

**UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS**

---

**Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to provide faculty with guidance and expectations about what is necessary to be promoted and/or be granted tenure in the College of Business Administration. This document will be reviewed periodically and will evolve as the environment and the mission in which the College operates change. It should be emphasized that this document provides guidance for faculty that is both specific and general. Although some target expectations for performance are provided, it should be understood that there is flexibility in how faculty demonstrate their readiness for promotion and/or tenure. As an example, a faculty member who has fallen short of a quantitative expectation may compensate by a demonstration of high quality in that same performance dimension (teaching, research, service). It should be understood that the burden of proof that a faculty member is ready for promotion and/or tenure rests with the candidate. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a dossier of performance outcomes that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process. Specific outcomes expected from the adoption of this policy include:

- A set of expectations for faculty members so that there are few "surprises" at tenure and promotion time.
- A reduced gap between perceptions of performance often held between faculty members and administrators.
- A set of evaluation standards that are integrated with the College of Business Administration Workload Policy, thus creating expectations based on the unique workload contributions of each faculty member.
- An ongoing process for peer and Dean feedback to each faculty regarding progress toward the next rank.
- The standards for determining "Academic Qualifications" as specified in the AACSB re-accreditation process.

**Faculty in Transition**

The Dean shall meet with all current tenure-track faculty, who are progressing toward promotion and tenure decisions, and clarify expectations for promotion and tenure in light of the newly articulated promotion standards. Senior faculty will play a significant role in mentoring faculty through the promotion and tenure process.

## **Performance Dimensions**

1. The bases for faculty evaluation are teaching, scholarship, service.
2. Faculty members will be evaluated on each of these three performance dimensions independently.

## **Rating Scale**

The scale to be used in evaluation of each of the three performance dimensions shall be the following:

- a. (5) Significantly exceeds expectations in quantity or exceed expectations in quantity and quality
- b. (4) Exceeds expectations in quantity or quality
- c. (3) Meets expectations in quantity and quality
- d. (2) Below expectations
- e. (1) Significantly below expectations

## **Relative Weights of Performance Dimensions**

All performance dimensions are valued by the College and all faculty are expected to contribute in all dimensions. The relative weight of the three dimensions in developing the promotion requirements below is Teaching (40%), Research (40%), and Service (20%).

## **Promotional and Tenure Standards**

Standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor. What combination of performance dimension "scores" is required for promotion?

- a. Meeting expectations on all three performance dimensions (3-3-3) is a requirement for a decision "to continue appointment" in annual reviews. However, (3-3-3) is not sufficient for promotion.
- b. To be recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate and Full Professor, a faculty member must at least "meet expectations" (Score of 3) on all three performance dimensions. That is, a score of "2" on any one dimension will lead to a negative recommendation.
- c. Faculty members "significantly exceeding expectations" (achieving a score of 5) on all three dimensions, will be recommended for tenure and promotion.
- d. To be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure
  1. The faculty member must exceed expectations ("4") in teaching or research, exceed expectations ("4") in one of the other performance dimensions, and meet expectations ("3") in the third dimension, or
  2. The faculty member must significantly exceed expectations ("5") in teaching or research and meet expectations ("3") in the other two performance dimensions.
- e. To be recommended for promotion to Full Professor

1. The faculty member must exceed expectations in all three performance dimensions (4-4-4), or
  2. The faculty member must significantly exceed expectations ("5") in either teaching or research, exceed expectations ("4") in one other performance dimension, and meet expectations in the third dimension.
- f. To be recommended for promotion to Full Professor- Level III
1. The faculty member must exceed expectations ("4") in one performance dimension and meet expectations in the other two performance dimensions.

### **Outcome Expectations: Teaching**

The following list indicates ways in which a faculty member could demonstrate teaching competency and teaching excellence.

- A. SET's: Target Average = 4.0
- B. Demonstration that course syllabi are consistent with generic syllabi, course description, and/or area faculty developed course objectives
- C. Outcome Assessment- Evidence of the use of some form of individual evaluation to assess student learning and the degree to which course objectives are being met.
- D. Evidence of high quality feedback to students on projects, exams, and assignments designed to increase and enhance learning
- E. Innovation in teaching methods, approaches and techniques
- F. Course Development and/or Improvement
  1. Evidence of the use of continuous evaluation and improvement process
- G. Curriculum Development and Assessment
- H. Faculty Development
  1. Development of teaching techniques
  2. Dissemination of new teaching techniques
  3. Mentoring of faculty with respect to teaching
  4. Mentoring of doctoral students with respect to teaching
  5. Participating in the IDP Teaching Fellows Program
- I. Independent Student Supervision
  1. Independent/Directed studies
  2. Internships
  3. Dissertation Chair
  4. Dissertation Committee
  5. Doctoral Phase II Committee
  6. KMBA Project Advisor
  7. Master's Thesis Committee (Outside CBA)
- J. Evidence of Continuous High Quantity of Teaching
  1. Large Sections
  2. High number of new course preparations over evaluation period
- K. Evidence of Continuous High Quality Teaching (multiple forms of evidence)
  1. Consistently high SET's- considering class size, class level, class G.P.A. etc.
  2. Letters of evaluation from students, alumni and colleagues
  3. Teaching honors and awards

- 4. Evidence that instructor's students continually meet course learning objectives
- L. Development of teaching/instructional materials including, but not limited to:
  - 1. Textbooks
  - 2. Web Texts and web teaching materials
  - 3. Case studies and exercises
- M. Other indicators may be added

The following matrix of expectations shows what is required to earn each score for teaching:

**Outcome Expectations: Teaching**

<b>Performance Level</b>	<b>Research Profile</b>	<b>Standard Profile</b>	<b>Teaching Profile</b>
<b>5:</b> Exceeds expectations in Quantity & Quality	Two additional forms of evidence from list	Two additional forms of evidence from list	Two additional forms of evidence from list
<b>4:</b> Exceeds expectations in Quantity or Quality	One additional form of evidence from list	One additional form of evidence from list	One additional form of evidence from list
<b>3:</b> Meets Expectations	<b>2/2 Teaching Load</b> A: Target SET Average: 4.0 B: Generic Syllabi Compliance C: Outcome Assessment	<b>3/3 Teaching Load</b> A: Target SET Average: 4.0 B: Generic Syllabi Compliance C: Outcome Assessment F/G: Course Development or curriculum Development	<b>4/4 Teaching Load or 3/3 and Additional Significant Activity</b> A: Target SET Average: 4.0 B: Generic Syllabi Compliance C: Outcome Assessment F/G: Course Development or curriculum Development H: Faculty Development

**Outcome Expectations: Research Quantity**

Promotion to Associate Professor, Full Professor and Full Professor - Level III

<b>Performance Level</b>	<b>Research Profile</b>	<b>Standard Profile</b>	<b>Teaching Profile</b>
<b>5:</b> Significantly Exceeds Expectations in Quantity	<b>9<sup>1</sup>/4<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>6<sup>1</sup>/1<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>4<sup>1</sup>/0<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>4:</b> Exceeds Expectations in Quantity	<b>7<sup>1</sup>/3<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>5<sup>1</sup>/1<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>3<sup>1</sup>/0<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>3:</b> Meets Expectations in Quantity	<b>5<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>3<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>2<sup>1</sup></b>

Superscript legend for table:

<sup>1</sup> Number of refereed Tier B journal articles or equivalent since last promotion.

<sup>2</sup> Expected number of *target* articles.

## **Target Journals**

Journals in each discipline (including electronic journals) are to be classified as *Target*, *Tier B* or *Tier C*.

1. Target Journals: Top 10-15 journals in the field
2. Tier B Journals: All other refereed journals
3. Tier C: All non-refereed journals

The following process shall be used to identify Target Journals:

1. Area faculty will decide among themselves, in consultation with the dean, which journals are the *target* journals for their area.
2. Journals will be accepted as *target* journals subject to other forms of validation
  1. Acceptance rates
  2. Published lists
  3. Citation analysis appearing in refereed journals.
3. Other considerations:
  - a) It is important that each faculty member has a number of opportunities (at least 5) to publish in target journals. That is, the lists developed by the areas to which he or she belongs will include journals that publish her or his type of work. This may require that the total number of target journal for an area exceeds 15.
  - b) These lists will be used to evaluate future work and not evaluate past work. Therefore, faculty members will be able to make informed decisions about where to target and send their work.
  - c) The list of target journals should be fluid and evolving.

## **Evidence of high quality in research may be demonstrated by such factors as:**

1. A strong pipeline of research activity
2. Evidence of research impact (e.g., article citations)
3. Single authorship
4. Body of research establishes strong focus
5. Additional forms of scholarship not included in equivalency table
6. Higher levels of research (basic, applied, instructional)
7. Placement of articles in what are truly “top tier” journals
8. Placement of articles in journals with very low acceptance rates
9. Articles representing complex, large-scale research projects
10. High quality grants, as evidenced by such factors as: large dollar amount of grant, provision of support for graduate students, award made through a peer review process, provision of overhead for the College or grants that support a continuing program of faculty research.

## **Non-Traditional Forms of Scholarship**

Faculty members may engage in forms of scholarship that might be considered non-traditional. According to the AACSB, scholarship has two criteria: (1) it is in the public domain and (2) it is peer-reviewed. If faculty believe that they have made non-traditional contributions to scholarship

(e.g., software development), they are encouraged to present evidence of such contributions as part of their dossier, particularly evidence that provides external validation of their contributions.

**Output Equivalency Table**

	Weight
Refereed Journal Article (Tier B)	1
National/International Conference Paper	.25
External Research Grant Proposal	.5
Externally Funded Research Grant	1
Peer-Reviewed Book Chapter in Scholarly Work or Peer-Reviewed Monograph	1

**Outcome Expectations: Service**

1. The following are lists of the types of intramural and extramural service a faculty member might provide:
  - A. Intramural
    1. CBA Committee (any type)
    2. University Committee
    3. Leadership role on CBA or University committees
    4. Faculty advisor for student organizations
    5. Faculty Senate
    6. AAUP
    7. Special projects within the College or University
    8. Involvement with other University organizations (e.g., board member for University Club)
    9. Administrative positions within CBA (e.g., area coordinator, program director, etc.) or University
  - B. Extramural
    1. Involvement with professional organizations (e.g., officer, committees, paper reviewer, discussant or session chair)
    2. Volunteer work (for-profit, not-for-profit organizations, and governmental agencies)
    3. Outreach- Training/consulting

***Other items may be added to these two lists in the future.***

2. Service Output Expectations
  - A. Since the workload policy does not differentiate service expectations among workload profiles, a single set of expectations for the Research, Standard, and Teaching profile with respect to Service has been developed..
  - B. There is an expectation that all tenure track faculty participate in College activities including but not limited to attending faculty meetings, advising

students, participating in Parents Day and graduation exercises of the College's degree programs.

C. This is the Output Expectation for Service

<b>Performance Level</b>	<b>All Profiles</b>
<b>5:</b> Exceeds expectations in Quantity & Quality	1 <b>Internal</b> service activity, 1 <b>External</b> service activity and 1 <b>External or Internal</b> service activity per year
<b>4:</b> Exceeds expectations in Quantity or Quality	1 <b>Internal</b> service activity and 1 <b>External</b> service activity per year
<b>3:</b> Meets Expectations	1 college or University Committee per year

In all performance dimensions, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to compile a portfolio of accomplishments that builds the strongest possible support for his or her tenure and/or promotion. Although critical for all performance dimensions, documentation of supportive evidence is particularly important in the teaching and service components.

## APPENDIX C FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

### **Faculty Qualifications**

#### **1. Academically Qualified<sup>1</sup>**

- Must at least meet expectations (score “3”) in Research performance dimension for workload profile<sup>2</sup>

#### **2. Master’s Qualified<sup>3</sup>**

- Must at least meet expectations (Score “3”) in Research performance dimension for workload profile, or
- Must exceed expectations (Score “4” or “5”) in Teaching performance dimension for workload profile.

#### **3. Doctoral Qualified<sup>4</sup>**

- Must at least meet expectations (score “3”) in Research performance dimension for workload profile and be in Research or Standard workload profile

---

<sup>1</sup> For AACSB purposes

<sup>2</sup> See Promotion Standards

<sup>3</sup> Qualified to teach MBA and MS in Accounting courses

<sup>4</sup> Qualified to teach doctoral seminars and act as major professor in doctoral program

## APPENDIX D

### PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATION PROCESS

---

**This review and evaluation process is designed to insure that faculty members present the best possible promotional package that recognizes their unique contributions to the College and the University.**

#### **1. Review Package (dossier)**

- A. The promotion package of each faculty requesting consideration for promotion and/or tenure will comply with the format required by the provost and the faculty member will submit the dossier using the timetable set by the University for submission to the Dean.
- B. Faculty members presenting packages for promotion and tenure **may** submit a list of six academic professionals to act as “outside reviewers.”
- C. In addition to the required information, each faculty member will submit a self-rating on Teaching, Research and Service and the rationale for this rating in the form of a summary page listing supporting evidence.

#### **2. Peer Review**

- A. Reviewing Group
  1. The peer review group for each faculty member will be his or her focus area and can include an evaluation by any tenure track faculty member in the College.
  2. Each faculty member can also request an evaluation by any other focus area groups.
- B. Information obtained from peer reviews
  1. The Promotion & Tenure Committee (or an appointed sub-committee) will develop rating forms consistent with the promotion and tenure standards as stated in the policy document.
  2. These forms will ask peers for information helpful in judging such things as the quality and impact of research, the quality and impact of teaching, the extent to which courses are consistent with generic syllabi, and the quality of service.

#### **3. Committee Recommendation-** The promotion and tenure committee will provide the dean with its recommendation for promotion and/or tenure along with its score on Teaching, Research, and Service. The committee will also provide the dean with its justification and rationale for each score.

- A. Each member of the Promotion and Tenure committee will review dossiers of each faculty seeking promotion. Based on (1) material presented by the candidate, (2) peer review information, (3) outside reviewer information, and (4) professional judgment, each member will score each candidate (using the 1-5 scale) on Teaching, Research, and Service.
- B. The Promotion and Tenure committee will convene as a group to derive a committee score.
  1. If all members are in agreement, the agreed upon score will prevail
  2. If there is disagreement, committee members will discuss the candidate in an attempt to arrive at a consensus score.
  3. If the committee cannot reach a unanimous, a vote of the majority shall prevail.

#### **4. Communication of Committee Recommendation**

- A. Before the committee submits its recommendation to the dean, it will communicate its recommendation to the faculty member.

- B. If the faculty member disagrees with the committee's score and/or recommendation, he or she can request a meeting with the committee or its chair to discuss the evaluation.
- C. The committee will decide whether to amend the evaluation. Once the committee makes its decision, it will forward the recommendation to the dean.
- D. The Dean will report his or her recommendation to the Provost, to the faculty member and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

## **5. Annual Review**

Peer reviews will be conducted for annual reviews using the process outlined in #2 above before the Dean prepares a written review for the faculty member.