

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Developed for the College of Business
University of Cincinnati

January 2008

Michael Ferguson
James Kellaris
Michael Magazine, chair
P.K. Sen
Narayan Umanath
Ann Welsh

as Revised and Adopted by the
Department of Quantitative Analysis and Operations Management

March, 2008

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

The purpose of this document is to define the standards, procedures, and documentation requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members in the Department of Quantitative Analysis and Operations Management, College of Business (CoB), University of Cincinnati. The standards are consistent with the goals and mission of the CoB and those of the university. The procedures are consistent with the process codified in the current agreement between the University of Cincinnati and the American Association of University Professors, University of Cincinnati Chapter.

This document is organized into two parts, describing (1) definitions and moving through the ranks, and (2) the procedures for compiling and evaluating documentation of the candidate's case.

PART I: Progress Through the Ranks

A candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure must qualify in three areas of professional endeavor: teaching, research, and service. Although adherence to a high professional standard in each of these areas is expected, there is no single path to success. A candidate's individual record of performance need not mirror that of a colleague. Individual differences in areas of emphasis and professional achievement are expected and may vary widely. Nonetheless, our standards are explicitly defined and as one progresses through the ranks makes some compensatory contributions across the areas of teaching and research.

Although this document is organized around the three themes of teaching, research, and service, the standard recognizes that a candidate's contributions cannot always be classified mutually exclusively and exhaustively in these three areas. The evaluation of a candidate's worthiness for RPT can include factors such as departmental citizenship, reputation within a discipline, professional integrity, collegiality, etc. As with teaching, research, and service performance, the expectation is that a candidate must meet a high professional standard on each evaluative dimension.

I. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. DEFINITION OF RANK

1. **Assistant Professor.** Typically has a doctorate and shows promise in both teaching and research.
2. **Associate Professor.** In addition to point 1, has demonstrated ongoing competence, maturity, and independence in research and teaching and service.
3. **Professor.** In addition to points 1. and 2., has demonstrated substantial achievement in both research and teaching, has produced scholarly work that is

widely known and respected, and has continued to participate significantly in service activities. The rank of **Professor** is the highest academic rank achievable.

B. PROGRESS THROUGH THE RANKS

1. **Assistant Professor.** Initial appointments are usually made at the Assistant Professor rank. Individuals holding this rank have all the responsibilities of a faculty member, including teaching, research, and service.
2. **Associate Professor.** Promotion to Associate Professor normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment as an Assistant Professor and is typically concurrent with the tenure decision. There should be clear demonstration of a standard of performance in teaching, research, and service as defined in this document. Early promotion may be considered for exceptional performance as specified in the contract between the university and its faculty.
3. **Professor.** High standards both of research and teaching are required for promotion to the rank of Professor. Service is also important but is weighed least heavily. For promotion to the rank of Professor, external peer reviews must be undertaken. Positive peer reviews of the candidate's program of research by nationally and internationally recognized scholars are essential for promotion to the rank of Professor. It is exceptional for promotion to Professor to occur prior to at least five years after promotion to Associate Professor. Indeed, promotion to Professor is not an assured step; there may be faculty members who do not attain this rank.

C. REAPPOINTMENT

Reappointment in a tenure-track position requires strong evidence of continuing professional growth that the candidate may eventually be promoted and receive tenure.

D. TENURE

The granting of tenure can be considered when it has been ascertained that the individual's performance will likely be sustained at a high level throughout the course of her or his academic career. There should be clear demonstration that the candidate meets the standard in teaching, research, and service as articulated in this document. The granting of tenure as an Associate Professor is typically considered in the sixth year of the candidate's tenure track appointment, but may, in exceptional circumstances, be considered earlier. Positive peer reviews of the candidate's program of research by nationally and internationally recognized scholars are essential for the granting of tenure. Faculty hired at the Associate or Full Professor level without tenure may apply for tenure sooner than the sixth year.

II. NON-TENURE-TRACK (QUALIFIED) FACULTY

Persons holding field service or bargaining unit adjunct appointments do not have the right to request a review for tenure. The criteria used for reappointment will be specified in the individual's most recent *letter of (re)appointment*, and promotion shall be consistent with those elements of this RPT document corresponding to appointment letter specifications.

III. TEACHING

Student learning is an essential element of the mission 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, design and delivery of coursework in undergraduate, graduate, and executive programs, and contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Conveying enthusiasm for subject matter, evidencing concern and respect for students, offering a challenging, yet rewarding experience in the courses taught, 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 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 by bringing research to classroom and 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.

IV. RESEARCH

A spirit of inquiry is the core of every academic institution. A faculty member's research supports this spirit in a direct manner and is interwoven with the process of good teaching. Research emphasis in the CoB is on scholarly contributions that advance the state of knowledge. Strong evidence of quality research is an essential element in determining reappointments, promotions, and the granting of tenure. A broad spectrum of research is recognized as long as the work enhances respect for the candidate, for the CoB, and for the University of Cincinnati.

In evaluating research, the primary criterion is quality with evidence of continuing activity over time. A reasonable judgment of quality can be formed using testimony

from leading scholars in the field, by examining the reputation of the candidate's publications, and by the extent that other scholars reference the candidate's work. Quality of work, in addition to the publication venue, is particularly important when assessing emerging areas where established journals are not yet available.

Weight should also be given to contributions, such as high quality review articles, that synthesize knowledge. Other evidence of quality includes invitations to give "keynote" addresses, research awards from learned or professional societies, and invitations to serve on editorial boards. Publication of research monographs and advanced scientific/research books, presentations at academic conferences with subsequent publication in proceedings, attracting funds to support a candidate's research efforts, solicited reviews of manuscripts for journals or research proposals, and chairing of dissertations and theses of graduate students would also be considered as evidence of quality research.

Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the candidate's peers in the college to judge research content and quality. It is recognized that differences across disciplines as well as changes over time make it inappropriate for the college to establish numerical guidelines or identify a fixed set of appropriate research outlets.

V. SERVICE

Service to the university is important because it provides faculty input into the administration process. Service to the profession is important as a way to influence the direction and impact of scholarly work on affected constituencies. Service to the community is important as a vital resource that can improve the quality of life for members of society, generate student demand for CoB courses, and generate interest in the hiring of CoB graduates. Service to the community may also provide a role model of community involvement for students mentored by serving faculty. Service to the university, at all levels, is internal service while service to the profession and community is external service.

Every faculty member should contribute, at a minimum, sufficient service to facilitate the essential communication, representation, and management of the university as well as providing service to one's profession. Service contributions are expected to increase with rank and length of service within the university.

Additionally, the ability to work productively with colleagues is an important qualification of any job, especially when it comes to a permanent appointment. Although no RPT decisions should be based on judgment of personality traits and heterogeneity should be encouraged, the unwillingness or inability to work with others and share in the workload of a unit constitutes a reasonable basis for denial of promotion and/or tenure.

PART II: Standards, Guidelines and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

I. PROCEDURES

This section reviews the main points to be included in a candidate's *brief* and *dossier*. The *brief* consists of elements prepared mainly by the candidate for the RPT process. All members of unit and College RPT committees will have copies of the *brief*. It constitutes a subset of the candidate's complete *dossier*, which includes elements available to all committees but not on an individual basis.

A. Responsibility of the Candidate

The person best able to present the contributions, activities, plans, strengths, and aspirations of the candidate is the candidate. Accordingly, the primary responsibility of preparing a written brief for consideration lies with the candidate. It is the responsibility of the department head to inform the candidate of this requirement in advance of the first deliberative meetings so that the candidate has sufficient time to prepare required materials. The department head also sets the due date for the candidate's complete dossier.

The brief should consist of the candidate's major strengths, contributions and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service. There are some contributions that do not exclusively reside in the teaching, research, or service categories and for which it is the candidate's responsibility to select appropriate categorization. The following information should be included, although the list is not necessarily exhaustive.

I. A curriculum vitae including:

A. Personal Data

1. Name
2. Department
3. Degrees earned (date awarded, university)
4. Dissertation title
5. Awards, honors
6. Post-Ph.D. employment record
7. Other

B. Teaching

1. Record of courses taught over the last five years, indicating course level (graduate/ undergraduate/ executive), class size, and summary student evaluations
2. Textbooks published
3. Graduate students supervised, degree, thesis/project title
4. Other graduate-student committees
5. Advisory activities

6. Other

C. Research

1. Areas of interest
2. A listing of publications (in reverse chronological order, including full authorship)
 - Articles that have appeared in refereed journals
 - Articles that have been accepted for refereed journals
 - Articles in refereed conference proceedings
 - Articles that have been submitted
 - Research monographs and advanced scientific/research books
 - Reports
 - Other publications (letters, reviews, abstracts, etc.)
3. List of grants and contracts
4. Invited addresses at conferences, universities, or institutes
5. Other

D. Service

1. Internal Service
 - Department, college and university committees (dates, name, role)
 - Other university service
2. External Service
 - Community service
 - Professional service
 - ◊ Society membership
 - ◊ Refereeing (list journals)
 - ◊ Editorial duties (include dates and journals)
 - ◊ Other reviewing activities (external grant or university reviews)
 - ◊ Positions and activities in professional organizations

II. Statements of teaching and research philosophy

III. Copies of department head letters of annual reviews, DRPT, DH and CRPT letters from previous reappointment/tenure review cycles

IV. External letters supporting scholarly activities

V. Peer reviews of teaching

Dossier Preparation-A consenting faculty member, typically the department head, has the responsibility to help assemble the candidate's dossier and to assist the candidate with his or her preparation of the brief. The candidate, guided by this individual, is strongly encouraged to present his or her case consistent with Section 7.4 in the *Agreement Between University of Cincinnati and American Association of*

University Professors, University of Cincinnati Chapter. The dossier contains additional documentation beyond the brief that the candidate wishes to be considered in RPT decisions. Where the brief is meant to be parsimonious the dossier may be extensive and detailed.

B. Levels of Review

The CoB has four independent levels of review for reappointment, promotion, and tenure:

1. Department RPT Committee (DRPT)
2. Department Head
3. College RPT Committee (CRPT)
4. Dean

Information from each level is to be shared among the levels and with the candidate, but recommendations are to be made independently.

C. External Reviews

The department head is responsible for arranging external reviews. The use of external reviewers for reappointment decisions is at the discretion of the candidate.

For tenure and promotion to Professor, the candidate should provide a list of not less than four potential external reviewers to the department head, who will add reviewers of her/his own choosing. Care should be taken to choose reviewers of high academic stature who, ideally, are not closely associated with the candidate or the department. Co-authors, thesis advisors or committee members, and former colleagues should be avoided if possible. (See the section on research documentation for further details.) The external reviewers should be specifically asked to provide an assessment of the quality and productivity of the candidate's research based on their evaluation of the submitted material and on any other direct knowledge they have about the candidate's research and scholarship. The candidate has the right to request external reviews for reappointment and non-tenured promotion to Associate Professor decisions.

D. Role of Committees

The primary responsibility for thorough evaluation of the candidate lies with the DRPT. The DRPT will also provide the teaching evaluation relating it to the teaching documentation provided by the candidate and the student evaluations. In addition, the DRPT will provide a paper-by-paper review of each research article and working paper, indicating its methodological strengths and weaknesses and its contribution to the literature. The role of the CRPT is to consider DRPT and academic unit head recommendations and forward its recommendation to the Dean

DRPT committees will be constituted according to individual department rules, consistent with the Agreement. The CRPT shall consist of one tenured member of each department chosen according to individual department procedures. Each department should also designate an alternate to serve on the CRPT. The CRPT member of the candidate's department is not chosen to be an advocate of a

departmental candidate. . Ideally, only full professors should sit in deliberation for candidates being considered for promotion to full professor. If the department's CRPT representative is not a full professor, the department should designate a full professor within the UC faculty to serve on the CRPT. In order to retain organizational memory over the years the CRPT will have staggered two year appointments, with Accounting, Finance and Management starting appointments in even years and the other departments in odd years.

Though it is desirable to not have CRPT committee members and alternates serve on the DRPT, small departments may find this difficult. DRPT members may not, however, sit in judgment on candidates from their department on the CRPT. Full-time administrators and department heads may not serve on either committee.

E. Role of the Department Head

Besides taking responsibility for external reviews, the department head is to provide continuing mentoring and guidance to all candidates in the RPT process. The department head is to assure that the process is done in a timely manner. This includes external reviews, obtaining the candidate's brief for the DRPT, and the forwarding of the dossier to the DRPT.

In addition, the department head has the responsibility to provide in a timely manner an independent assessment to the CRPT after the DRPT review based on the data supplied in the dossier.

F. Role of the Dean

Responsibilities of the dean of the college include providing a cover letter to the Provost that summarizes the candidate's qualifications and the recommendations of the DRPT, the department head, and the CRPT. The dean must also provide in a timely manner an independent recommendation.

G. Timing of the RPT Process

It is crucial that meetings and information-gathering activities be given adequate lead-times. Timing decisions are to be based on the schedule for Provost decision making, currently February 1 for Promotion and Tenure.

- A. At least two months prior to the first DRPT meeting members of the DRPT and CRPT are elected. External letters should be requested -- usually August-September
- B. Two weeks prior to the first DRPT meeting the dossier should be prepared and the brief is to be given to each member of the DRPT -- usually October
- C. Deliberative meetings of the DRPT -- usually November-December
- D. Independent evaluation by the DH -- after the DRPT review in December
- E. Meetings of the CRPT -- usually December-January

Reappointment decisions may occur up to three times during the year depending on the date of initial appointment. Documentation must be submitted to the Provost by February 1, November 15, or May 1. Appropriate lead-times should be allowed.

II. DOCUMENTATION

A. Teaching Documentation

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. It is important that candidates 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.

At a minimum, the teaching section of a candidate's Dossier should contain information regarding the products of good teaching, the candidate's teaching philosophy, methods, and materials; and information from others regarding the candidate's accomplishments. Each of these three categories should receive attention and supporting documentation with examples. The list below offers representative items for each category. The list is not meant to be complete or prescriptive.

1. Products of good teaching
 - a. Textbooks and associated support material
 - b. Examples of student-written materials (e.g., graded papers, essays, journals, and student-published works or activities)
 - c. Information about the effect of course content and methods on student career choices or employment
 - d. Examples of student projects (e.g., videos, business or marketing plans, presentations, practicums)
 - e. Results of professional certification exams
 - f. Evidence of helping others enhance their teaching
 - g. Examples of student growth (e.g., pre/post scores, enhanced performance)
 - h. Results of activities that foster higher-level thinking skills (decision making, problem solving and /or application, and evaluation of material presented in class)
 - i. Evidence of successful internships or practice
 - j. Materials developed demonstrating effective teaching appropriate to the level of courses taught (e.g., Ph.D., M.B.A).
2. Philosophy, methods, and materials
 - a. Statement of teaching philosophy and of beliefs about teaching and learning processes
 - b. Evidence of careful course planning and preparation (e.g., syllabi and how syllabi support the teaching/learning process)

- c. Description of materials the candidate has written about teaching or materials that s/he has studied concerning teaching strategies or research findings
 - d. 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
 - e. 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
 - f. 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)
 - g. 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
 - h. 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)
 - i. 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
 - j. Innovative use of communication technologies
3. Information from others
- a. Statements from colleagues who have examined the candidate's teaching materials
 - b. Documentation from colleagues regarding the candidate's effectiveness in cooperative activities such as curriculum development, related committee work, and team-teaching experiences
 - c. 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.
 - d. Results of student surveys, exit interviews, or questionnaires
 - e. Letters describing the candidate's effective teaching behaviors or that reflect upon the quality of her/his teaching
 - f. Evidence of the successful development and use of innovative teaching materials, technologies, or strategies, including research and publication on the scholarship of teaching and learning.
 - g. Identification of awards or honors the candidate has received for teaching or teaching-related activities

B. Research Documentation

Similar to teaching, research is also best assessed in multiple ways over time. It is the candidate's responsibility, in cooperation with the department head, to gather and present specific information evidencing research quality and productivity. It is important that the candidate shape her/his research documentation so that accomplishments and contributions are clearly positioned and framed.

The candidate's dossier should reflect research quality, productivity, thrust and consistency. At a minimum, the research section of a candidate's dossier should contain information regarding research publications, peer reviews of research and other evidence of scholarly work. Listed below are items that are typically used as evidence of research quality and productivity. This list is not necessarily exhaustive.

1. Research Publications

Copies of any or all refereed journal publications and refereed proceedings may be enclosed in the dossier. Fulfilling the standard of independence does not require sole authorship. In the case of multiple-authored research contributions, the candidate may indicate her/his contribution level or include statements from co-author(s) about relative contribution levels. The dossier should list research manuscripts using an accepted standard bibliographical form indicating all the authors in the order in which they appear in each publication. This listing should differentiate the following categories:

- a. Research contributions published in or accepted for publication in peer refereed journals. In the latter case, a copy of the letter of acceptance from the editor of the journal may be included.
- b. Research contributions under review with a peer-refereed journal
- c. Publications of research monographs and advanced scientific/research books

2. Peer Reviews of Research

The quality and productivity of the candidate's research must be substantiated by external and internal peer evaluations.

External Reviews

The candidate may provide to the department head for consideration as external reviewers the names of at least four established researchers capable of evaluating her/his research. These people should not be the candidate's close friends, mentors/dissertation advisors, or (recent) co-authors. The department head is to select at least two from this list and add names of a sufficient number of other established researchers capable of evaluating the candidate's research in order to obtain a final response of at least three external reviews. Present and past journal editors, present and past members of editorial boards, scholars frequently cited in the candidate's publications, and other scholars well respected in the candidate's field of research are desirable sources to provide external reviews. The candidate with the help of the department head should prepare and include a short summary of the academic/research background and accomplishments of the external reviewers from whom evaluations are sought. Each external reviewer should

receive a copy of the candidate's vita and a sample of papers chosen by the candidate from his/her research output. The external reviewers should be specifically asked to provide an assessment of the quality and productivity of the candidate's research based on their evaluation of the submitted material and any other direct knowledge they have about the candidate's research and scholarship. All evaluations received must be included in the dossier. The department head is responsible for initiating and completing this task in sufficient time to ensure a timely and fair evaluation of the candidate.

Internal Evaluations

The department head and the DRPT should each document their independent evaluations of the quality and productivity of the candidate's research using the assessment anchors below. This documentation must include subjective evaluation of all publications of the candidate, evaluation of the publication channel/outlet, number of publications of different quality levels, etc.

Additional factors employed by the DRPT will include:

- a. Consistent, long-term research behavior.
- b. A research 'thrust' in one or more areas in which the candidate's research is focused as opposed to random research activity. The candidate may use her/his self-evaluation statement to highlight this point.

3. Other Evidence of Scholarly Work

Other scholarly work that is considered secondary evidence, given ample primary evidence of research quality and productivity in sections a. and b. above, includes, but is not limited to:

- a. Dissertations/theses chaired
- b. Working papers, with an indication if paper is submitted for publication
- c. Evidence from co-citation analysis
- d. External and internal research grants and contract research received as primary investigator (PI) or co-PI to support research projects of the candidate including support of graduate students. The list should indicate the topic, funding agency, amount, time period, beginning date, graduate students supported, and other relevant information for each grant/contract
- e. Invited presentations of research at symposia/workshops/seminars at other universities, research institutes, and conferences
- f. Presentations at national/international academic conferences
- g. Presentations at professional meetings
- h. Publications in peer-refereed conference proceedings
- i. Research grant proposals submitted as PI or co-PI: title, date submitted, level of funding requested, time period, and status (e.g., rejected/when, under review)
- j. Solicited reviews of manuscripts for journals or research proposals. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the candidate's peers in the college to judge research content and quality. It is recognized that differences across disciplines as well as changes over time make it inappropriate for the college

to establish numerical guidelines or identify a fixed set of appropriate research outlets.

C. Service Documentation

Candidates for reappointment or promotion should submit evidence of service activities commensurate with rank, including internal service to students, department, college, and university, and external service to the profession, business community, and general community. This documentation should include a list of committee assignments and roles, student and professional organizations served, and any other major contributions of service. Service documentation may also include a list of press placements, media coverage, and other external relations activities, a list of events attended (e.g., Commencement exercises, alumni events), and other evidence of service.

Candidates must demonstrate not only nominal activity, but engagement in meaningful service and a willingness to make contributions worthy of the rank they seek. Additional evidence may be submitted in the form of committee chairs' testimony concerning the candidate's contribution, notes of thanks from student and/or professional organizations, journal editors, etc.

III. ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

A. Assessment Standard for Teaching

The candidate must meet a minimum threshold value of **“Good”** in the overall (CRPT) scale in order to be eligible for promotion and tenure at both Associate and Full Professor ranks. For reappointments, the candidate may be in the preliminary or developing categories. It is expected that candidates demonstrate improvement between reappointments.

At the College level an overall (CRPT) teaching evaluation scale which takes into account information provided by the candidate as well as assessments generated at the department level will be used. This scale is presented below:

Reappointment	Tenure	Promotion to Full	Category	Overall (CRPT) Teaching Evaluation <i>Examples of qualifying characteristics may include:</i>
			Excellent	Regarded as a highly stimulating instructor. Courses are, in general, highly challenging, yet offer a highly rewarding experience to students. Dedicated to student learning, has a thorough knowledge of the subject, easily accessible, extremely responsive to student questions and capable of clear exposition of intricate technical details. Respected by colleagues as an authority on the subject matter and gifted instructor who always maintains course content current and delivers it very effectively. Known to keep up with the current industry trends and research advances in the subject and brings it to the classroom in a timely manner. Able to effectively teach courses at different program levels.
	Good	Regarded as an effective instructor. Take-away from the instructor's courses are of significant value. Has reputation for courses that are challenging and valuable. Tries to facilitate student learning, has a decent knowledge of the subject, is accessible, and explains the material reasonably well. Considered by colleagues as competent on the subject matter and a useful instructor who tries to maintain course content current and good in course delivery. Well informed about field, strives to stay abreast of new development.		
	NA	NA	Developing	Regarded as an improving instructor. Courses need development to become more challenging but useful. Known as an instructor who works hard, has a decent knowledge of the subject, somewhat accessible, and explains the material reasonably well most of the times. Considered by colleagues as acceptable to teach the subject matter and a sincere instructor who tries to maintain course content current but still needs improvement in course delivery.
NA	NA	Preliminary	Regarded as needing improvement but shows good faith effort. Considered by colleagues as an instructor who ought to try harder to maintain course content current and make course delivery effective	

The department level assessment will use scales calibrated at a finer granularity and focus on assessing (a) Technical competence & practical expertise and (b) pedagogical expertise. The candidate must meet a minimum threshold value of “**Good**” in the overall (DRPT) scale in order to be eligible for promotion and tenure at both Associate and Full Professor ranks. For reappointments, the candidate may be in the preliminary or developing categories. It is expected that candidates demonstrate improvement between reappointments. The two scales are presented below:

Reappointment	Tenure	Promotion to Full	Category	Technical competence and practical expertise <i>Examples of qualifying characteristics may include:</i>	Pedagogical Expertise <i>Examples of qualifying characteristics may include:</i>
			Excellent	Noted authority in field domestically or internationally. An expert on both the history and current developments in the field and participates actively in its development. Has depth of research and practical experience to draw on. Has received teaching awards.	Demonstrates high competence in classroom. Is active in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Competent in variety of pedagogies. Continuously updates pedagogical skills. May be called upon to mentor other faculty.
			Good	Well informed about field, strives to stay abreast of new development. Can tie theory and practice together effectively. Brings research into the classroom. Uses technology effectively.	Well organized, effective delivery. Stimulates student involvement, interest in field. Can answer questions by drawing on knowledge and experience. Knowledgeable about student learning styles. Uses assessment to enhance student learning.
	NA	NA	Developing	Informed about field, knows most of the current developments. Can answer questions, but with little elaboration.	Organization and delivery adequate but ineffective at creating learning environment. Needs some additional skill building (e.g., learning styles, assessment, and technology use). Feedback to students delayed or lacking.
			Preliminary	Relatively informed, aware of current developments. Limited or dated practical expertise. Fails to meet teaching standards necessary for tenure or promotion.	Classroom delivery needs improvement. Needs instruction/mentoring in pedagogical skill development.

B. Assessment Standards for Research

Over the course of the candidate's career it is expected that the candidate will provide evidence of steady progress towards achieving the goal of advancing the state of knowledge in their field. It is recognized that a candidate's career could have several stages encompassing the traditional 'life-cycle' of a faculty member: untenured junior faculty (Assistant Professor); tenured Associate Professor; tenured Full Professor. It is expected that what constitutes evidence of progress towards the research goals at different stages in the candidate's career will evolve.

The candidate must meet a minimum threshold value of **“Good”** in the overall (CRPT) scale presented below in order to be eligible for promotion and tenure at both Associate and Full Professor ranks. For reappointments, the candidate may be in the preliminary or developing categories. It is expected that candidates demonstrate improvement between reappointments.

The following set of quality anchors will be used for reappointment, tenure, promotion to Associate, and promotion to Full.

First Reappointment	Second Reappointment	Tenure	<u>Category</u>	For Tenure and Promotion to Associate <i>Examples of qualifying characteristics may include:</i>	For Promotion to Full <i>Examples of qualifying characteristics may include:</i>
			Excellent	The difference between a Good and Excellent research portfolio would be in both in quantity and quality of research papers, the prestige of the outlets in which they appear and their importance as documented by the outside letters and citations. Acting as a dissertation chair and being members of several dissertation committees in and outside of the department would be consistent with an excellent research portfolio	The difference between a Good and an Excellent portfolio is in both quantity and quality of scholarship in different dimensions and their recognition from the outside experts. Consistent evidence of mentoring junior faculty and PhD students by coauthoring of research papers and projects, obtaining grants, and activities such as invited lectures, awards and prizes and editorship of prestigious journals that are consistent with high visibility in the academic field would characterize an Excellent research portfolio.
			Good	Publications (including forthcoming) in the top tier journal/s, some in other respectable journals. Evidence of a viable pipeline of research including some revise and resubmits, some submissions, some circulating working papers would characterize a good research portfolio. Evidence of working with PhD students is a plus. A good research portfolio would also be characterized by presentations in conferences, meetings and workshops, and some activities for seeking grants.	An ongoing significant stream of publications and a portfolio characterized by research publication and steady output of high impact/high visibility intellectual activities. Ample evidence of continued engagement/mentoring of PhD students and activities consistent with furthering of the research mission of the college such as chairing dissertation/s, being in dissertation committees outside of department PhD students, refereeing and participation of editorial boards of reputed journals.
	NA	Promising	Some publication/s consistent with the	NA	

			department's standards in respectable journal/s, some forthcoming and revise and resubmits, many working papers in circulation, presentations in conference, workshops and meetings, and some ongoing projects would characterize a promising research portfolio. Some involvement with doctoral students and doctoral program and/or grant writing activity is a plus	
		Developing	The candidate has some success in the publication process; may be a paper, more likely one or more revise and resubmit from a high quality journal, some working papers in circulation evidenced by presentations in the conferences, meetings, and research workshops, may be some invited presentations in some universities.	NA
NA		Preliminary	The candidate has an agenda that can possibly produce high quality research and he/she is trying to execute it. PhD dissertation defense is complete. Submissions to high quality journals, revisions of rejected papers to address weaknesses, working papers of high quality would be evidence consistent with a preliminary progress towards research.	NA

It is expected that a candidate during his/her first reappointment would have at least a Preliminary research agenda. A candidate with a Promising research agenda at the time of the second reappointment would be considered making a good progress towards tenure. A candidate with a Developing research portfolio at the second reappointment may face significant uncertainty towards tenure. A candidate with a Preliminary research portfolio during the second reappointment may face uncertainty in reappointment.

The research portfolio of a Candidate for Full Professor could be more diverse and is consistent with many options of scholarly work in which a faculty member could engage. A Full Professor is an intellectual leader of the college and must have demonstrated the ability to conduct research at the highest level. While continued research and publication activities in the best journals in the recent years would satisfy the criterion of research at the highest level, that need not be the only evidence for individuals who have already demonstrated in the past their ability to the highest quality research and publications. For such a candidate, an important indicator would be how the past important papers have matured over time by way of citation analysis. With past evidence of research at the highest level, a candidate could demonstrate intellectual leadership and significant contribution by publishing in highly visible/high impact outlets. Writing of cases and research monographs would be consistent with such alternative high impact portfolio.

C. Assessment Standards for Service

Unlike teaching and research, service performance is assessed using a global sufficient/insufficient criterion. Because each candidate is expected to perform service according to individual interests and talents, evolving institutional needs, and changing demands of the profession, there is no fixed model for assessment. It is expected, for example, that whereas some individuals' service contributions may emphasize participation in governance or supervision of student organizations, others may emphasize service to their profession or external relations. Moreover, both load and allocation of emphasis may change across ranks and career stages.

Nevertheless, a candidate's record of service will be deemed sufficient and acceptable when it is judged as appropriate for career stage by DRPT, DH, and other reviewing parties. A candidate's record of service will be deemed insufficient and unacceptable when evidence suggests that the individual avoided bearing a "fair share" of internal service obligations, that lack of internal service was not compensated by exceptional external service, or when the evidence suggests unwillingness or inability to perform meaningful service.

Overall Assessment for Promotion

In summation of CoB assessment standards, an assessment of at least "good" in both research and teaching is required for promotion to associate professor. Additionally, acceptable service and collegiality are required. For promotion to the rank of full professor, it is necessary to be at least good in both teaching and research, with one of these being excellent; and, the record of service must indicate greater contributions than those acceptable for promotion to associate professor.