

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REVIEW POLICIES
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY
2013-14

I. INTRODUCTION

The Mission of the School of Accountancy (SOA) is to become a center of excellence for accounting education and associated activities. The goals of the School are designed to develop excellence in faculty, curriculum, students, continuing education, and resources. All faculty activities that materially advance those goals contribute to faculty credentials for appointment, for promotion, for tenure, and for periodic review.

Appointment, promotion, tenure, and review policies of the School of Accountancy are constrained to be consistent with the *Faculty Handbook*, and with other University policies. The School's policies also are consistent with those of the College of Business (CoB). In cases of conflict, *Faculty Handbook* policies are followed in all cases.

Both the initial contract with the University and annual role negotiation with the School Director present opportunities for role specialization to each faculty member. Both Director and Peer evaluation of a faculty member must be on a basis consistent with that faculty member's role as determined by these two factors. Nevertheless, the *Faculty Handbook* clearly requires performance in all of the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service as prerequisite to tenure and to promotions. Therefore, roles of those faculty with an interest in tenure or in promotion must be negotiated with the School Director in such a way as to permit demonstration of acceptable levels of performance in all three areas.

II. COMMITTEES

The Tenure Committee of the School of Accountancy shall consist of all tenured faculty of the School except for those acting in a university administrative appointment, those who have been officially notified of termination for reasons other than retirement, and those who are currently under sanction. Faculty are expected to serve, but shall abstain from any evaluation that involves a conflict of interest. The Committee is also responsible for annual appointment recommendations and for the annual review of untenured faculty that occur each year during the probationary period. The Promotion Committee shall consist of the Tenure Committee reduced by those faculty of rank below that for which the candidate is applying and those upon whose applications the Committee would be acting.

III. PROCESSES

All processes shall follow the schedule and adhere to the deadlines published by the Provost's office. The candidate's application will be presented to the chair of the Committee, who will undertake security of the application dossier. The Committee will make the original recommendation in all cases involving promotion, tenure, or appointment. If there is a split vote among the tenured faculty, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the

minority, which will be forwarded with the majority recommendation.

For Appointment: The candidate shall initiate the annual appointment process, submitting relevant materials to the chair of the Tenure Committee at a date specified by the Committee. The Committee will make the initial recommendation and forward it to the Director, who will then add his/her recommendation and forward both to the Dean. The Director shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the Committee. Copies of Committee and Director recommendations shall be provided to the candidate, who must acknowledge by signature receipt of the Committee's and the Director's recommendations before forwarding can occur.

For Pre-Tenure Review: During each spring of the probationary period, the School Director and the Tenure Committee will each conduct a pre-tenure review, and each will specify in writing to the probationary faculty member one of the following three outcomes.

- That progress toward tenure is satisfactory.
- That progress toward tenure is questionable, identifying areas for improvement and providing specific suggestions.
- That progress toward tenure is unsatisfactory, providing specific rationale.

This review will constitute that year's regular performance review for the probationary faculty member. Copies will be maintained by the School and forwarded to the Dean.

For Tenure or Promotion: When a faculty member submits application for promotion or tenure, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly review. Such evaluation will be based upon the departmental statement of expectations provided by the faculty member upon employment and upon the regular yearly reviews, as well as the documentation presented by the candidate.

External reviewers are required for all tenure and promotion decisions. External reviewers will primarily assist in the evaluation of research and scholarship. Reviewers will be identified and selected by the Director of the School of Accountancy in consultation with the candidate. The Director may also consult the Tenure and/or Promotion Committee to assist in reviewer selection. Selection of reviewers will follow guidelines published by the Office of the Provost. Reviews provided by external reviewers will become part of the candidate's dossier. External reviewers should be faculty members at AACSB accredited institutions that would generally be considered peer institutions (or above).

Faculty applying for tenure will be evaluated according to their performance in accumulated assignments since employment at Missouri State University and when applicable, in accumulated assignments at other institutions for which credit equivalent to service at Missouri State University was granted. Faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. Each faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established deadlines.

The Committee will give to the candidate a copy of its recommendation and the written rationale therefore. At each subsequent stage of evaluation, beginning with that by the School Director, a copy of the recommendation and a probative rationale therefore will be furnished to the candidate and to the Committee for its information and records. Confidentiality of information must be maintained throughout the entire process. Committee members assume personal responsibility to ensure that confidentiality is not violated.

IV. EVIDENCE

Each year in late spring or early summer, every faculty member will discuss with the Director (1) the results of prior performance and (2) objectives for forthcoming performance. Where progressive performance expectations are pertinent, these will be specifically addressed. The results of this meeting will be summarized in writing and placed in the School personnel file, with copies provided to the faculty member and to the appropriate Committee as required for promotion, tenure, or appointment recommendations.

Teaching: Quality teaching is the most important responsibility of faculty members in the SOA. For tenure and promotion, faculty members must provide evidence of effective teaching. This evidence should include documentation that the faculty member is remaining current in the field (maintaining academic or professional qualifications). Other documentation of effective teaching must be presented by the candidate to establish teaching effectiveness. The evaluation of teaching must be based on a variety of evidence. No more than 50% should depend on student evaluations. Rather, student evaluations shall be used in combination with other evidence to develop a balanced assessment of teaching performance. The examples of evidence provided below are intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence to support quality teaching.

- *Self-Evaluation* submitted by the candidate should include a portfolio containing course syllabi, policy statements, samples of assignments, samples of examinations, representative samples of work turned in by students. It may also include evidence of significant course or curriculum development, evidence of instructional methods development, evidence of instructional technology utilization, on-line course information, and evidence of academic and career advising. Finally, it may include evidence of continuing professional education, advanced study, certificates earned, and honors and awards for teaching.
- *Student Evaluation* materials may include summary means, ratings on individual items, and written comments by students.
- *Peer Evaluations* may include honors and awards for teaching, reports of classroom observation, reviews of course materials, reviews of video tapes of classroom presentations, and reviews of online course materials.
- *Scholarship of Teaching* may include publications and presentations related to teaching.

It may also include evidence of cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations, direction of theses or special projects, and service on thesis committees.

- *Learning Outcome Measures* may be supplied if they provide evidence for learning in courses taught by the candidate. Examples include instructor-administered pretests-posttests.
- *Administrator Provided Indicators* may include the Director's assessment of the candidate's availability to students, participation in curricular development, and appropriate use of instructional technology.

Scholarship/Research: As the School supports the Master of Accountancy program and other CoB graduate degrees and as the School holds separate accounting accreditation from AACSB International (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), the scholarship of discovery is recognized as an essential element of the School's mission and a valued contribution by any candidate. Examples include the following:

- Scholarly monographs or books that advance understanding.
- Original research findings published in scholarly journals.
- Successful grant applications for research.
- Presentations of original research findings.

The scholarship of integration and the scholarship of application are essential elements of the School's mission to support business and economic development and a valued contribution by any candidate. Examples include:

- Published textbooks summarizing existing research.
- Published professional or applied research journal articles.
- Published literature reviews or position papers.
- Published research protocols.
- Published bibliographies.
- Published critical reviews of scholarly projects.
- Successful grant applications for applied research.
- Presentations of integrative or applied research.

The scholarship of teaching is recognized as an essential element of the School's mission and an essential element of every teaching candidate's performance. Evidence of this form of scholarship is necessary, but it alone is not sufficient for tenure and for promotions. Examples include:

- Scholarly presentations to campus-based or community groups.
- Designing and refining media of expression.
- Improving the effectiveness of one's own teaching through seeking and using peer and

student feedback.

- Assessing effectiveness of new learning technologies for teaching one's own courses.
- Preparing, compiling, and disseminating custom texts, reading packages, and/or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
- Successful grant applications for developing or enhancing one's own courses.

Additional evidence of scholarship may include: paper and manuscript submissions, book chapters completed, and honors and awards.

Both the quantity and the quality of scholarship are to be evaluated. Evidence of quality includes evidence of the perceived quality of journals in which the candidate has published, evidence of citation of the candidate's work by other scholars, and letters of support from recognized scholars in the candidate's discipline including letters from external reviewers.

Service: Evidence should be provided for both internal and external service activities. Each candidate is expected to participate actively in the shared governance structure of the University by serving on School, College, and/or University committees and by assuming an appropriate share of requisite duties. Evidence for internal service activity may also include advising active student organizations, establishing opportunities for student learning experiences, removing barriers to learning, and obtaining funding and other resources to support teaching and scholarship. The University's emphasis on public affairs requires that the candidate's service to the community be recognized and rewarded. External service activity includes participating in professional organizations and public bodies, and providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, and community organizations. Documentation of external service should include evidence of centrality of the service to the discipline of the faculty member, the value of the contribution, the amount of time and energy invested, and assessment of outcomes.

V. CRITERIA

General: Statements of criteria regarding expected, above expected, and excellent performance for each area of evaluation establish minimum expectations for being considered for a given level of performance. For example, at a minimum, an applicant must meet CoB guidelines for being "academically" or "professionally qualified" to be considered for an "expected" rating in research. Meeting these guidelines is in no way a guarantee of tenure or promotion. In all cases, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain and document achievement of a certain level of performance.

Teaching: Expected performance is achieved by meeting all *Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria, providing an expected self-evaluation portfolio and achieving expected student evaluations. An expected portfolio is one that provides substantial evidence of competence in courses taught. Expected student evaluations using the 1-5 scale of the instrument currently in use, will generally include a long-term average overall evaluation no lower than 3.80 **or** no lower than 0.25 below the average overall evaluations of all faculty in

courses actually taught by the candidate. Absence of such an overall average evaluation creates a refutable presumption that evaluations are unacceptable. A candidate may rebut the presumption of unacceptability by arguments based on the facts and circumstances of his or her teaching experience.

Above expected performance is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least three ways; including, but not limited to, the following:

providing a high quality teaching portfolio, achieving unusually high student evaluations, substantial evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching, substantial course development activity, substantial curriculum development activity, support of graduate theses, substantial student advisement, substantial contribution to the public affairs mission, innovative use of instructional technology, and development of internet courses.

Excellent performance is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed in the above paragraph.

Research: In general, expected performance in research is minimally achieved by publishing five-peer reviewed articles in six years.

Above expected performance is minimally achieved by exceeding that standard with at least six peer-reviewed articles in six years. The number of publications represents minimum expectations and in no way is a guarantee of tenure or promotion.

As the quality of intellectual contributions also plays a role in tenure and promotion decisions, the publication of a lesser number of articles of high quality can provide qualitative evidence of expected or above expected performance. For example, publications in journals of the American Accounting Association might provide qualitative evidence of a given level of performance even though the total number of articles might be less than the minimum.

Excellent performance may be demonstrated by exceeding above expected performance qualitatively, quantitatively, or in combination. Examples of evidence for excellent performance might include (1) publication of three articles in five years, at least two of which are in AAA journals or other academic journals of similar quality; (2) a diversified portfolio of at least ten publications and presentations in a five year period that includes at least seven published articles of acceptable quality; (3) meeting both the qualitative and the quantitative tests for above expected performance.

Service: Expected performance includes service to the School and participation in relevant professional societies. Above expected performance extends beyond expected performance to include significant service to the College or the University, and either significant activity in professional societies or significant community service. Excellent performance extends beyond expected performance to include leadership roles in internal and in external service. Internal leadership roles include holding offices in faculty governance and chairing of College or University committees. External leadership roles include holding offices in professional

societies and holding office or board positions in community organizations.

VI. STANDARDS

Annual Appointment of untenured faculty requires expected performance in the areas of assigned responsibility: teaching, research, and service.

Promotion to Assistant Professor requires above expected performance in teaching or research and at least expected performance in the other two categories.

Tenure requires above expected performance in teaching or research and at least expected performance in the other two categories.

Promotion to Associate Professor requires above expected performance in two categories and at least expected performance in the third.

Promotion to Professor requires excellent performance in teaching or research and at least above expected performance in the other two categories.

Promotion to Distinguished Professor requires a record of “extraordinary accomplishments” in research and a sustained record of excellence in teaching and service. (FH 3.4.4). Distinguished professor is a rank above professor and thus requires sustained performance that significantly exceeds that required for promotion to professor.

Early tenure and/or promotion require that the candidate significantly exceed performance expectations. For example, a candidate who wishes to be considered for early tenure should generally provide evidence of excellent performance in either teaching or research and above expected performance in the other (and at least expected performance in service). Examples of excellent performance for teaching and research are provided in Section V of this document. Achievement of the necessary performance levels for tenure or promotion is not in and of itself a condition sufficient for early tenure or promotion.

VII. Senior Instructor

A faculty member who holds the rank of Instructor may apply for promotion to Senior Instructor after completing at least four years of full-time at Missouri State University. Instructors must minimally meet the following qualifications for promotion to Senior Instructor.

- Receive average annual performance ratings of “Commendable” or “Excellent” in teaching as defined in the SOA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines that are currently used for annual faculty evaluation.
- Have an average annual performance rating of at least “Competent” in both research and

service as defined in the Evaluation Guidelines.

- The candidate at all times during the service period must maintain “Professionally” or “Academically” qualified status as established by the COB and/or the SOA.

The above qualifications are minimum expectations for promotion to Senior Instructor and meeting the qualifications is not a guarantee of promotion. The candidate must provide documentation and evidence of satisfactory performance. As instructors are hired primarily to teach, there is a realization that research and service expectations may differ significantly from those of tenure-track faculty.

VII. AMENDMENT

Any tenured faculty member may propose amendments to this policy at any faculty meeting of the School of Accountancy. No faculty member is excluded from debate on proposed amendments, but adoption requires affirmative votes by a majority of the tenured faculty. Amendments take effect in the academic year immediately following the year of their adoption.

Last date of review/modification November 2013