

REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION,
AND TENURE

Proposed to the Management Faculty of the UC College of Business
Approved, May 12, 2009

Based upon:

RPT document adopted by faculty June 5, 1984; amended 1989; supplemented by
proposed revision 1999, and field service document proposed January, 2006.

Table of Contents
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Reviews

Preface

- Applicability
- Intent
- Inputs

Summary Sheet

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures

- Requirements
- Measures

Teaching

- Procedures
- Teaching Standards
- Technical Competence & Practical Expertise Scale
- Pedagogical Expertise Scale
- Overall (CRPT) Teaching Evaluation

Research and Scholarly Writing

- Procedures
- Research Standard Listing Form
- Research Standards
- Other Scholarly Writings
- Publication Quality Scale
- Overall (CRPT) Research/Scholarly Writing Evaluation

College and Professional Service

- Procedures
- Service Standards
- Service Quality Scale
- Overall (CRPT) Service Evaluation

Amendment

- Reappointment and Promotion of “Qualified” Faculty

PREFACE

The college and departmental committees for reappointment, promotion and tenure shall be known as the CRPT and DRPT committees, respectively. Upon initiation by the candidate, it is their responsibility to review for "reappointments", as well as promotion and tenure decisions, and inform reappointment candidates whether their progress to date is acceptable or not. Copies of these reviews, as well as of their annual written reviews by their department heads (DH), must accompany their files for later reappointments, promotion, or tenure.

It is the assumption throughout this document that the primary responsibility for thorough evaluation and RPT recommendations rests with the candidate's department, not the CRPT. This RPT procedure has been designed to be a non-adversarial process. The role of the CRPT is viewed as that of an "equalizer" in the CoB: to oversee, check, and balance the CoB departments.

Applicability

This document will apply to all faculty:

- 1) who either start employment (or are once promoted) after the passage of this document (June 5, 1984), or
- 2) who choose to be evaluated on the basis of this document. and in all events,
- 3) after the passage of three years (i.e., after 2009).

Intent

It is the intent of this document to:

- Add flexibility to the RPT process while avoiding game/number playing. It should be borne in mind that in spite of all criteria specified herein, there always exist exceptions for extraordinary circumstances.
- Include research and teaching as major factors in the RPT evaluations for tenure track faculty, since the CoB offers both doctoral and bachelor's degrees.
- Include teaching, service, and AQ/PQ status maintenance in the RP evaluations for field service faculty.
- Reward quality of effort, particularly if sustained over the long term, such as the clear existence of outstanding teaching, or a "thrust" in a particular area of research. The candidate must understand that promotion and tenure are always granted, never "earned".
- Reward collaboration on research, as indicated by co-authorship of publication, while still recognizing the strength of the candidate as displayed by sole-authored research.
- Discourage excess service activity by untenured faculty.

- Strongly encourage service activity on the part of tenured faculty.
- Ensure that RPT decisions are based solely on academic criteria rather than other criteria, such as supply or demand in the field.

Inputs

Necessary inputs to be provided the Provost from the Dean, the DH, and the CRPT and DRPT committees are:

- A cover letter summarizing the candidate's qualifications and the recommendations of the Dean, the two RPT committees and the Department Head. (Dean)
- The DH's recommendation. (DH)
- The candidate's vita, including citation of refereed publications, and self-evaluation. (Candidate)
- The RPT criteria and the CRPT and DRPT reports describing how the candidate fared on these criteria. (CRPT, DRPT)
- A ranking of the journals and a DRPT assessment of the contributions to the discipline made by the candidate's publications. (DRPT)

It should be remembered that the DH, the DRPT, the CRPT, and the Dean's recommendations are only that – it is the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees who make the RPT decision. Satisfying the requirements of this document is no guarantee of receiving RP or T, and not satisfying the requirements does not guarantee being refused RP or T either. Historically, however, meeting or exceeding the college RPT requirements has fared well for candidate.

Summary Sheet: Tenure Track Faculty

	DRPT	CRPT	Assoc Prof Requirement	Full Prof Requirement
Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical competence and practical expertise • Pedagogical expertise • Overall 				
Research and Scholarly Writing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Overall 				
College and Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Overall 			40 (min/max)	50 (min)
Overall Sum			165**	200

Summary Sheet: Field Service Faculty

	DRPT	CRPT	Assoc Prof Requirement	Full Prof Requirement
Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical competence and practical expertise • Pedagogical expertise • Overall 				
College and Professional Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality • Overall 				
Maintenance of AQ/PQ Status			40 (min/max)	50 (min)
Overall Sum			165**	200

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Requirements

Tenure-track Faculty. The requirements for promotion to Associate Professor, and tenure, are a value of 50 (or more, as specified by the department) on the Overall (CRPT) Teaching Evaluation scale, 50 (or more, as specified by the department) on the Overall (CRPT) Research/Scholarly Writing Evaluation scale, 40 on the Overall (CRPT) Service Evaluation scale, and a Summary Sheet "Overall" total of 165 (of which no more than 40 will accrue from the service category). The requirements for promotion to full Professor are an overall value of 50 (or more, as specified by the department) in teaching, 70 (or more, as specified by the department) in research, 50 in service, and an "Overall" total of 200.

Field Service Faculty. The requirements for promotion to Associate Field Service Professor are a value of 50 (or more, as specified by the department) on the Overall (CRPT) Teaching Evaluation scale, 50 (or more, as specified by the department) on the Overall (CRPT) Service Evaluation scale, 40 for the maintenance of AQ/PQ status (see AQ/PQ document, adopted by the College of Business, February, 2009), and a Summary Sheet "Overall" total of 165. The requirements for promotion to full Field Service Professor are an overall value of 60 (or more, as specified by the department) in teaching, 60 (or more, as specified by the department) in service, 50 for the maintenance of AQ/PQ status, and an "Overall" total of 200.

The difference between the "Overall" score and the sum of the category scores (a total of 25 for Associate Professor and 30 for full Professor) is intended to allow tradeoffs between areas so the candidate can emphasize his/her own strengths.

The requirements for reappointment are the demonstration of visible progress toward meeting the promotion and tenure requirements. At the first reappointment this would include the completion of the dissertation and submission of at least one manuscript to one of the higher quality journals in the candidate's field.

Measures

This document uses behaviorally anchored rating scales with intentionally unbounded maxima at a value of 100. Every ten points includes sample descriptors of behavior the candidate could be expected to exhibit at that level, but may not have actually demonstrated. These descriptors are multidimensional and are intended to aid the rater in evaluating the candidate. Clearly, candidates will typically rate at a variety of levels among these various descriptors, centered about some mean that represents the bulk of the evidence on the candidate. That level, where the candidate "nets out", should be the score the candidate receives on that scale.

TEACHING

Student learning is the heart of the College of Business. Quality teaching is critical to this process. For the purposes of this document, teaching is defined broadly, encompassing program and curriculum development, creation and/or implementation of pedagogical innovations, assessment of student learning, advising of students, managing and evaluating of field study experiences (typically BBA, MBA), guiding of programs of study (typically MS and Ph.D.), involvement of students in the process of knowledge creation, and design and delivery of coursework in undergraduate, graduate, and executive programs. Enthusiasm for subject matter, evidencing concern and respect for students, demonstrating accessibility and integrity in all interactions, and being committed to and skilled at connecting students and subject matter are also aspects of teaching quality.

Because of the fluid and dynamic nature of the teaching process, evidence of effectiveness must be collected over time from multiple sources in order to provide an in-depth assessment of teaching accomplishments. Exemplary teachers are those who create intellectual excitement through the clarity of their presentations while adhering to rigorous standards of content validity. Exemplary teachers are skilled at communicating in ways that increase student motivation, enjoyment, and independent learning.

All faculty are expected to provide students with a stimulating learning experience both inside and outside the formal classroom. This section of the RPT document provides two basic forms of guidance for evaluating a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. First, it outlines several important sources of information that may be used for assessment purposes and, second, it presents guidelines for assessing these sources of information.

Procedures

As a dynamic process, teaching is best assessed in multiple ways over time. It is the candidate's responsibility to gather, maintain, and reflect upon information pertaining to teaching effectiveness. This information should be used, with supporting documentation, to develop a coherent statement of teaching philosophy and accomplishments. Candidates are responsible to shape their presentation so that their pedagogical vision and accomplishments are neither lost nor obscured by unrelated documents. It is important to be selective and include only those items most appropriate for communicating these accomplishments to others.

The candidate is responsible, in conjunction with the DH and DRPT, for securing the necessary information and documentation to be used in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Each of the three categories below should receive attention and supporting documentation with examples. The listing below offers representative items for each category; is not meant to be complete or prescriptive.

Sources of Information

A. Products of good teaching

1. Textbooks and associated support material
2. Examples of student-written materials (e.g., graded papers, essays, journals, and student-published works or activities)
3. Information about the effect of course content and methods on student career choices or employment
4. Examples of student projects (e.g., videos, business or marketing plans, presentations, practicums)
5. Results of professional certification exams
6. Evidence of helping others enhance their teaching
7. Examples of student growth (e.g., pre/post scores, enhanced performance)
8. Results of activities that foster higher-level thinking skills (decision making, problem solving and /or application, and evaluation of material presented in class)
9. Evidence of successful internships or practice

B. Philosophy, methods, and materials

1. Statement of teaching philosophy and of beliefs about teaching and learning processes
2. Evidence of careful course planning and preparation (e.g., syllabi and how syllabi support the teaching/learning process)
3. Description of materials the candidate has written about teaching or materials that s/he has studied concerning teaching strategies or research findings
4. Samples of teaching materials or strategies (e.g., current publications, videos, texts, transparencies, guest speakers, simulations, handouts, study guides, field trips, computer-assisted instruction materials, assignments, cases, one-on-one or group-help sessions, individualized learning packets, interaction techniques) and rationale for their use
5. Descriptions that illustrate the what, how, and why of the candidate's teaching and the value of those aspects to student learning and retention of that learning
6. List of new courses developed or recent courses taught (e.g., title, number, enrollment, grade distribution) and brief description of the way the courses were taught)
7. Evidence of involvement in organizations concerned with teaching effectiveness, research efforts linked directly to teaching (e.g., creative teaching grants, classroom research), and contributions to or editing of professional journals on teaching
8. Self-evaluations of teaching (e.g., use of self-assessment instruments or videos) and a description of the candidate's availability to students (e.g., advising, help sessions, counseling)
9. Description of steps the candidate has taken to evaluate and improve her/his

teaching. These steps might include workshops, seminars, classroom research, readings, evaluations (peer, mid-term, student, self), and changes made in the candidate's teaching resulting from these inputs. The description might also include efforts to implement new ideas or obtain instructional development grants

10. Innovative use of communication technologies

C. Information from others

1. Statements from colleagues who have examined the candidate's teaching materials
2. Documentation from colleagues regarding the candidate's effectiveness in cooperative activities such as curriculum development, related committee work, and team-teaching experiences
3. Formal and informal evaluations of good teaching behaviors or student reactions to course planning and instruction (student, peer, alumni, consultant). Benchmarks for interpretation are useful.
4. Results of student surveys, exit interviews, or questionnaires
5. Letters describing the candidate's effective teaching behaviors or that reflect upon the quality of her/his teaching
6. Evidence of the successful development and use of innovative teaching materials, technologies, or strategies, including research and publication on teaching
7. Identification of awards or honors the candidate has received for teaching or teaching-related activities

Based on these information sources, and taking into consideration the types of courses taught (elective vs. required, graduate vs. undergraduate, seminar vs. mass lecture, etc.), the DH will prepare a memorandum which includes a written summary evaluation of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the teaching area. This evaluation will include an overall assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

All documentation should then be reviewed by the DRPT. The DRPT will make summary judgments on two basic dimensions of the candidate's teaching performance: "technical competence & practical experience", and "pedagogical expertise", as described further below. The DRPT's evaluations will be supplemented by a written rationale for the ratings given. All documentation should be included as part of the candidate's review file and passed on to the CRPT.

Teaching Standards

For tenure-track faculty, an Overall (CRPT) rating of 50 or more is required for the candidate to be eligible for promotion and tenure at both Associate and Full Professor Ranks. This summary judgment should be justified in writing by the CRPT. For field service faculty, an Overall (CRPT) rating of 50 or more is required for the candidate to be eligible for promotion to the Associate Field Service, and 60 or more for promotion to

the Full Field Service, rank. For Field Service Faculty, an overall (CRPT) rating of 50 or more is expected for a candidate to be reappointed.

Technical Competence & Practical Expertise Scale

This dimension of teaching effectiveness includes an evaluation of the candidate's knowledge of the content area and ability to understand fundamental issues in that area. Competence and expertise would also encompass such factors as an awareness of new technical developments and being in touch with the mainstream research and current practical problems in the field. These factors may be assessed to determine whether the candidate is maintaining his/her technical expertise in the subject matter area. The following descriptors are typical of what could be expected of the candidate, though they may not have been exhibited.

100 Candidate is a noted national authority in the area. Is involved in virtually every new trend and development in the field. Demonstrates high competence in the classroom. Can answer questions without hesitation by drawing on knowledge and experience. Comments are insightful, well thought out.

90 Has a depth of practical experience to draw on. Often corrects textbook and expands on the topics. Knows all minor details. An expert on history of the field. Is extremely involved in development of the field.

80 Knows the subjects in the field in detail; can give dozens of references on the subjects. Highly conversant on current events in the area. Participates in development of the field. Can answer any question about subject area. Valuable practical experience.

70 Strives to stay abreast of new developments in the field. Well read, knowledgeable in subject areas. Some useful practical experience in recent past.

60 Well informed about the field. Knows of most of the current developments in the field. Can tie theory and practice together generally. Some practical experience.

50 Relatively informed about field. Aware of many of the current developments. Can answer questions about subjects, but with little elaboration. Some practical experience, but dated.

40 Poorly informed about the field. Aware of very few current developments. Can answer most questions about field. Little practical experience.

30 Barely informed about current events in the field. Material is dated. Dwells on insignificant aspects of field. Minimal practical experience.

Pedagogical Expertise Scale

This dimension includes all aspects of teaching effectiveness that deal with course content and classroom delivery. Factors assessed in this dimension should encompass the candidate's organization of material, communication effectiveness, speaking ability, and the ability to spark and maintain the interest of students. The descriptors below are typical of what the candidate could be expected to demonstrate, though they may not have actually been exhibited.

100 Well known by students as outstanding. Superior reputation. Holds students' attention through very complex material. Class session plans are well organized and executed. Sensitive to class responses and relates material to audience needs and interests. A highly sought-out speaker. Students rarely miss class. Is enthusiastic about material and motivates students to get involved with the subject.

90 Stimulating, provocative speaker. Well known by students as one of the better teachers. Excellent use of media.

80 One of the better, more respected teachers. Students report favorably on presentation of material, interest in the subject.

70 A well-respected, very effective teacher. Students consistently evaluate highly. Speaks well, maintains interest in the subject.

60 Quite effective teacher. Good organization, delivery. Watches class time; doesn't rush to finish.

50 Typical college-level teacher. Effective in class. Typical organization and delivery. Usually maintains the students' interest.

40 Less effective teacher. Rushes to complete lecture. Uses some media but little. Students have trouble taking notes, understanding point of lecture.

30 Weak teacher. Uses no media. Lectures somewhat confused. Talks about irrelevant personal experiences. Gets off topic. Frequent student complaints.

Overall (CRPT) Teaching Evaluation

This category combines the two previous categories: technical competence & practical expertise, and pedagogical expertise. The following descriptors are typical of what the candidate could be expected to demonstrate, though they may not have actually been exhibited.

100 Super-star instructor; highest competence in area; wide reputation outside the university, as well as throughout the student body. Novel teaching

approaches. Students fight to get space in class. Top evaluations.

90 Excellent teacher, widely respected. Well organized, highly stimulating. Uses media, humor effectively. Very high evaluations. Knows the field.

80 Very good teacher. Students always pleased with courses. Good delivery, organized, relevant. Highly conversant in the field. Has useful interchange with students; maintains interest. High evaluations.

70 Good speaker, well prepared, knowledgeable in the subject area. Up to date, approachable by students. Motivates students to learn. Exhibits enthusiasm and interest in subject. Very good evaluations.

60 Above average teacher. Quite effective, well informed, stimulating. Good evaluations.

50 Typical good teacher. Effective, good delivery, interesting. Can answer questions but with little expansion.

40 Acceptable performance, in general, but a few problems in some aspects. Aware of a few current developments in the area. Somewhat weak evaluations.

30 Weak teacher. Significant number of problems. Needs special training. Puts little effort into teaching. Poor evaluations. Dwells on insignificant aspects of the field.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WRITING

Strong evidence of quality research and writing is an essential element of the CoB RPT standards for tenure-track faculty; field service faculty are not evaluated on the basis of research and scholarly writing except to the extent that it relates to their AQ/PQ status. Thus, there is no separate evaluation of research and scholarly writing, but there is an evaluation of the field service faculty's maintenance of AQ/PQ status. A broad spectrum of research and writing is recognized as long as such enhances the academic respect of the candidate, the CoB, and the University of Cincinnati.

Note that the emphasis of this research component is on scholarly contributions that advance the state of knowledge. Other types of writing activities will generally be considered as "Other Scholarly Writings" (or may be placed, 'if desired, in the teaching or service categories), separate from the standards for research.

Procedures

It is the responsibility of the candidate, in cooperation with the DH and the DRPT, to secure the appropriate documents described below:

1. DRPT will divide the candidate's list of all research and writing into two separate lists. The first list will contain at least the research standards required by the CoB for promotion and tenure-at the appropriate rank. (See "Research Standards" below.) Generally, this first list will contain the research contributions of the candidate and will not include unrefereed reports or writings. The second list will contain other scholarly writings that the candidate and/or DRPT feel add to the overall research component of the candidate's evaluation.

2. The quality of the research contributions of the candidate (first list) must be evaluated, described, and quality rated (see scale further below) by the DH in the DH evaluation letter. This evaluation must be supported both by internal peer evaluations as well as external peer evaluations. Outside evaluations should be obtained as follows:

The candidate should identify four top researchers or academicians in his/her field who are not close friends or mentors of the candidate (e.g., do not identify past dissertation advisors) and submit these to the DR, who will select from these at least two and add a sufficient number of his/her own choice to obtain a final response from at least three outside reviewers. Evaluations from journal editors, members of editorial boards, and respected scholars are especially desirable. Each of these reviewers is to receive whatever materials the DR and candidate feel are necessary to make an evaluation. All resulting evaluations, positive and negative, are to be included in the candidate's files. This procedure should commence at least some 50 to 60 days before RPT documents are to be turned in to the CRPT.

3. The DRPT is to then review all documentation and determine if the research standards have been met.' Secondly, a quality rating of each of these publications of the candidate is to be determined on the "Publication Quality Value" scale in the Form below. Finally, the DRPT will determine a composite quality rating for the publications and enter this value on the Summary Sheet.

Research Standard Listing Form

Title (give full reference)	Publication Quality Value
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. An "Overall" rating will be assigned to the candidate's research component by the CRPT, considering both the quantity and quality of the candidate's research, as well as the factors described below:

- a. Consistent, long term research behavior is to be given more consideration than short term bursts of activity.
- b. A research "thrust" in one or more areas, where s/he is a leader or innovator, will be given more consideration than "shotgun" or random research activity. The candidate's self-evaluation statement should include an evaluation regarding this point.
- c. General research awards, grants, and other recognition may be given special consideration.

Research Standards

The research standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to full Professor, should be determined by the candidate's department. These standards may be higher than general CoB standards but may not be lower, and should reflect the current circumstances of the department and research competitiveness within the candidate's chosen area.

The current CoB research expectation is for evidence of continuous research activity and the ability to contribute to the faculty member's chosen discipline, including 5-7 articles in refereed journals for promotion and tenure at the Associate Professor level and 10-12 articles in refereed journals at the full Professor level. Other refereed publications in the field may be substituted when appropriate. Only publications which have a quality score of 50 or more are acceptable for fulfilling these standards.

Multiple-authored articles will contribute equally to the minimum requirements as long as there is strong evidence of individual research ability such as one sole-authored high quality paper, spearheading a major research project, etc. Unless some individual research ability is demonstrated, the candidate will be deemed to have not met the minimum research requirements.

Other Scholarly Writings

Other scholarly writings, although not acceptable in meeting the research requirements for RPT, may be included as part of the overall evaluation. Some items might also fall under the service or teaching component and thus be included there instead. The list below is illustrative of such writings but not exhaustive.

1. Refereed critiques and replies
2. Technical reports
3. Published software
4. Sponsored unrefereed research monographs
5. Reprinting of thesis or dissertation
6. Grant awards or principal investigator research
7. Dissertation chairmanships
8. Invited lecturer for research symposium/workshop/conference
9. Papers presented at academic and professional society meetings or chaired

sessions

10. Papers published in unrefereed proceedings of academic and professional society meetings
11. Editorials, book reviews, short critiques of articles
12. Articles in unrefereed journals, lower than average quality refereed journals, and trade magazines
13. Textbooks, workbooks, cases, practice sets.

Publication Quality Scale

Publications in each of the following categories could be expected to demonstrate the associated characteristics, but need not exhibit all the characteristics.

100 Seminal research. A classic. Frequently cited.

90 Very high quality. Significant influence on the field. Creative, original. Often cited.

80 Very good quality work. Good rigorous analysis. Good design. Well known.

70 Good research, generally known by others in area of specialty. Occasionally cited.

60 Better than usual work. A few particularly good points in design or analysis

50 Typical research. Common design or methodology

40 Typical research on a well-studied problem. Mediocre work on a new problem.

30 Lower level work, such as industry education of well-known theory or findings. Repetition of existing work.

Overall (CRPT) Research/Scholarly Writing Evaluation

This category combines quantity, quality, research thrust, and consistency. Again, each of the descriptors below need not be directly exhibited by the candidate but should be a characteristic the candidate could be expected to exhibit.

100 Continuing seminal or classic contributions provide quantum jumps in the field. Many awards. Hundreds of publications in the literature. Many large research grants.

90 Consistent, high quality research and writing. Often cited in the literature. An outstanding expert in the field. Clear research thrusts. Some major research grants. Directs many and may fund some dissertations. Has been or is a senior editor of at least one major journal. Consistently productive and prolific

researcher/writer.

80 Quite well known in the field. A few special recognition awards. Has probably received a couple of major research grants and a number of minor ones. Probably on at least one editorial board for a major journal, an associate editor for one, and a frequent reviewer for others. Directed several dissertations. Several more publications than required for full Professor.

70 Known by researchers or scholars in the same area and a few scholars outside the area. Work cited now and then by others. May have received a few minor research grants. Directed a few dissertations. An occasional journal reviewer, perhaps an associate or department editor once. Meets the research standard for full Professor.

60 Known by many researchers in the same area. A few major works that are occasionally cited. Some minor grants. Has directed one or two dissertations, served on a few dissertation committees. Two or three major research interests from past opportunities. A few more publications than the standard for Associate Professor.

50 Known by some researchers in the very same area. An article or two are occasionally cited. A grant or two. Served on a few dissertation committees. Meets the research standard for Associate Professor.

40 Known by a minority of researchers in same area. Research rarely cited. No grants. Served on a dissertation committee or two.

30 Conducts research on occasion and publishes some. Not known for research work. Known by some for scholarly writing. No dissertation committees.

COLLEGE AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Faculty members are expected to serve responsibly in various capacities that further the mission of the CoB, the University of Cincinnati, and the community, as well as contribute to professional development. Evaluation of service activity of tenure-track CoB faculty must take into account the automatic reduction in teaching load to facilitate basic service contributions.

The purpose of this section of the RPT document is to establish guidelines and procedures for evaluation of faculty service activity and describe those service levels expected of candidates for tenure and promotion.

Procedures

It will be the candidate's responsibility, in conjunction with the DR and DRPT, to secure the necessary documents and materials described below:

1. The candidate will prepare a listing of service activities that will be classified and described under four categories that designate the beneficiaries of the service activity:

- a. CoB and college departments
- b. University of Cincinnati
- c. Community, Region, or Nation
- d. Profession

2. Service activities that are to be considered in the review process shall represent direct or indirect contributions to the Department, CoB, University, or profession, whether performed within the university (e.g., committees, panels, representatives) or outside the university in service to the community, industry, or profession. Examples of such activity are:

- a. College level committee, including Ph.D. committee-type service
- b. Department level committee
- c. Professional development teaching --UCEP, PDP, etc.
- d. Individual speaking engagements
- e. Administrative assignments
- f. Editorial work
- g. Conference coordination
- h. Professional society committee, officer or board memberships
- i. Student group advising
- j. University committees (graduate council, senate, etc.)
- k. College fund-raising activity
- l. Consulting that reflects positively on UC and the college, and not at the expense of teaching or research

3. The quality and extensiveness of the candidate's service contribution will be independently evaluated by the DH and DRPT. Activities that reflect the candidate's specialty, professional status, or expertise should be given emphasis in evaluation. Evaluations of service must consider the obligation of the candidate for three credit hours' worth of service activity, given the teaching load reduction.

4. The DH will write a letter of evaluation of the candidate's service activity to be included in the candidate's file for consideration in the remainder of the review process.

5. The DRPT will use the appropriate service quality scale further below to rate the quality of the candidate's service contributions. A written explanation of the ratings will be included.

5. The CRPT will assign an overall rating of the candidate's service contributions using the appropriate scale. The evaluation will reflect both quantity and quality of service. Simple accumulation of many mediocre service activities should not be seen as fulfilling the service standards. DH evaluations, DRPT ratings and justification, and review of the service record will be used to make this rating. A written explanation and justification of

this rating will accompany the rating in the file.

Service Standards

Tenure-track Faculty. The requirements for consideration of a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be fulfillment of the basic expectation of service given the standard teaching load reduction. The DH's letter must document that the candidate has fulfilled this requirement. The DRPT evaluation should concur with this evaluation.

For the candidate to meet the service standard, the CRPT must, upon review of all the material, assign a rating of 40 or more. However, additional service activity above this level will not be considered for granting tenure and promotion to candidates for Associate Professor. The intent of this policy is to encourage new faculty to focus their initial efforts on developing their teaching skills and materials, and establishing a solid line of research.

Promotion from Associate to full Professor brings an increased expectation of significant service contributions, to the degree that the candidate serves as a role model or mentor for more junior faculty. At that level the candidate must receive an evaluation of 50 or higher from the CRPT.

Field Service Faculty. The requirements for consideration of a candidate for promotion to Associate Field Service Professor are a rating of 50 or more by the CRPT, for promotion to Full Field Service Professor are a rating of 60 or more by the CRPT.

Service Quality Scale

The following are descriptors that might characterize the quality of the candidate's service contribution, but need not necessarily have been exhibited.

100 Extremely valuable contributions are evident. Makes great personal sacrifices for the good of the college, university, community, or profession. Innovative. Widely recognized for quality of contributions. Takes leadership role. Serves as role model and mentor for others. Others very commonly turn-to for guidance or help.

90 Reliable, always gets job done well. Others seek this person's help. Often takes a leadership position. Superior team member, a delight to work with. Frequently considered a role model. Sometimes a mentor for a junior faculty member.

80 Has good contributions, ideas. Frequently takes leadership position. Excellent team member.

70 Makes good contributions in many areas. Makes some sacrifices for the good

of the college, university, community, or profession. Sometimes is a leader of others. Very competent, enjoyable work partner.

60 Makes good contributions in a few areas. Enjoyable work partner.

50 Effective contributions. Useful ideas. Does fair share of workload.

40 Some contributions. A few good ideas. Acceptable to work with.

30 Few contributions. Not especially pleasurable to work with.

Overall (CRPT) Service Evaluation

The following are descriptors that might characterize the quality of the candidate's service contribution, but need not necessarily have been exhibited.

100 Highly active participant in all areas. Extended periods of commitment. Strong leadership is visible. Extremely valuable contributions are evident. Makes great personal sacrifices for the good of the college, university, community, or profession. Innovative, involved. Widely recognized for quality of contributions. Takes leadership role. Serves as role model and mentor for others. Others turn to for guidance or help very commonly. Excellent outside publicity for CoB. Extensive network of contacts. Major fund-raiser for CoB through multiple activities.

90 Very involved in service in multiple areas. Highly visible. Reliable, always gets job done well. Others seek this person's help. Often takes a leadership position. Superior team member, a delight to work with. Frequently considered a role model. Sometimes a mentor for a junior faculty member. Maintains multiple contacts within and outside the university for business and academic uses. Commonly raises funds for CoB.

80 Usually quite involved in a number of different service areas. Has good contributions, ideas. Frequently takes leadership position. Excellent team member. Always willing to participate and help. Widely recognized outside CoB as advocate of the college. Raises funds for CoB on occasion.

70 Involved in quite a few different areas. Makes good contributions in many of these. Makes some sacrifices for service. Sometimes a leader of others. Very competent, enjoyable work partner. Often recognized outside as a CRA advocate.

60 More than normal involvement. Makes good contributions in a few of the areas. Enjoyable work partner. A leader on a few occasions.

50 Typical amount of contributions. Useful ideas. Generally involved. Does fair

share of workload.

40 Some contributions and involvement. A few good ideas. Acceptable to work with. Average amount for Assistant Professor.

30 Very little involvement, few contributions. Not pleasurable to work with. Occasionally avoids major service commitments.

REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF "QUALIFIED" FACULTY

Introduction

Persons holding qualified titles (Field Service, Adjunct, Research, Clinical) do not have the right to request a review for tenure (Art. 6.3.1). The CoB Dean shall give written notice to each person appointed to a qualified title, which will state that faculty members serving under qualified titles do not have the right to be reviewed for tenure, and which shall describe the precise terms for the appointment offered as well as any conditions placed upon reappointment or promotion. The appointment letter should define the AQ/PQ process and indicate which status the person will hold upon starting his or her employment.

Criteria

The criteria used for reappointment and promotion of persons holding qualified titles shall be consistent with those elements of the CoB RPT model that are specified by one's letter of appointment, as specified in the document above.

Role and appointment term

In general, the role of field service faculty is to assist the College in fulfilling its teaching and service missions. The initial appointment is typically from 2 to 5 years with 3 being normal. Reappointments may range from 1 to 5 years with 1 year appointments being used more for positions likely to expire without renewal.

Evaluation procedures:

Prior to beginning their appointment, department heads will meet with the field service faculty member for the purpose of acclimating him/her to the needs and expectations of the department as to teaching and service contributions and how these will be evaluated. This document should be reviewed with all newly appointed field service faculty or existing field service faculty after revisions occur. During the initial period of performance (before the end of first quarter as mandated by 7.1.1 of the contract), field service faculty will meet with their department heads to review performance and to discuss any possible issues of fit between the contributions of the field service faculty member and the needs of the department. The procedures for reappointment and

promotion of field service faculty are outlined in this document.

The letter from the program or department head should include a statement about continuing teaching/service needs and funding capability. If the field service faculty member is being asked to perform special mission specific service or take on unique projects, the letter should state the nature of this work and expected duration as well as comments on past performance.

Field service faculty will be evaluated on three dimensions: teaching, college and professional service, and maintenance of AQ/PQ status. The classification of the field service faculty member as academically qualified (AQ) or professionally qualified (PQ) should be stipulated in the initial offer letter, and maintenance of this status is important for AACSB accreditation purposes (see AQ/PQ document adopted by CoB, February, 2009).

Promotion

For candidates applying for promotion, the evaluation process will make use of the standards contained in this document. It is expected that candidates will have a reasonable period in rank before promotion is considered.