Number of Committee Assignments	1.35	1.59	1.51	1.44	1.77	1.61
Number of Journal Articles	.81	1.04	1.58	.88	1.29	1.20
Number of Convention Papers	1.09	1.27	1.43	1.13	1.50	1.38
Number of Books	.17	.17	.17	.23	.26	.25

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Philip Emmert (Ph.D., Ohio University, 1965) is Professor and Director of the School of Speech Communication at James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22801.

Steven A. Rollman (Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1977) is Professor of Speech Communication at James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22801.

Buell, C. (1990). Demands for research and publication at the small college. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 74, 63-68.

Buzza, B. W. (1990). Faculty perceptions of publication expectations in the small college setting: Have the rules changed? *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 74, 54-62.

Emmert, P. (1986). Surviving in a research university. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 57, 44-49.

Emmert, P. (1981). Salary, merit, promotion and tenure practices in Speech Communication Departments. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 36, 70-77.

Rosenfeld, L. B., Stacks, D.W., & Hickson, M. (1990). Perceptions of Professional Associations II: Role and Impact of Professional Outlets on Faculty Development. *Communication Education*, 39, 171-180.

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. (2nd ed.). New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Young, R. R. (1987). Standards for promotion, tenure, and merit decisions. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 60, 56-57.