

**UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS
November 2005, May 2007
(Effective starting AY 2007/2008)**

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide faculty members with guidance and expectations regarding what is necessary to be promoted and/or 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 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 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 member regarding progress toward the next rank.
- The standards for determining "Academic Qualifications" as specified in the AACSB reaccreditation process.

Faculty Members in Transition

The Dean shall meet with all current tenure-track faculty members, 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. If faculty members believe that the older standards would yield a different decision than the revised standard, they can present their packages using the older standards.

Performance Dimensions

1. The bases for faculty evaluation are teaching, scholarship, and service.
2. Faculty members will be evaluated on each of these three performance dimensions independently.
3. For the purposes of promotion and annual review, the last five years will be given the greatest weight in evaluating performance

Rating Scale

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

- (5) Significantly exceeds expectations in quantity or quality or exceeds expectations in quantity and quality
- (4) Exceeds expectations in quantity or quality
- (3) Meets expectations in quantity and quality
- (2) Below expectations
- (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. 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.
- b. Faculty members "significantly exceeding expectations" (achieving a score of 5) on all three dimensions, will be recommended for tenure and promotion.
- c. 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 The faculty member must significantly exceed expectations ("5") in teaching or research and meet expectations ("3") in the other two performance dimensions.
- d. To be recommended for promotion to Full Professor the faculty member must exceed expectations in all three performance dimensions (4-4-4), or 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.
- e. 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.

Teaching Performance Evaluation

1. A peer teaching evaluation form will be used for peer evaluation (see attachment)
2. Peer will use this teaching expectations chart in rating teaching performance

Outcome Expectations: Teaching

Performance Level	Average SET's Above 4.0	Average SET's Below 4.0
5: Highly Exceeds Expectations	Highly rated in two teaching dimensions	Highly rated in three teaching dimensions
4: Exceeds Expectations	Highly rated in one teaching dimension	Highly rated in two teaching dimensions
3: Meets Expectations	Generic Syllabi Compliance Outcome Assessment	Generic Syllabi Compliance .Outcome Assessment .Highly rated in one teaching dimension

3. General rating guidelines.
 - a. Raters will check each of the items on which the ratee presents evidence of excellence.
 - b. To be *highly rated* (provides model for others) in each teaching performance dimensions, 3 checks are required for Course Design and Preparation and Presentation/Communication; 2 checks for Feedback; and 1 check for quantity and Development.

Outcome Expectations: Research Quantity

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

To meet research expectations, a faculty member is expected to produce research output equivalent to the number of RE's accumulated during the rating period. Accumulation of RE points is used solely to establish the extent to which the faculty member has met research expectations (i.e., scored at least a "3" on scale). To be rated at a higher level (Exceeds Expectations or Significantly Exceeds Expectations) evidence must be shown that the body of work is greater in quantity or quality than general expectations. See the list below for factors indicating high research performance. In some cases, faculty members who have not met quantity expectations, but have produced a body of research that is rated high in quality, may earn a rating of "3."

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 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.

The Peer Evaluation Rating Form for Research Performance found in Exhibit B will be used by peers to rate faculty members on the above listed dimensions.

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.

Performance Level	Expectation
5: Exceeds Expectations in Quantity and Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets RE expectation • Rated high on 2 research dimensions
4: Exceeds Expectations in Quantity or Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets RE expectation • Rated high on 1 research dimension
3: Meets Expectations in Quantity and Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 3 Dimensions Average • RE's greater or equal to accumulated expectation or below RE expectation and rated high on at least 1 research dimension

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 or University (e.g., area coordinator, program director, etc.)
 - 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

Service Performance Evaluation

1. Most recently, the P&T committee has asked CBA committee chairs to evaluate the contributions of members of their committees. Our committee agreed to continue and formalize this process.
2. The following set of general expectations will guide peers in making this global assessment.

Performance Level	Achievement Criteria
5: Exceeds expectations in Quantity & Quality	Faculty member regularly takes a leadership role in college, university, community, and/or professional activities.
4: Exceeds expectations in Quantity or Quality	Faculty member makes regular substantial contributions to service activities that have a positive impact of the activity's or group's output. Involved in more than just assigned committees.
3: Meets Expectations	Faculty members meets basic service expectations by participating 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; contributes to assigned CBA committees and actively participates in the annual peer review process.

3. As part of his or her review dossier, faculty members will list annual service activities, broken down as assigned or voluntary. The faculty member's contribution to these activities will also be summarized.

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.

EXHIBIT A 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. 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 Recommendations

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 decision, 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.

EXHIBIT B
College of Business Administration
Peer Review Rating Form
Summary

Candidate: _____ **Rank:** _____

Type of Review:

- Promotion to Full III Promotion to Professor Promotion to Associate Professor
Tenure Annual

Teaching Performance Summary

- Exceeds expectations in quantity and quality
- Exceeds expectations in quantity or quality
- Meets expectations
- Below expectations
- Significantly below expectations

Research Performance Summary Research Expectation _____ Research Output _____

- Exceeds expectations in quantity and quality
- Exceeds expectations in quantity or quality
- Meets expectations
- Below expectations
- Significantly below expectations

Service Performance Summary

- Exceeds expectations in quantity and quality
- Exceeds expectations in quantity or quality
- Meets expectations
- Below expectations
- Significantly below expectations

Recommendations:

- Promotion: Yes No N/A
Tenure: Yes No N/A
Re-appointment Yes No N/A

Comments

Evaluator

Print Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

EXHIBIT B
Peer Evaluation Rating Form
Teaching Performance

To meet expectations:

1. Syllabi consistent with generic syllabi, course descriptions and faculty developed course objectives
2. Provides evidence of course modification based on some form of outcome assessment of student learning.

To exceed expectations, evidence of the following should be considered:

Course Design and Preparation

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Provides Model for Others

- Demonstrates mastery and current knowledge of subject area
- Courses are structured to meet class objectives as established in course descriptions
- Evaluation and feedback methods are consistent with stated course objectives
- Course expectations are clearly communicated
- Participates in course or curricula development
- Participates in the design, development, improvement or dissemination of teaching techniques and methods
- Courses build on prerequisites and expected knowledge
- Other _____

Presentation/Communication

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Provides Model for Others

- Uses innovative teaching methods, approaches and techniques
- Establishes positive rapport with students
- Lectures are stimulating and thought provoking
- Uses a variety of teaching techniques
- Encourages questions and discussion in class
- Available to students outside of class
- Provides multiple forms of information dissemination (texts, handouts, web pages, etc.)
- Other _____

Feedback on Student Performance

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Provides Model for Others

- Presents evidence of high-quality feedback on projects, assignments, and exams designed to increase and enhance student learning
- Feedback is consistent, fair, related to stated grading criteria
- Feedback is timely
- Maintains high and rigorous standards
- Other _____

EXHIBIT B
Peer Evaluation Rating Form
Teaching Performance

Teaching Quantity

N/A

Needs
Improvement

Meets
Expectations

Provides
Model for
Others

- Activity involved in the direction of independent studies, doctoral committees, student projects, thesis work, or dissertation work
- Consistently teaches large sections (over 130 students per semester)
- Consistently teaches courses involving new preparations
- Other _____

**Development of Teaching
Excellence of Others**

N/A

Needs
Improvement

Meets
Expectations

Provides
Model for
Others

- Participates in the design, development, improvement or dissemination of teaching techniques and methods
- Provides guidance to new faculty members and/or doctoral students in the area of teaching
- Other _____

EXHIBIT B
Peer Evaluation Rating Form
Research Performance

Quantitative Guidelines:

Research Expectation _____ Number of Research Equivalents _____

Evaluation of the Quality and Quantity of Scholarly Contributions

Research Quantity

N/A Below Expectations Meets Expectations Exceeds Expectations

- Produces more than research expectation
- Type of research requires more time and effort than normal
- Publications report on complex, involved and/or large scale research projects
- Major contributor to multi-authored papers
- Taken a leadership role on multi-authored papers
- High percentage of single authored papers
- A strong pipeline of research activity
- Additional forms of scholarship not included in equivalency table
- Other _____

Research Impact

N/A Low Impact Average Impact High Impact

- Provides evidence that his/her work is cited by others
- Provides evidence that work has impacted an area of a field of study
- Provides evidence that work has impacted professional practice
- Has established a regional or national reputation in an area of study
- Provides evidence that work is focused on important area in field.
- Provides evidence that current research builds on past research findings
- Other _____

Research Quality

N/A Low Quality Average Quality High Quality

- Higher levels of research (basic, applied, instructional)
- Placement of articles in journals with very low acceptance rates
- 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.
- Other _____

Overall Scoring Guidelines:

Performance Level	Expectation
5: Exceeds Expectations in Quantity and Quality	Two High Dimensions
4: Exceeds Expectations in Quantity or Quality	One High Dimension
3: Meets Expectations in Quantity and Quality	All 3 Dimensions Average and RE's greater or equal to accumulated expectation

EXHIBIT B
Peer Evaluation Rating Form
Service Performance

Check One	Performance Level	All Profiles
	5: Exceeds expectations in Quantity & Quality	Faculty member regularly takes a leadership role in college, university, community, and/or professional activities.
	4: Exceeds expectations in Quantity or Quality	Faculty member makes regular substantial contributions to service activities that have a positive impact of the activity's or group's output. Involved in more than assigned committees.
	3: Meets expectations	Faculty members meets basic service expectations by participating 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; contributes to assigned CBA committees and actively participates in the annual peer review process.
	2: Below Expectations	Assigned committees only with little contribution to those committees
	1: Significantly below expectations	Very little or no service

Comments: