

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

**GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

Approved August 2014

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
I. Departmental Guidelines for the Selection of Committee(s).....	2
II. Regular Performance Reviews.....	3
III. Process for Annual Tenure Review for Probationary Faculty	3
IV. Promotion and Tenure Applications	6
V. Promotion and Tenure Process	7
VI. Required Documents for Tenure/Promotion.....	8
VII. Guidelines for External Reviews	11
VIII. Committee Responsibilities	11
IX. Department Head Recommendations	13
X. Requirements for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.....	14
XI. Review of Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.....	14

**FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

I. Philosophy.....	16
II. Dimensions.....	17
A. Teaching	19
B. Research.....	33
C. Service.....	43

Introduction

Sections 3 and 4 of the 2007 *Faculty Handbook* make departments and faculty responsible for several activities. Included in these are the responsibilities for developing application procedures for tenure/promotion, and communicating evaluation processes and performance criteria to all departmental faculty. This document has been developed to communicate process and standards for promotion and tenure.

The following guidelines are based on the language of the *Faculty Handbook*, COB Guidelines, and guidelines from the Office of the Provost. They are intended to elaborate further upon the language within the *Faculty Handbook* and COB Guidelines to make them more explicit and assure standardization of these procedures within the Department of Management. If there is conflicting language, the language contained in the *Faculty Handbook* is controlling and supersedes any language in this document. All bracketed section numbers refer to the *Faculty Handbook* section from which the language is taken. Although quotation marks are not used, the sections may be either direct quotes from the *Faculty Handbook* or strongly paraphrase its language.

I. Departmental Guidelines for the Selection of Committee(s)

Only *tenured faculty* may serve on tenure/promotion/reappointment committees [Sec. 4.8.3]. Upon approval of this document all merit procedures and department merit guidelines established prior to January, 2014 are eliminated. A new **Departmental Personnel Committee** as defined in the *Faculty Handbook* for purposes of this annual performance review will be established by a vote of the tenured faculty. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will consist of five tenured faculty members, each of whom must receive a majority of favorable votes from the tenured faculty. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will select a chair who convenes the committee's meetings and drafts the report of the committee. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** develops new merit guidelines consistent with new departmental tenure/promotion criteria and the role and performance of each faculty member. The committee chair will call a meeting of the department's tenured faculty to discuss and refine new merit guidelines and gain approval via a majority vote of the tenured faculty.

For tenure decisions, the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** will consist of all full-time tenured faculty. For promotion decisions, the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** will consist of all full-time faculty members of a rank higher than the rank of the person applying for promotion. More than one promotion committee may be appointed, depending upon the ranks being considered, so that the broadest degree of departmental participation can be involved in recommendations. Any such committee will select a chair who convenes the committee's meetings and drafts the report of the committee. No one may serve on the committee considering his/her application. All committees must consist of at least three members. If there are fewer than five eligible faculty members for any committee, however, the **Department Head** and committee-eligible faculty will jointly agree on a list of additional qualified faculty from the College to present to the **Dean** who will appoint sufficient additional faculty from that list to create a total of five members for the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** [*Faculty Handbook* at

Other subcommittees or special purpose committees may be formed by a vote of the department, provided that members of such committees shall be drawn from tenured faculty of the department if the committee's purpose relates to tenure, promotion or reappointment.

Guidelines governing voting and other committee procedures are set forth below in Section VIII.

II. Regular Performance Reviews

The *Faculty Handbook* states that performance evaluations shall be conducted annually for all full time faculty [Sec. 4.6.4]:

The Department Head shall seek the written input of the departmental personnel committee on each faculty member and recommend a composite rating to the Dean of the college in which the department is located. However, in years when there will be no performance-based component to salary adjustments, the full-time faculty of a department may, by majority vote, opt to forgo a review by the departmental personnel committee; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head. The Dean shall either endorse or modify the recommended rating. In instances where the Dean modifies the rating, the Dean must provide a compelling rationale for the change in writing to the Department Head, to the departmental personnel committee, and to the affected faculty member.

In years when there is no performance-based component of salary the faculty of the Management Department agree to forgo performance reviews by the **Departmental Personnel Committee**. Consistent with Section 4.6.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Department Head will initiate the review process under such circumstances.

In years in which there is a performance-based component of salary and at the request of the **Department Head**, the **Departmental Personnel Committee** will be responsible for writing personnel recommendations based on the deliberations of the committee. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will rate each faculty member based on established merit criteria, and will forward the recommendation and rationale to the **Department Head** and the affected faculty member. Faculty may appeal performance ratings based on procedures described in the *Faculty Handbook*.

III. Process for Annual Tenure Review for Probationary Faculty

Annual Reviews are conducted for probationary faculty to assess appropriate progress toward tenure [Sec. 4.6.1]. When new tenure track faculty members are employed it is assumed they will be reappointed annually through their sixth year, during which they must apply for and receive tenure or else receive a terminal contract for their seventh year. A decision to not reappoint will be made only after a candidate's failure to positively respond to performance feedback made following one or more annual reviews in which the candidate was judged to not be making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, absent extenuating circumstances explaining the candidate's failure to positively respond to such feedback.

These annual tenure reviews for *untenured, ranked faculty* will be conducted according to the *Academic Work Calendar* issued by the Provost. The **candidate** shall initiate the annual appointment process, submitting relevant materials to the Department Head who will make them available to the **Department Personnel Committee** at a date specified by the committee. The **Department Personnel Committee** will make the initial recommendation and forward it to the **Department Head**, who will then add his/her recommendation and forward both to the **Dean**. The **Department Head** shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the **Department Personnel Committee**. Copies of **Department Personnel Committee** and **Department Head** recommendations shall be provided to the **candidate**, who must undersign the **Department Head's** recommendation before forwarding can occur.

A. Annual Tenure Review Process

The candidate's packet will be presented to the chair of the **Departmental Personnel Committee**. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will solicit and consider input from all tenured faculty members. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will meet to consider the candidate's packet and establish the final recommendation. A majority vote of the committee members conducted by secret ballot will establish the final recommendation (note: this vote *cannot* be taken via e-mail). If there is a split decision, the minority *may* file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority decision. The recommendation will include the rationale for the decision, whether it was a consensus decision, and will specify one of three outcomes [Sec. 4.6.1]:

1. That progress toward tenure/promotion is satisfactory
2. That progress toward tenure/promotion is questionable, identifying areas for improvement and providing specific suggestions
3. That progress toward tenure/promotion is unsatisfactory, providing specific rationale.

In all cases the **Departmental Personnel Committee** will provide clear and detailed feedback consistent with the tenure and promotion criteria identified in this document. Feedback will identify the candidate's progress in each performance dimension, identify areas for improvement, make specific suggestions or recommendations regarding continued appointment or non-renewal, and provide appropriate rationale in the event the committee recommends non-renewal.

The final recommendation will be forwarded to the **Department Head**. The **Department Head** will add his or her evaluation and recommendation and forward the evaluations, the accompanying recommendations, and the dossier to the **Dean**. The **Dean** will make his or her evaluation and accompanying recommendation in the case of non-renewal, and notify the **Provost**.

B. Report to the Candidate

Copies of **Departmental Personnel Committee**, **Department Head**, and **Dean** evaluations and accompanying recommendations shall be provided to the candidate. Candidates must undersign the evaluations for the purpose of acknowledging their receipt. The **Department Head** should use information provided by the **Departmental Personnel Committee** to give extensive formal feedback to the candidate. Feedback should include an evaluation of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, recognition of each candidate's progress, a candid discussion of areas of insufficient progress, and the establishment of expectations for the following period.

C. Supporting Documentation for Annual Reviews

The faculty member's tenure review packet will include the following documentation and other material as desired (more detailed descriptions of materials are available in the tenure/promotion criteria section of this document):

1. A letter of self-evaluation summarizing and describing teaching accomplishments, intellectual contributions (research), and service activities. This document should summarize the candidate's performance in *each* of the tenure and promotion performance dimensions, and should describe both all activities since appointment and activity within the current year.
2. Supporting documentation in this order:
 - a. A current Academic Vita
 - b. A detailed summary teaching evaluation results.
 - c. A report of the grade distributions for all classes taught at MSU.
 - d. Copies of all evaluation forms containing student comments from the most recent semester available.
 - e. Copies of recent course syllabi, samples of assignments, exams, and/or student projects, and other documentation to support teaching effectiveness.
 - f. Evidence of significant course or curriculum development activity.
 - g. Documentation of all scholarly activity including:
 - full citations for all published work
 - copies of all published work (actual article copies not copies of drafts)
 - copies of proceedings, paper presentations, monographs
 - draft copies of submitted work under review
 - descriptions of all work in progress.

- h. A complete description of service activities including the nature of the activity, the candidate's level of involvement
3. Documentation from previous years obtained from applicant files maintained by the department.

D. Annual Tenure Review Calendar

Annual tenure reviews will be conducted consistent with the *Master Calendar* issued by the **Provost's** office and as described in the Faculty Handbook [Sec 4.6.1]. It is each individual faculty member's responsibility to meet deadlines described in the *Master Calendar*. The *Master Calendar* is available on the Provost's website, and is updated annually in a document titled "Calendar for Faculty Evaluation."

IV. Promotion and Tenure Applications

The Faculty Handbook at Section 3.8.2. states of tenure:

Only members of the ranked faculty are eligible for tenure. The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against University standards. Recommendations for tenure are made in accordance with Department, College, and University policies and procedures. The expectations for each individual are dependent upon the particular assignment. It is the responsibility of the applicant for tenure to provide sufficient relevant documentation as evidence in support of his or her teaching, research, and service activities.

Tenure is based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the University. While specific responsibilities of faculty members may vary because of special assignments or because of the particular mission of an academic unit, all evaluations for tenure shall address the manner in which each candidate has performed in teaching, research, and service. Basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify granting tenure, for such competence is a prerequisite for the initial appointment. The decision to grant tenure is inherently and inescapably judgmental and is a deliberate action indicating the person has been selected as a member of the permanent faculty because of demonstrated high-quality performance and relative merit.

Tenure will be granted only to faculty members who apply for tenure and are approved through normal procedures (Refer to Section 4). All initial appointment letters for individuals hired in tenure-track faculty positions will specify the last semester during which this tenure application can be made. If a tenure application is not made by a faculty member by this specified time, the individual forfeits all expectations to tenure as specified in this Faculty Handbook. De facto tenure will not occur. Tenure-track faculty who have not been granted tenure by the end of their seventh year of employment at Missouri State University shall not be further employed by Missouri State University in a tenure-track

position.

No faculty member will be offered tenure upon hire unless (1) the candidate's credentials satisfy the department's standards for tenure and promotion, and (2) a majority of the tenured departmental faculty at or above the candidate's rank vote to approve the tenure offer [*Faculty Handbook*, Sec. 3.9.2.].

V. Promotion and Tenure Process

In most cases, a probationary faculty member must apply for tenure/promotion no later than the sixth year of employment (except when the tenure clock has been temporarily stopped) to remain employed beyond the seventh year. In cases where the faculty member has negotiated for a shorter probationary period, the final application year will be stated in the faculty member's letter of employment. Candidates denied tenure in the final application year are not permitted to reapply. The tenure clock begins in August of the first year of employment [Sec. 4.6.2].

The process for applications for tenure/promotion follow the *Tenure and/or Promotion Calendar* established annually by the Provost and include the following steps:

1. The faculty member prepares and submits a complete dossier to the **Department Head** who forwards it to chair of the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** in early October (see Section VI below for a description of the required documents).
2. The **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** reviews the dossier and writes a recommendation normally by late October or early November. The candidate receives a copy and signs the original **Departmental Tenure Review Committee's** recommendation.
3. The **Departmental Tenure Review Committee's** recommendation and dossier are forwarded to the **Department Head** who reviews the materials and writes a recommendation normally by late November. The candidate receives a copy and signs the original **Departmental Head's** recommendation.
4. The **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** and the **Departmental Head's** recommendations and dossier are forwarded to the **Dean** who reviews the materials and writes a recommendation, normally by mid-to-late December. The candidate receives a copy and signs the original **Dean's** recommendation.
5. By the end of each year, the **Dean** completes a recommendation and sends all rationales and a current applicant vita to the **Provost** who makes a final recommendation.

At each stage of evaluation—i.e., **Department Tenure Review Committee, Department Head, College Dean, Provost** - the candidate will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written rationale for the recommendation. At each subsequent stage, a copy of the recommendation and a probative rationale therefore will also be furnished to the **Departmental Tenure Review**

Committee for its information and records [Sec.4.6.2].

Recommendations and rationales and current vita will be forwarded to the next stage for evaluation. Supporting materials will be forwarded as far as the **Dean's** office; they will be forwarded beyond the **Dean's** office at the request of the Provost. The candidate may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process [Sec. 4.6.2].

Through the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision making must assume personal responsibility to ensure that confidentiality is not violated [Sec. 4.6.2].

VI. Required Documents for Tenure/Promotion

Each faculty member making tenure/promotion application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established deadlines. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate, as well as departmental data.

The list of materials for inclusion in packets includes both documents required by the **Office of the Provost**, as well as specific information required by the **College** and **Department**:

- A. Required Documentation in the Order Listed (from Office of the Provost), subject to change as announced by the Office of the Provost:** Documentation required by the Office of the Provost is available at the following address:

<http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/tpappointments.htm>.

Candidates also are required to submit their documentation in approved and/or provided binders and in such order as stipulated by the Office of the Provost at the time of application.

B. Additional Documentation Required by the Department

These documents should be in this order and clearly labeled:

1. Documentation Required by the Department: Teaching Effectiveness

- a. Self-Evaluation (required)

The Self-Evaluation should include a statement of teaching philosophy, evidence of significant course or curriculum development activity, descriptions of activities to improve teaching effectiveness (as described in the performance dimensions for teaching) in addressing each of the dimensions of performance in **Item 1**. Evidence supporting the performance dimensions in **Item 2** descriptions of receiving teaching awards, outstanding

student advising and/or thesis advising, assisting students with internships or employment opportunities, or involving students in research activities. Organize as follows:

(Item 1) Developing Educated Persons

- A. Clearly Identified Course Goals
- B. Course Content
- C. Course Rigor
- D. Subject Knowledge
- E. Organization and, Preparation Skills
- F. Course Delivery and Presentation Skills
- G. Appropriate Conduct towards Students
- H. Course Development
- I. Measures of Learning

(Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching

- A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher
- B. Experiential Learning
- C. Accessibility
- D. Diversity

- b. Course Documents (required)
 - Copies of the most recent course syllabi for each course taught
 - Samples of assignments, exams
 - Samples of student projects
 - Other documentation to support teaching effectiveness
- c. Student Evaluations and other Reaction Measures
 - Summary table of all teaching evaluation results including ratings on items and dimensions of formal student evaluation forms (required)
 - Copies of all evaluation forms containing students' comments from the most recent semester available (required)
 - Student, alumni, and/or employer feedback or comments (optional)
 - Student interviews or focus groups (optional)
- d. Outcome Measures
 - Summary report of the grade distributions for all classes taught (required).
 - Scores on departmental or standardized final exams (optional).
 - Pretest-posttest results (optional).
 - Performance on standardized exams (optional, however, the results of COB and/or departmental program assessments are not to be included).

2. Documentation Required by the Department: Effectiveness in Intellectual Contributions (Research)

a. Self-Evaluation (required)

Self-Evaluation must summarize activity in each area and address the degree to which standards in each of the four dimensions described in **Intellectual Contributions (Research)** have been met:

A. Scholarly Engagement: Basic or Discovery Scholarship

-summaries of journal publications and scholarly works

B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research

-summaries journal publications and applied works

C. Scholarly Engagement: Teaching and Learning Scholarship

-summaries of published works and activities

b. Supporting Documentation (required)

-complete and accurate of citations of all works by category and chronological order (most recent first)

-copies of all published work (actual article copies not copies of drafts)

-copies of proceedings, paper presentations, monographs

-draft copies of submitted work under review

3. Documentation Required by the Department: Effectiveness in Service

a. Self-Evaluation (required)

Self-Evaluation must summarize and describe activity in each area and address the degree to which standards in each of the four dimensions described in **Dimensions of Service** are met.

1. University Citizenship

-Descriptions of active participation in the collegial decision-making process such as committees and other mechanisms for shared governance.

2. Professional Service

-Contributions to the profession

3. Public Service

-Descriptions of community service

4. Professional Consultation

-Contributions to the profession (see Professional Engagement)

b. Supporting Documentation (none unless requested by the committee)

VII. Guidelines for External Reviews

External reviews will be obtained for all tenure and promotion candidates [Sec. 4.6.2]. In the spring of the year before the application is due in the fall, the candidate and department head, in consultation with the Departmental Personnel Committee, will identify a list of four external reviewers, from which two from each list will be selected. In the event consensus agreement on the identity of the two external reviewers from each list cannot be reached, the Departmental Personnel Committee shall make the final selection. Reviewers are to be at a rank higher than the applicant and to be at schools considered to be peer or aspirant institutions. Reviewers should also not be previous coauthors or personal friends of the candidates or have any relationship that might create a conflict of interest. The department head will send the packet to the reviewer containing the following: Current Vita; Departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion; Information on the number of hours taught and other relevant details of the faculty members assignments in each academic year in question; Samples of research selected by the candidate. Packets will be sent in late spring to facilitate receipt by October 1. The external reviews will then become part of the candidate's tenure and/or promotion packet.

VIII. Committee Responsibilities

A. Formation of Tenure Review Committees

Each committee will select a **Chairperson** who will be responsible for receiving appropriate forms and supporting documentation, calling meetings, and forwarding committee recommendations to the **Department Head** and faculty members. The candidate's application will be presented to the **Chairperson** of the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee**, who will undertake the security of the application dossier. *The Departmental Tenure Review Committee(s) will meet, confer, and vote by secret ballot to establish the departmental faculty recommendation. When an applicant is being considered for promotion, only those tenured faculty who hold a rank equal to or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered shall participate in the decision-making process.* If there is a split vote among tenured faculty, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of

the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority decision. The recommendation will include the rationale for the decision and whether it was a consensus decision [Sec. 4.7.3].

B. Departmental Tenure Review Committee Meeting and Voting Guidelines

Departmental Tenure Review Committee procedures for meetings must follow these rules:

Guidelines for Meetings

1. Any meeting in which a formal vote will be taken must be scheduled by the committee chairperson and announced *at least two weeks* prior to the meeting (this can be waived by consensus of the committee).
2. Meetings must be scheduled so that there are no conflicts with any voting faculty's teaching schedule.
3. The committee chairperson should make every effort to schedule this meeting to accommodate the needs of all faculty members.

Guidelines for Proxies and Quorums

1. A faculty member who cannot attend a scheduled meeting for a legitimate reason will be allowed to submit a written proxy vote. All proxy votes must include separate consideration on each dimension for each area of teaching, research, and service, a vote in each area with a rationale based on the criteria established in this document and a careful review of the applicant's credentials. A valid proxy must also include an overall vote on tenure/promotion. Proxy votes not meeting these guidelines will be disallowed.
2. No vote can be held without a quorum of faculty present and participating in deliberations.

A quorum for any vote will be at least three-fourths (75%) of the eligible faculty voters.

3. A favorable vote for requires a majority vote of the department's eligible faculty voters.

(Eligible voters include all tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate whether in attendance or not. However, no department member with an administrative appointment will be eligible to participate or vote)

Guidelines for Voting

1. In these 2014 *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*, standards for tenure and promotion are identical for candidates whose initial appointment is as an untenured assistant professor. There will be only one vote and it will be cast for tenure *and* promotion (no

longer a separate vote for tenure and then promotion).

2. Tenure guidelines for untenured faculty applying for promotion will be identical to the promotion guidelines of the rank for which the candidate is applying.

3. Voting will proceed as follows:

-Voting will be by secret ballot.

-An initial ballot for tenure will be cast first and will include evaluations in each dimension of teaching, intellectual contributions (research), and service, and an up-or-down vote on each of the three criterion measures for tenure and promotion.

-The evaluations will be explained and discussed.

-A second vote will be cast in which committee members will offer an up-or-down vote in each of the three criteria and an overall vote.

-Committee members may accept the results of the second vote by consensus or individual members may request further discussion of voting outcomes. If the discussion reveals additional facts or concerns a third vote may be requested by committee consensus.

-The third vote will be cast in which committee members will offer an up-or-down vote in each of the three criteria and an overall vote. The results of this vote will be final and binding.

The committee chair will provide the exact overall vote for promotion and/or tenure to the **Department Head** but will not include the exact vote in the committee's recommendation.

IX. Department Head Recommendations

The **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** recommendation will be forwarded to the **Department Head**. The **Department Head** shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the department committee. The **Department Head** will make an independent evaluation and recommendation.

The **Department Head** will review the recommendations of the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** as well as the material submitted for each faculty member and make a recommendation to be forwarded to the **Dean** of the college. The **Department Head** shall state in writing to the faculty member and to the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee** his/her recommendation. In instances of disagreement between the **Department Head** and the **Department Tenure Review Committee**, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. If resolution is not possible, the **Department Head** must offer in writing compelling

reasons for disagreeing with the **Departmental Tenure Review Committee's** recommendation before advancing his or her recommendation to the Dean [Sec. 4.8.3].

X. Requirements for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Descriptions of rank and requirements for appointment and eligibility for promotion and tenure are described in the *Faculty Handbook* Section 3.4 for tenure track faculty and in Section 3.6 for non-tenure track faculty. All candidates are responsible for knowing the relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook as it applies to their unique status and candidacy, particularly to one's eligibility status.

The Management Department has no guidelines separate from the *Faculty Handbook* guidelines that address eligibility for tenure and promotion in terms of meeting specific degree and experience requirements. The language of the *Faculty Handbook* is controlling in these criteria. These guidelines supplement the eligibility requirements with a set of performance dimensions and standards spelled out in **Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure** below.

XI. Review of Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Departmental promotion and tenure guidelines normally are reviewed by the Office of the Provost every three years, subject to changes in timing and substance announced by the Office of the Provost. In addition, at the request of the **Department Head**, the Management Department's **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee** will conduct a review of the department's **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**. The process will occur as follows:

1. At the initial department meeting of each academic year in August or early September, if requested by the **Department Head** as set forth above, the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee** will be formed by a vote of the tenured faculty. The committee will consist of five tenured members of the department faculty. The committee shall select a chair responsible for convening meetings of the committee and conducting the affairs of the committee in accordance with the committee procedures set forth above in Section VIII. In early October of each year, the chair of the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee** shall solicit all tenured faculty members for suggested modifications, additions, and/or deletions regarding the department's **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**.
2. The **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee** shall meet during the fall semester to consider modifications suggested by faculty. The **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee** will circulate proposed modifications, if any, to all tenured faculty members.
3. The chair of the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee** will call a meeting of all tenured faculty to discuss and vote on proposed modifications.

4. The proposed modifications will be considered adopted into the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines** *only* if a *majority* of all tenured management department faculty vote to adopt the proposed modifications (note: this is not to be construed as a majority of those present at the meeting, it is a majority of all active tenured faculty in the department).
5. The modifications to the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines** will be submitted to the **Department Head** for subsequent administrative approval.

Faculty members have the option of applying for tenure/promotion under any set of guidelines in effect within six years of their application.

FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Management Department's Philosophy Towards Tenure and Promotion Decisions

The development and application of these criteria reflects a shared philosophy deeply held by the Management Department. That philosophy includes the following:

1. Tenure and promotion decisions are not programmed decisions that can be reduced to the application of rating scales, point systems, and weighting schemes, that provide an illusion of objectivity where none exists. Instead, these decisions are *inherently judgmental* [*Faculty Handbook* at Sec. 3.8.2.] and the role of faculty is to exercise professional judgment in evaluating candidates.
2. When an individual is appointed to a position in the Management Department, we expect that individual to succeed and it is our responsibility to do everything we can as peers and mentors to develop and nurture new faculty.
3. We have a responsibility to inform candidates about what is expected of them by communicating all relevant dimensions of performance, standards for dimensions, and providing regular and detailed performance feedback.
4. We have a responsibility not only to be fair and impartial in our application of these relevant criteria, but also to realize that individuals perform varying roles and contribute in different ways, and that each promotion and tenure decision is unique and must be made with sensitivity to individual dimensionality and the specific role and context within which each individual must perform.

SUMMARY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS

The *Faculty Handbook* at 4.1. states the following:

Faculty members with standard appointments... are evaluated in three categories of performance: teaching, research, and service.

The sections below describe three general criterion measures of faculty performance - teaching, intellectual contributions (research), and service - used by the Management Department to evaluate faculty with standard appointments for purposes of promotion and tenure. Each criterion is defined, performance dimensions are described, and standards and examples of measures are offered.

Table 1 provides a list of the performance criterion categories, the dimensions within each, and whether meeting a performance standard is required or optional for each dimension.

Teaching consists of **(Item 1) Developing Educated Persons** and **(Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching**. Item 1 has nine separate dimensions that describe most of the behaviors and processes essential to effective teaching and meeting the standards for most of these dimensions is required of all faculty for tenure/promotion. Many of the four dimensions within Item 2 are outcomes that are optional or supporting for promotion to higher ranks.

Intellectual Contributions (Research) contains three dimensions.

Service contains four dimensions. University citizenship is required for all tenure/promotion decisions. Professional Service, Professional Consultation and Public Service contributions also may be required for candidates seeking promotion to certain ranks (see Table 1). These dimensions and associated standards are detailed in the pages that follow.

In addition to these dimensions of performance each candidate must meet standards of ethical behavior and collegiality described in the *Faculty Handbook* and required of the profession. While not specifically addressed in performance criteria, serious breaches of professional ethical standards and/or inappropriate conduct towards others, including conduct inconsistent with notions of collegiality as provided in Section 1.3.7 of the *Faculty Handbook*, may provide grounds for denying tenure/promotion.

Table 1: Performance Dimension Requirements for Tenure and Promotion			
Criterion Dimensions	Required (R) or Optional (O)		
	Tenure & Associate	Professor	Senior Instructor
Teaching - Item 1			
A. Clearly Identified Course Goals	R	R	R
B. Course Content	R	R	R
C. Course Rigor	R	R	R
D. Subject Knowledge	R	R	R
E. Organization and, Preparation Skills	R	R	R
F. Course Delivery and Presentation Skills	R	R	R
G. Appropriate Conduct Towards Students	R	R	R
H. Course Development	R	R	R
I. Measures of Learning	O	O	O
Teaching Item 2			
A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher	O	R	R
B. Experiential Learning	O	O	O
C. Accessibility	O	O	O
D. Diversity	O	O	O
Intellectual Contributions (Research)			
A. Scholarly Engagement: Basic or Discovery Scholarship	R	R	O
B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research	O	O	O
C. Scholarly Engagement: Teaching and Learning Scholarship	O	O	O
Service			
1. University Citizenship	R	R	R
2. Professional Service	R	R	R
3. Public Service	O	R	O
4. Professional Consultation	O	O	O

GENERAL CRITERION ONE: TEACHING

The Missouri State University general mission at Sec. 1.3.3. of the *Faculty Handbook* states: *While the University recognizes the individual importance and collective synergies of teaching, scholarship, research, creative activity, and public service, its first obligation is to the teaching of students.* Thus, teaching is among the most important faculty responsibilities in any institution of higher education, and no serious consideration will be given to promotion or tenure unless a candidate can demonstrate effective teaching.

The *Faculty Handbook* in various sections, especially Sec. 4.2.1, acknowledges that teaching is a multidimensional activity. This suggests that *no single measure is adequate to assess the total domain of teaching effectiveness.* Instead, different measures should be used to assess different dimensions of teaching. The *Faculty Handbook* at Sec. 4.2.1.2. describes the two primary teaching objectives:

(Item 1) Developing Educated Persons - The *Faculty Handbook* states that this goal *...is of paramount importance... any faculty member, in order to succeed as a teacher at Missouri State University, must succeed in the areas of item 1 relevant to his or her teaching.* This objective focuses on specific instructor behaviors and/or inputs that contribute to student learning. The Management Department places **primary emphasis** on this goal in the evaluation of credentials for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, or Senior Instructor.

(Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching - The *Faculty Handbook* states that *Although items 2 a, b, c, and are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of teaching and may be considered.* Items 2 a, b, and c, include recognition of excellent classroom performance as well as engaging in activities such as experiential learning and increasing accessibility and diversity as described in Sec. 4.2.1.2. The Management Department places **secondary or supporting emphasis** on Item 2 for decisions involving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Some evidence from Item 2 is required for promotion to Professor and Senior Instructor.

Within each component are different performance dimensions and criterion measures. Thus, in the evaluation of a candidate, the Departmental Committee should consider multiple measures of teaching effectiveness, and the validity of each specific measure for assessing the dimension of teaching effectiveness it presumes to measure.

The table below describes the dimensions of Items 1 and 2, the supporting documentation for each dimension, the relative importance to each dimension in the promotion and tenure process. Tables that follow describe the application of the supporting documentation in more detail, and the specific performance requirements for evaluating candidates.

Table 2. Performance Dimensions: (Item 1) Developing Educated Persons			
Dimension	Description	Documentation	Importance
<i>A. Clearly Identified Course Goals</i>	Course goals are clearly stated and unambiguous. Course goals reflect the strategic purpose of the course and are consistent with catalog descriptions and the intent of the faculty in the design and development of the course.	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of course documents	Required and Substantial
<i>B. Course Content</i>	Content is appropriate for the course. Course topics, assignments, projects, and exams reflect and support course goals. Course content reflects current developments in the area and textbooks, cases, and readings are appropriate for the course.	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of course documents	Required and Very Substantial
<i>C. Course Rigor</i>	Assignments, projects, and exams are appropriate for the level and subject. Grading systems limit the influence of team or group grades and ability of students to free-ride; grades accurately reflect differences in student performance; grade distributions are appropriate for course and subject.	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of course assignments and exams and course grades	Required and Very Substantial
<i>D. Subject Knowledge</i>	Faculty member engages in activities to maintain current knowledge of the course material	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review	Required and Very Substantial
<i>E. Organization and Preparation Skills</i>	Sequence of course activities exhibit thoughtful planning and preparation; Assignments and exam schedules are clear and communicated; performance feedback is timely and appropriate	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of course documents and Student Reaction Measures	Required and Substantial
<i>F. Course Delivery and Presentation Skills</i>	Skill in classroom delivery; clear and organized in providing content to students	Peer Review via classroom visit and observation; Student Reaction measures	Required and Substantial
<i>G. Appropriate Conduct Towards Students</i>	An attitude of respect for students; maintains office hours and keep appointments; arrives to class on time and holds class as required; available and willing to assist students; perceived fairness in the application of class policies.	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of Student Reaction Measures	Required and Substantial
<i>H. Course Development</i>	Continuous development of new course tools, delivery mechanisms and course technologies	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of course content	Required and Moderate
<i>I. Measures of Learning</i>	Measures of student learning including pre/post test results or standardized exams (note: program assessment measures may not be used to support this performance dimension).	Self-Evaluation; Peer Review of Outcome Measures	Optional and Limited

Table 3. Performance Dimensions: (Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching			
Dimension	Description	Documentation	Importance
<i>A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher</i>	Beyond basic effectiveness as a teacher; judgments made by students, peers, administrators, and colleagues with appropriate academic expertise; external recognition for outstanding preparation of students for professional fields; students receiving external recognition for outstanding work produced in the course; include noteworthy research work done with students; internal or external grants to support innovative teaching	Self-Evaluation Peer Review of Student Reaction Measures	Optional Substantial
<i>B. Experiential Learning</i>	Evidence of service learning components in their courses; other structured activities that apply the course material to social issues or problems	Self-Evaluation Peer Review	Optional Supporting
<i>C. Accessibility</i>	Efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond one's typical assignments; offering distance learning, online courses, public lectures or workshops; exceptional in-load teaching assignments	Self-Evaluation Peer Review	Optional Supporting
<i>D. Diversity</i>	Efforts to bring diversity to students' learning experiences	Self-Evaluation Peer Review	Optional Supporting

DOCUMENTING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Self-Evaluation: An essential measure of teaching effectiveness is the individual faculty member's critical review of his or her own teaching approaches and philosophies and self-review of teaching tools and techniques.

Self-evaluation as part of the promotion and tenure process within the Management Department requires each candidate to describe all activities, outcomes, behaviors, relevant to each performance dimension. This measure of teaching effectiveness can be useful for assessing organization and preparation, teaching objectives, course content and rigor, and subject knowledge. Additionally, this measure can be used to evaluate course development activities, active attempts to improve teaching, and efforts to incorporate new instructional technology into the classroom. This method should not be used to assess dimensions such as presentation skills or attitude measures. Examples of possible measures might include some of the following, or other related measures:

- Statements of teaching philosophy.
- Course materials including syllabi, exams, and handouts.
- Evidence of course development.
- Student work samples.
- Activities to improve teaching effectiveness (seminars, workshops, etc...)

Peer Review: An essential measure of teaching performance is review by faculty colleagues. Peer review should include review of course materials and other documents described above in "self-evaluation" to establish the appropriateness of course content and methods, course rigor, and organization skills. Peer review can also be used to assess subject matter knowledge and, if classroom observation is used, presentation and communication skills. Peer review will also include review and interpretation of student reaction measures. Examples of possible measures might include some of the following, or other related measures:

- Critical review of course materials and philosophy statements.
- Classroom visits and observation
- Assessment of professional development activities to assess subject knowledge.

Peer reviews may be conducted by not less than two members of the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Head. Reviews shall be conducted without notice after receiving a list of available dates from the candidate.

Reaction Measures: Reaction measures regarding individual faculty performance are appropriate measures of teaching effectiveness for some aspects of both Item (1) Developing Educated Persons, and Item (2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching. Reaction measures should be used to evaluate the presentation skills of the faculty member including the ability to present clear course objectives, to present material effectively, and to assess perceptions of a faculty member's willingness to treat students fairly, and with respect and dignity. Finally, reaction measures can be used to assess faculty willingness to assist and encourage students, and to provide them reasonable access and timely feedback. Because of psychometric error in the design and administration, reaction measures should not be used to assess course rigor, faculty member subject knowledge, or course content. *The committee should exercise caution in the interpretation of formal student evaluation instruments, recognizing both the influence of the context of the evaluation process, and the limits of practical and statistical significance in the numerical outcomes.* Rather more emphasis should be given to specific items on an instrument than on total average scores. In addition, evaluations of scores should be *criterion* rather than *norm* referenced. Limits to the use of student evaluations scores are as follows:

Item (1) Developing Educated Persons - For Dimensions A, B, C, D, H, and I, student evaluations should not be considered. For Dimensions E, F, and G, student evaluations should receive substantial weight. In the overall evaluation of Goal (1) student evaluations should account for no more than 25% of the final assessment of faculty performance for this goal.

Item (2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching - For Dimension A student evaluations *may* be given substantial weight. For Dimensions B, C, and D, student evaluations should receive little if any weight. Since Goal (2) dimensions are optional the overall weight given to student evaluations may vary.

Examples of reaction measures could include some of the following, or other related measures:

- Ratings on items and dimensions of formal student evaluation forms.
- Student, alumni, and/or employer feedback or comments.
- Student interviews or focus groups.

Outcome Measures: Outcome measures represent additional indices of the effectiveness of one's teaching. Specifically, outcome measures assess learning. The committee should consider, however, that outcome measures are subject to numerous threats to internal validity not present with other measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, outcome measures should be used judiciously. Outcome measures such as grade distributions and performance on standardized final exams may be used in context to assess knowledge acquisition and course rigor. Other measures such as scores on standardized tests (such as the PHR accreditation exam) are subject to contamination (forces outside the individual faculty member's control), and while useful to assess academic programs, should be used with caution as indicators of individual teaching effectiveness. Neither COB nor departmental program assessment results are to be submitted as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Examples of outcome measures might include some of the following, or similar measures:

- Course final grade distributions.
- Scores on departmental or standardized final exams.
- Pretest-posttest results.
- Performance on standardized exams.

DESCRIPTIONS OF CRITERION STANDARDS FOR TEACHING

Candidates are evaluated using one of three sets of teaching effectiveness criteria.

Criterion Standards Set A - Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In the Management Department the decision to grant tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for candidates whose initial appointment is as a tenure-track Assistant Professor is a joint decision. Tenure will not be granted to candidates whose credentials fail to justify promotion to Associate Professor; hence, the performance standards for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are identical. Current tenured Assistant Professors are also subject to Criterion Standards Set A when applying for promotion. Criterion Standards Set A requires candidates to meet performance expectations, as expressed and delineated annually by the Departmental Personnel Committee and the Department Head, for all dimensions of **(Item 1) Developing Educated Persons** but does not require additional supporting evidence from **(Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching**. See Tables 4a and 4b.

Criterion Standards Set B - Promotion to Full Professor

This set of standards requires candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor to meet somewhat more stringent performance expectations for all dimensions of **(Item 1) Developing Educated Persons** and requires additional supporting evidence from **(Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching**. See Tables 5a and 5b.

Criterion Standards Set C - Promotion to Senior Instructor

This set of standards requires candidates seeking promotion to Senior Instructor to meet somewhat more stringent performance expectations for all dimensions of **(Item 1) Developing Educated Persons** and requires additional supporting evidence from **(Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching**. This set is identical to Set B except for Dimension D. See Tables 6a and 6b.

These standards serve as a basis for tenure and promotion decisions when incorporated with the research and service categories. However, establishing specific, objective, and measurable criteria for teaching performance is probably neither possible nor desirable. Instead, the committee must use careful, considered, professional judgment in evaluating a candidate. The committee must consider the entire context of the teaching environment, the various dimensions of teaching performance, and the totality of the evidence presented by the candidate.

Table 4a. Criterion Standards Set A: Teaching Standards for <i>Tenure and Associate Professor: (Item 1)</i> Developing Educated Persons	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standards
<i>A. Clearly Identified Course Goals</i>	Course syllabus must describe course goals. Self-evaluation must describe how goals relate to course purpose and communicated and supported. Peer review must include a review of course documents and self-evaluation to insure that goals are appropriate and supported by course activities described in the syllabus Required documents: Course syllabus
<i>B. Course Content</i>	Supporting course documents include syllabus, readings, and assignments. Self-evaluation must address how course content and materials are appropriate to course. Peer review must examine syllabus, assignments, cases, text, readings, and other materials to determine appropriateness of content. Required documents: Course syllabus; samples of course documents
<i>C. Course Rigor</i>	Supporting course documents required include samples of assignments and exams. Self-evaluation must discuss grading processes and outcomes. Peer review must include evaluations of assignments and the suitability of grading processes and outcomes. Grading systems must reflect differences in individual performance and grade distributions must be in line with departmental standards for level and course. Required documents: Course syllabus; grade distributions for all classes; samples of assignments and exams
<i>D. Subject Knowledge</i>	Self-evaluation <i>must</i> demonstrate command of subject matter and knowledge of the discipline through evidence of continued education, attendance at professional meetings, an ongoing research agenda, or other means. Peer review must find evidence that supports command of the subject knowledge. Required documents: descriptions of all activities
<i>E. Organization and, Preparation Skills</i>	Self-evaluation must establish evidence of adequate organization, and preparation skills based on course documents. Peer review must include an examination of supporting evidence from course documents and analysis of student evaluations. Documentation must include student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments. Student evaluation scores on items related to organization and preparation should reveal that the majority of students agree that the faculty member is organized and prepared and do not fall meaningfully below departmental norms for the course. Student comments should support perceptions of organization and preparation. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments.
<i>F. Course Delivery and Presentation Skills</i>	For untenured faculty particularly, peer review should involve in-class observation and assessment of course delivery and faculty-student interaction skills, and signify that the faculty member has skills at or above what is commonly expected of a university faculty member. Peer review must include assessment of student evaluation results and student comments. Student evaluation results on items relating to course delivery should reveal that the majority of students perceive that course delivery is adequate, and scores should not be meaningfully below departmental norms for the course. Student comments should support perceptions of adequate course delivery and presentation skills. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments
<i>G. Appropriate Conduct Towards Students</i>	Self-evaluation must describe how the faculty member interacts and responds to students. Peer review must include assessment of student evaluation results and student comments. Student evaluation results on items dealing with conduct towards students should be in line with departmental norms for the course. Student comments suggesting that the faculty member fails to meet his or her responsibilities to hold classes or keep office hours or appointments, or those supporting perceptions of unfairness should be considered in this

	<p>evaluation. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments.</p>
<i>H. Course Development</i>	<p>The faculty member must demonstrate some efforts to develop and implement new course tools and delivery techniques and/or instructional technologies, and/or develop new courses. Peer review must include an assessment of course documents to verify ongoing course development activities Required documents: descriptions of course developmental activities</p>
<i>I. Measures of Learning</i>	<p>Self-evaluation must include a description of outcome measures supporting this dimension. Peer review must focus on the suitability and value of these measures. This dimension is optional.</p>

**Table 4b. Criterion Standards Set A: Teaching Standards for *Tenure and Associate Professor*: (Item 2)
Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching**

Dimension	Description of Performance Standards
A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher	not required
B. Experiential Learning	not required
C. Accessibility	not required
D. Diversity	not required

Table 5a. Criterion Standards Set B: Teaching Standards for <i>Full Professor</i>: (Item 1) Developing Educated Persons	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standards
<i>A. Clearly Identified Course Goals</i>	Course syllabus must describe course goals. Self-evaluation must describe how goals relate to course purpose and communicated and supported. Peer review must include a review of course documents and self-evaluation to insure that goals are appropriate and supported by course activities described in the syllabus Required documents: Course syllabus
<i>B. Course Content</i>	Supporting course documents include syllabus, readings, and assignments. Self-evaluation must address how course content and materials are appropriate to course. Peer review must examine syllabus, assignments, cases, text, readings, and other materials to determine appropriateness of content. Required documents: Course syllabus; samples of course documents
<i>C. Course Rigor</i>	Supporting course documents required include samples of assignments and exams. Self-evaluation must discuss grading processes and outcomes. Peer review must include evaluations of assignments and the suitability of grading processes and outcomes. Grading systems must reflect differences in individual performance and grade distributions must be in line with departmental standards for level and course. Required documents: Course syllabus; grade distributions for all classes; samples of assignments and exams
<i>D. Subject Knowledge</i>	Self-evaluation <i>must</i> demonstrate professional mastery of subject matter and knowledge of the discipline through evidence of continued education, participation in profession meetings, an ongoing research agenda related to the subject matter of commonly taught courses, or other means. Peer review must find evidence that supports professional mastery of the subject knowledge. Required documents: descriptions of all activities
<i>E. Organization and, Preparation Skills</i>	Self-evaluation must establish evidence of adequate organization, and preparation skills based on course documents. Peer review must include an examination of supporting evidence from course documents and analysis of student evaluations. Documentation must include student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments. Student evaluation scores on items related to organization and preparation should be generally positive and meet or exceed departmental norms for the course. Student comments should support perceptions of organization and preparation and contain few, if any, valid complaints demonstrating lack of preparation. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments.
<i>F. Course Delivery and Presentation Skills</i>	Peer review may involve in-class observation and assessment of course delivery and faculty-student interaction skills. Peer review must include assessment of student evaluation results and student comments. Student evaluation scores on items relating to course delivery should be positive with the majority of students supporting perceptions of good course delivery, and scores should be at or above departmental norms for the course. Student comments should also support perceptions of good course delivery and presentation skills. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments
<i>G. Appropriate Conduct Towards Students</i>	Self-evaluation must describe how the faculty member interacts and responds to students. Peer review must include assessment of student evaluation results and student comments. Student evaluation results on items dealing with conduct towards

	<p>students must reveal that the majority of students perceive that the faculty member's conduct and behaviors are appropriate and fair. Student evaluation scores on items relating to faculty conduct should meet or exceed departmental norms for the course. Valid student comments suggesting that the faculty member fails to meet his or her responsibilities to hold classes or keep office hours or appointments, or those supporting perceptions of unfairness must be given consideration.</p> <p>Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments.</p>
<i>H. Course Development</i>	<p>Self-evaluation must demonstrate ongoing and effective efforts to develop and implement new course tools and delivery techniques and/or instructional technologies. Evidence of the development of cases, assignments, or other class activities targeting specific learning goals provide evidence of meeting this standard, as well as the development of new courses. Peer review must include an assessment of course documents to verify ongoing course development activities.</p> <p>Required documents: descriptions of course developmental activities.</p>
<i>I. Measures of Learning</i>	<p>Self-evaluation must include a description of outcome measures supporting this dimension. Peer review must focus on the suitability and value of these measures. This dimension is optional.</p>

Table 5b. Criterion Standards Set B: Teaching Standards for *Full Professor*: (Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching

Dimension	Description of Performance Standards
A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher	Evidence of some activity within this performance dimension is required. Self-evaluation may include documentation of recognition for exceptional teaching performance (beyond that required by Item1) from students, colleagues, or administrators, as supported by consistently strong teaching evaluations, awards for teaching, grants for teaching-related activities, or other forms of external recognition. Also included here is recognition for exceptional preparation of students, exceptional advising, research or scholarly activity performed with students, student mentoring, thesis advising or other similar activities.
B. Experiential Learning	Evidence for activity in this dimension is not required but is supporting. Self-evaluation may include evidence of structured course activities aimed at service learning or dealing with social issues or public affairs.
C. Accessibility	Evidence for activity in this dimension is not required but is supporting. Self-evaluation may include evidence of all activities aimed at expanding the accessibility education beyond normal assignments and may include the development of distance learning, online or blended courses, accepting course loads beyond those normally required, participating in international teaching assignments, providing public lectures, or otherwise extending educational opportunities in one’s discipline to the public.
D. Diversity	Evidence for activity in this dimension is not required but is supporting. Self-evaluation may include evidence of structured activities that expose students to diverse viewpoints and environments through guest speakers, presentations, or cases, or cause students to explore diverse cultures, opinions, backgrounds, and appreciate and embrace the nature of the contributions made by diverse groups of individuals.

Table 6a. Criterion Standards Set C: Teaching Standards for <i>Senior Instructor: (Item 1) Developing Educated Persons</i>	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standards
<i>A. Clearly Identified Course Goals</i>	Course syllabus must describe course goals. Self-evaluation must describe how goals relate to course purpose and communicated and supported. Peer review must include a review of course documents and self-evaluation to insure that goals are appropriate and supported by course activities described in the syllabus Required documents: Course syllabus
<i>B. Course Content</i>	Supporting course documents include syllabus, readings, and assignments. Self-evaluation must address how course content and materials are appropriate to course. Peer review must examine syllabus, assignments, cases, text, readings, and other materials to determine appropriateness of content. Required documents: Course syllabus; samples of course documents
<i>C. Course Rigor</i>	Supporting course documents required include samples of assignments and exams. Self-evaluation must discuss grading processes and outcomes. Peer review must include evaluations of assignments and the suitability of grading processes and outcomes. Grading systems must reflect differences in individual performance and grade distributions must be in line with departmental standards for level and course. Required documents: Course syllabus; grade distributions for all classes; samples of assignments and exams
<i>D. Subject Knowledge</i>	Self-evaluation <i>must</i> demonstrate professional mastery of subject matter and knowledge of the discipline through evidence of continued education, participation in consulting activities, development of and participation in executive development programs, participation in professional organizations, professional certifications, or activities that focus on business management or practice. Peer review must find evidence that supports professional mastery of the subject knowledge. Required documents: descriptions of all activities
<i>E. Organization and Preparation Skills</i>	Self-evaluation must establish evidence of adequate organization, and preparation skills based on course documents. Peer review must include an examination of supporting evidence from course documents and analysis of student evaluations. Documentation must include student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments. Student evaluation scores on items related to organization and preparation should be generally positive and meet or exceed departmental norms for the course. Student comments should support perceptions of organization and preparation and contain few, if any, valid complaints demonstrating lack of preparation. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments.
<i>F. Course Delivery and Presentation Skills</i>	Peer review may involve in-class observation and assessment of course delivery and faculty-student interaction skills. Peer review must include assessment of student evaluation results and student comments. Student evaluation scores on items relating to course delivery should be positive with the majority of students supporting perceptions of good course delivery, and scores should be at or above departmental norms for the course. Student comments should also support perceptions of good course delivery and presentation skills. Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments
<i>G. Appropriate Conduct Towards Students</i>	Self-evaluation must describe how the faculty member interacts and responds to students. Peer review must include assessment of student evaluation results and student comments. Student evaluation results on items dealing with conduct towards students must reveal that the majority of students perceive that the faculty member's

	<p>conduct and behaviors are appropriate and fair. Student evaluation scores on items relating to faculty conduct should meet or exceed departmental norms for the course. Valid student comments suggesting that the faculty member fails to meet his or her responsibilities to hold classes or keep office hours or appointments, or those supporting perceptions of unfairness must be given consideration.</p> <p>Required documents: student evaluation results from all courses and copies of student comments.</p>
<i>H. Course Development</i>	<p>Self-evaluation must demonstrate ongoing and effective efforts to develop and implement new course tools and delivery techniques and/or instructional technologies. Evidence of the development of cases, assignments, or other class activities targeting specific learning goals provide evidence of meeting this standard, as well as the development of new courses. Peer review must include an assessment of course documents to verify ongoing course development activities.</p> <p>Required documents: descriptions of course developmental activities.</p>
<i>I. Measures of Learning</i>	<p>Self-evaluation must include a description of outcome measures supporting this dimension. Peer review must focus on the suitability and value of these measures. This dimension is optional.</p>

Table 6b. Criterion Standards Set C: Teaching Standards for *Senior Instructor: (Item 2) Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching*

Dimension	Description of Performance Standards
A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher	Evidence of some activity within this performance dimension is required. Self-evaluation may include documentation of recognition for exceptional teaching performance (beyond that required by Item1) from students, colleagues, or administrators, as supported by consistently strong teaching evaluations, awards for teaching, grants for teaching-related activities, or other forms of external recognition. Also included here is recognition for exceptional preparation of students, exceptional advising, research or scholarly activity performed with students, student mentoring, thesis advising or other similar activities.
B. Experiential Learning	Evidence for activity in this dimension is not required but is supporting. Self-evaluation may include evidence of structured course activities aimed at service learning or dealing with social issues or public affairs.
C. Accessibility	Evidence for activity in this dimension is not required but is supporting. Self-evaluation may include evidence of all activities aimed at expanding the accessibility education beyond normal assignments and may include the development of distance learning, online or blended courses, accepting course loads beyond those normally required, participating in international teaching assignments, providing public lectures, or otherwise extending educational opportunities in one's discipline to the public.
D. Diversity	Evidence for activity in this dimension is not required but is supporting. Self-evaluation may include evidence of structured activities that expose students to diverse viewpoints and environments through guest speakers, presentations, or cases, or cause students to explore diverse cultures, opinions, backgrounds, and appreciate and embrace the nature of the contributions made by diverse groups of individuals.

GENERAL CRITERION TWO: INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS (RESEARCH)

The Management Department's performance dimensions and standards for research are guided by two major sources: the *Faculty Handbook* and the AACSB's *2013 Business Accreditation Standards*. The *Faculty Handbook* states that the process of research (scholarly productivity) is an integral and indispensable part of the university's basic function to create, preserve, and transmit knowledge and otherwise facilitate student learning. Thus, research is considered to be an essential faculty role responsible for maintaining the individual faculty member's competence, contributing to the education of students, and advancing the interests of one's profession and the needs of society. Therefore, intellectual contributions or research productivity should be considered in tenure and promotion decisions [Section 4.2.2].

The AACSB's *2013 Business Accreditation Standards*, Standard 15, requires ...*significant academic and professional engagement that sustains the intellectual capital necessary to support high-quality outcomes consistent with the school's mission and strategies*. This document defines and describes a taxonomy of sustained engagement activities: (1) Scholarly Academics, (2) Practice Academics, (3) Scholarly Practitioners, and (4) Instructional Practitioners. In general, tenure track candidates must satisfy the requirements for academic engagement as Scholarly and/or Practice Academics. Candidates for Senior Instructor must satisfy standards for professional engagement as Scholarly and/or Instructional Practitioners as described below.

The *Faculty Handbook* [Section 4.2.2] provides a taxonomy of scholarship/research that is substantially similar to that described in the AACSB's *2013 Business Accreditation Standards*, Standard 2 describing intellectual contributions consistent with mission. This taxonomy forms the basis for the Department of Management's criteria for promotion and tenure

DIMENSIONS OF INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The following provides examples of different types of activities that fall under each of four dimensions of intellectual contributions encompassing scholarly and professional engagement. The examples are not meant to be either exclusive or exhaustive. The departmental committee must exercise considered professional judgment, both when deciding whether a faculty member's contribution fits a specific category, and on evaluating the significance of the contribution.

A. Scholarly Engagement: Basic or Discovery Scholarship

Defined as scholarship *that generates and communicates new knowledge and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions intended to impact the theory, knowledge, and/or practice of business and management*. Recognized as an essential element of the mission of the University, the College, and the Department, scholarship of discovery is highly valued for both tenure and promotion. Evidence of scholarship of discovery is *required* for tenure and promotion. Examples include:

1. Original research findings published in scholarly journals.
2. Scholarly books or monographs that advance understanding.
3. Successful external grant applications for research.

4. Presentation of original research findings at national or international, peer-reviewed professional meetings.

B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research

Synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business and management. Recognized as essential elements of the mission of the University, College, and the Department, integrative and applied research embracing synthesis and application is required for tenure and promotion. Examples include:

1. Published professional or applied research journal articles:
2. Presentation of integrative or applied research at national, peer-reviewed meetings (paper or case presentations).
3. Published literature reviews or position papers.
4. Published critical reviews of scholarly projects.
5. Successful external grant applications for applied research.

C. Scholarly Engagement: Teaching and Learning Scholarship

Develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching of business and management. Not required for promotion and tenure but can be used as contributory evidence of scholarly engagement. Examples include:

1. Published journal articles focusing on teaching content or methods
2. Published textbook summarizing existing research.
3. Contributions in others' published work such as textbooks chapters, readings books, case books, and other ancillary materials.
4. Published cases

DESCRIPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS (RESEARCH)

Candidates are evaluated using one of three sets of criterion standards for intellectual contributions.

Criterion Standards Set A - Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In the Management Department the decision to grant tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for candidates whose initial appointment is as a tenure-track Assistant Professor is a joint decision. Tenure will not be granted to candidates whose credentials fail to justify promotion to Associate Professor; hence, the performance standards are identical. Current tenured Assistant Professors

are also subject to Criterion Standards Set A when applying for promotion (Table 7).

Criterion Standards Set B - Promotion to Full Professor

This set of standards requires candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor to meet somewhat more stringent performance expectations for Scholarly Engagement dimensions A and B, and Professional Engagement dimension D as described below (Table 8).

Criterion Standards Set C - Promotion to Senior Instructor

This set of standards requires candidates seeking promotion to Senior Instructor to meet only specific performance standards relating to dimension

Documentation of Intellectual Contributions

Candidates must provide a summary list and description for all activities within each of the four performance dimensions relating to Intellectual Contributions as described above. The description must include accurate and complete citations for all published work. For non-published activities a brief description of the activity must be included. Copies of all published works must be included in the applicant's portfolio (copies must be of the finished work as published not drafts). Works that have been unconditionally accepted must include a copy of the acceptance letter.

External Reviews

The departmental committee must use evidence from external reviews in their evaluation of relevant performance dimensions relating to the candidate's intellectual contributions.

Table 7. Criterion Standards Set A: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standard
A. Scholarly Engagement: Basic or Discovery Scholarship	Evidence of basic or discovery scholarship is highly desirable for tenure and promotion, and will be weighted more heavily than contributions in other performance dimensions. The primary standard for this dimension is evidence of original empirical or theoretical activity in the form of peer reviewed academic journal articles. Candidates, particularly those newly hired with SA status are required to have some peer-reviewed published work for Dimension A that satisfies the definition of basic or discovery scholarship. Articles must be evaluated based on relevance to the candidate’s field, authorship, publishing outlet, and other impact factors. Suitable contributions in addition to peer reviewed journal articles will provide supporting evidence for this dimension but will not be used to satisfy minimum productivity requirements.
B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research	Research that synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge can be used as evidence of scholarship to support an application for tenure and promotion. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business and management. Articles must be evaluated based on relevance to the candidate’s field, authorship, publishing outlet, and other impact factors. Evidence of activity other than refereed journal articles will also be considered as supporting evidence for satisfying the standards of this dimension but will not be used to satisfy minimum productivity requirements.
C. Scholarly Engagement: Teaching and Learning Scholarship	Meeting the standards of this dimension is optional for promotion and tenure. Evidence of activity within this dimension may be considered as supporting evidence for meeting the standards of Dimension B above

Notes on Interpreting Criterion Standards Set A: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

1. All candidates must have **some** contributions from Dimension A
2. The ***absolute minimum requirement*** for tenure/promotion is **five published peer reviewed journal articles** over a period from five years prior to the year of application for tenure/promotion to the year of application. For purposes of this requirement, research contributions from Dimension A and from Dimension B count toward this minimum, subject to the requirement of Dimension A that a candidate demonstrate at least “some peer-reviewed published work that satisfies the definition of basic or discovery scholarship.”
3. Candidates must have at least **two other activities** to satisfy minimum requirements. These may include: conference presentations at national, peer-reviewed meetings (paper or case presentations), published literature reviews or position papers, published critical reviews of scholarly projects, invited papers or presentations, successful external grant applications for applied research, or similar activities. For purposes of this requirement, *significant* activities from Dimension C may also satisfy this standard.
4. Meeting the minimum of five peer reviewed articles is not, of itself, sufficient for tenure and/or promotion. The following should be considered in evaluating a candidate's portfolio of articles:

Evaluating the Category of Scholarship

In *general*, basic or discovery scholarship should be more heavily weighted than applied or integrated scholarship when evaluating the research contribution. Publications dedicated to basic or discovery scholarship may result in a reduction of the total number of publications required of the candidate if such publications are deemed representative of high quality productivity when considering the publication outlet and the rigor of the research.

Evaluating the Contribution

Significant evidence of the faculty member's *individual contribution* on the basis of authorship *must* be considered. In general, single and first authorship will be given considerable weight as evidence of one's individual contribution. Contributions with multiple authorship may be considered, but should be given lesser weight.

Evaluating the Impact Factor

All publications *must* be evaluated on the basis of the (1) reputation of the journal or publishing outlet, (2) reviews of the article, book, or other contribution, (3) evidence of recognition provided by citation indices, or (4) any other evidence of the impact factor of the

contribution. While scholarship of discovery is *not* required to place someone at this level, it would be considered strong support of high quality. In the absence of scholarship of discovery, *strong* evidence of a body of integrative and applied research is *required*.

Evaluating Relevance

Truly interdisciplinary efforts are encouraged where the faculty member can bring his/her expertise to bear with professional peers on difficult or unusual problems, or to facilitate the creative redefinition of issues. However, an abundance of publications out of one's field, particularly multiple authored, out-of-field publications, generally should not be considered evidence of meeting performance standards.

5. The candidate's overall level of contribution beyond the minimum required must be considered as evidence of meeting the standards of Dimension B.
6. Candidates with peer reviewed publications at or near minimal levels may present other supporting evidence of intellectual engagement from Dimensions A, B, and/or C, for the committee to consider in the overall evaluation of the candidate.
7. For tenured assistant professors with at least five years of departmental service as tenured faculty, this minimum standard applies to the five years immediately prior to application for promotion.

Table 8. Criterion Standards Set B: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Promotion to Professor	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standard
A. Scholarly Engagement: Basic or Discovery Scholarship	Evidence of basic or discovery scholarship is highly desirable for promotion, and will be weighted more heavily than contributions in other performance dimensions. The primary standard for this dimension is evidence of original empirical or theoretical activity in the form of peer reviewed academic journal articles. Candidates for professor are required to have significant peer-reviewed published work or other significant outcome for Dimension A that satisfies the definition of basic or discovery scholarship. Articles must be evaluated based on relevance to the candidate’s field, authorship, publishing outlet, and other impact factors. Suitable contributions in addition to peer reviewed journal articles will provide supporting evidence for this dimension.
B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research	Research that synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge can be used as evidence of scholarship to support an application for tenure and promotion. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business and management. Articles must be evaluated based on relevance to the candidate’s field, authorship, publishing outlet, and other impact factors. Evidence of activity other than refereed journal articles will also be considered as supporting evidence for satisfying the standards of this dimension but will not be used to satisfy minimum productivity requirements.
C. Scholarly Engagement: Teaching and Learning Scholarship	Meeting the standards of this dimension is optional for promotion. Evidence of activity within this dimension may be considered as supporting evidence for meeting the standards of Dimension B above. In some circumstances the committee may find that works in this category are of sufficient merit to apply them to the minimum productivity standard.

Notes on Interpreting Criterion Standards Set B: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Promotion to Professor

1. Candidates for professor must demonstrate a continuous and significant record of accomplishment. All candidates for professor must have **significant** contributions from Dimension A.
2. The ***absolute minimum requirement*** for tenure/promotion is **six published peer reviewed journal articles** over a period from five years prior to the year of application for promotion to the year of application. For purposes of this requirement, research contributions from Dimension A and Dimension B count toward this minimum.
3. Candidates must have at least **two other activities** to satisfy minimum requirements. These may include: conference presentations at national, peer-reviewed meetings (paper or case presentations), published literature reviews or position papers, published critical reviews of scholarly projects, invited papers or presentations, successful external grant applications for applied research, or similar activities. For purposes of this requirement, *significant* activities from Dimension C may also satisfy this standard.
4. Meeting the minimum of six peer reviewed articles is not, by itself, sufficient for promotion. The following should be considered in evaluating a candidate's portfolio of articles:

Evaluating the Category of Scholarship

In *general*, basic or discovery scholarship should be more heavily weighted than applied or integrated scholarship when evaluating the research contribution. Publications dedicated to basic or discovery scholarship may result in a reduction of the total number of publications required of the candidate if such publications are deemed representative of high quality productivity when considering the publication outlet and the rigor of the research.

Evaluating the Contribution

Significant evidence of the faculty member's *individual contribution* on the basis of authorship *must* be demonstrated. Contributions that are single and first author will be given more weight as evidence of one's individual contribution. Contributions with multiple authorship may be considered, but should be given lesser weight. Contributions with more than four or more authors may be given little weight.

Evaluating the Impact Factor

All publications *must* be evaluated on the basis of the (1) reputation of the journal or publishing outlet, (2) reviews of the article, book, or other contribution, (3) evidence of recognition provided by citation indices, or (4) any other evidence of the impact factor of the contribution. While scholarship of discovery is *not* required to place someone at this level, it

would be considered strong support of high quality. In the absence of scholarship of discovery, *strong* evidence of a body of integrative and applied research is *required*.

Evaluating Relevance

Truly interdisciplinary efforts are encouraged where the faculty member can bring his/her expertise to bear with professional peers on difficult or unusual problems, or to facilitate the creative redefinition of issues. However, an abundance of publications out of one's field, particularly multiple authored, out-of-field publications, generally should not be considered evidence of meeting performance standards.

5. The candidate's overall level of contribution beyond the minimum required must be considered as evidence of meeting the standards of Dimension B.
6. Candidates with peer reviewed publications at or near minimal levels may present other supporting evidence of intellectual engagement from Dimensions A, B, and/or C, for the committee to consider in the overall evaluation of the candidate.

Table 9. Criterion Standards Set C: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Promotion to Senior Instructor	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standard
A. Scholarly Engagement: Basic or Discovery Scholarship	Not required but contributory
B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research	Not required but contributory
C. Scholarly Engagement: Teaching and Learning Scholarship	Not required but contributory; may count towards teaching performance

Notes on Interpreting Criterion Standards Set C: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Promotion to Professor

1. Scholarly engagement is not required of senior instructors but activity in Dimensions A, B, and C, may apply to professional engagement.
2. Candidates for senior instructor may apply Dimension C to teaching performance Items 1 or 2 if desired.

GENERAL CRITERION THREE: SERVICE

The *Faculty Handbook* states that service serves to support the academic tradition of shared governance, to support professional and organizational needs of the disciplines, and to bring the products of University work to the public for its benefit [4.2.3.1]. Each faculty member is expected to make professional contributions through service to the Department, the College, the University, the regional community, and to his or her discipline as one of the requirements for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

DIMENSIONS OF SERVICE

The *Faculty Handbook* [Section 4.2.3.2] provides a taxonomy of service activity that forms the basis for the Department of Management's criteria for promotion and tenure. Service activities include (1) University Citizenship, (2) Professional Service, (3) Public Service, and (4) Professional Consultation. The examples that follow are not meant to be either exclusive or exhaustive. The departmental committee must exercise considered professional judgment, both when deciding whether a faculty member's contribution fits a specific category, and in evaluating the significance of the contribution.

1. University Citizenship

The *Faculty Handbook* defines University Citizenship: *In the interest of maintaining broad participation in the decision-making process at the University, faculty should recognize their responsibilities to the organization and contribute fairly to the task of shared-governance. This includes, but is not limited to, service on program, departmental, college and university committees and task forces. In so doing, faculty members increase the level of self-determination in their ranks.* Citizenship activities relate to active participation in the shared governance structure of the Department, the College, and the University. Sustained success in this performance dimension is required from all candidates' tenure and/or promotion. Examples include:

- Developing and implementing University/College/Department policy through active participation in the collegial decision-making process such as committees and other mechanisms for shared governance.
- Advising a student professional organization.
- Providing professional development opportunities for other faculty or staff.
- Involvement in special projects for the department, college, or university, work on innovative solutions to university problems.
- Participating in University discussions, forums, or other collaborations.

2. Professional Service

The *Faculty Handbook* defines Professional Service: ...*contributions to professional organizations within the faculty member's field. Professional association participation may include serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. Additionally, this may include sponsoring an active student organization, mentoring or advising, or providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching.*

3. Public Service

The *Faculty Handbook* defines Public Service for faculty as: ...*evidence of using their professional skills and expertise to serve community, state, national or international public constituents. This may take the form of op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. In this way, Faculty Members not only further the mission of public outreach, but also serve as models for their students who are encouraged to engage in similar activities.*

Public service is not an individual requirement for tenure and promotion but can be used as supporting evidence for sustained success, particularly as part of promotion to the rank of professor. Examples of activities in this category:

- Using one's professional expertise in the service of community or nonprofit organizations that exist to improve the community or the welfare of its citizens.
- Serving on boards or in a leadership capacity within community or nonprofit organizations that exist to improve the community or the welfare of its citizens.
- Using one's professional expertise to engage the public and advance the public affairs mission.
- Serving as members or volunteers in organizations that further the community or the welfare of its citizens.

4. Professional Consultation

The *Faculty Handbook* defines Public Service for faculty as: ...*providing evidence of providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs. Consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise may be included in this area.*

DESCRIPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS (RESEARCH)

Candidates are evaluated using one of two sets of criterion standards for intellectual contributions.

Criterion Standards Set A - Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In the Management Department the decision to grant tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for candidates whose initial appointment is as tenure-track Assistant Professor is a joint decision. Tenure will not be granted to candidates whose credentials fail to justify promotion to Associate Professor so the performance standards are identical. Current tenured Assistant Professors are also subject to Criterion Standards Set A when applying for promotion. See Table 10.

Criterion Standards Set B - Promotion to Full Professor and Senior Instructor

This set of standards requires candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor or Senior Instructor to meet somewhat more stringent performance expectations for **University Citizenship, Professional Service and Public Service** as described below. See Table 11.

Table 10. Criterion Standards Set A: Standards for Service for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standard
1. University Citizenship	<p>Meeting the standards of this dimension is required for tenure and promotion. Evidence of success within this dimension involves demonstrating citizenship behavior through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -attendance and participation in department and college activities and meetings -active membership in department, college, and university committees, task forces, and work groups as evaluated by the impact of the service and the attendance and the role of the candidate -active engagement with other faculty to address problems within the department, the college, and the university -Assisting colleagues with professional issues and problems -engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors through a willingness to assume roles and engage in activities necessary for faculty governance and the operation of the department, college, and university -advising student organizations <p>Candidates are expected to maintain a limited service role early in the appointment but are expected to show increased citizenship behavior and activities as time progresses including some evidence of leadership in the latter years of the appointment.</p>
2. Professional Service	<p>Meeting the standards of this dimension is required for tenure and promotion. For descriptions see Profession Engagement in Criterion Standards Set A: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor</p>
3. Public Service	<p>Public service is not required but evidence of public service activities is supporting evidence of meeting standards for the service criterion for purposes of tenure and promotion.</p>
4. Professional Consultation	<p>Meeting the standards of this dimension is not required for tenure and promotion, but can provide supporting evidence of service contributions.</p>

Table 11. Criterion Standards Set B: Standards for Service for Promotion to Professor or Senior Instructor	
Performance Dimension	Description of Performance Standard
1. University Citizenship	<p>Meeting the standards of this dimension is required for promotion. Evidence of success within this dimension involves demonstrating citizenship behavior through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -attendance and participation in department and college activities and meetings -active membership in department, college, and university committees, task forces, and work groups as evaluated by the impact of the service and the attendance and the role of the candidate -active engagement with other faculty to address problems within the department, the college, and the university -Assisting colleagues with professional issues and problems -engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors through a willingness to assume roles and engage in activities necessary for faculty governance and the operation of the department, college, and university -advising student organizations <p>Candidates are expected to show a pattern of sustained success in university citizenship through increasing engagement in activities that are of primary importance to faculty governance (such as Faculty Senate or key committees within the college or university) or through leadership in areas key to the missions of the university or college.</p>
2. Professional Service	<p>Meeting the standards of this dimension is required for promotion. For descriptions see Criterion Standards Set B: Standards for Intellectual Contributions for Promotion to senior Instructor</p>
3. Public Service	<p>Some evidence of public service is required for promotion to Professor. This might include providing service, consulting, or leadership to public or nonprofit organizations or other activities that serve to advance the public affairs mission of the University. Public service is not required for promotion to Senior Instructor, but evidence of public service activities is supporting evidence of meeting standards for the service criterion for purposes of promotion.</p>
4. Professional Consultation	<p>Meeting the standards of this dimension is not required for promotion, but can provide supporting evidence of service contributions.</p>