

Statement of Intent

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation, reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business (CoB). This document aligns with guidelines stipulated by the Florida Institute of Technology Faculty Handbook, and defines performance, reappointment, promotion, and tenure norms for the CoB. These norms must coincide with the goals and objectives of the CoB, as stated and implied by the College's mission statement.

The Nathan M. Bisk College of Business is an integral academic unit of Florida Institute of Technology. The college provides well-rounded, high quality educational experiences to prepare graduates for a variety of careers in the global business environment.

In support of all undergraduate and graduate programs, the college:

- provides foundational knowledge in all areas of business and exposes students to ethical decision-making and leadership challenges;
- continuously improves curricula, being responsive to rapidly changing global workforce demands;
- furthers intellectual growth opportunities for both faculty and students;
- serves society through quality educational offerings that target the needs of working professionals and traditional college students, encouraging a culturally diverse student experience; and
- builds effective partnerships with university stakeholders to further program excellence and lifelong learning.

Consequently, the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business will recommend the granting of tenure to or promoting only those faculty members whose contributions help the CoB fulfill its mission. Similarly, it would be in the best interests of the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business to deny a recommendation for tenure, promotion, or both to faculty members whose individual achievements do not coincide substantially with the mission and goals of the CoB, regardless of their competency within their field(s).

The following basic precepts inform both tenure and promotion, and in this document, any time the term 'Dean' is used, it is understood to mean the Dean, Associate Dean, Academic Unit Head or the appointed representative of the Dean.

- ✓ Tenure is a cornerstone of academic life because it ensures freedom of thought and speech.
- ✓ The promotion and tenure norms promulgated should be consistent with and support the mission of the CoB; in addition, the norms also should be consistent with recommendations from AACSB about tenure and promotion guidelines, and general performance standards accepted by the Florida Institute of Technology and institutions comparable in rigor, stature, and teaching, research, and service loads.
- ✓ The CoB adopts AACSB terminology for categorizing faculty in terms of expectations for intellectual contributions, expected ongoing intellectual development, and a faculty member's role in achieving the College's mission. Although AACSB posits four categories of faculty (see AACSB guidelines for details), it is the Scholarly Academic (SA) category which defines typical, tenure-track, career faculty. SA faculty members possess a doctoral degree in the field in which they teach, sustaining currency and relevance through scholarship and related activities.
- ✓ A key principle is that tenure be granted only to faculty members who are considered worthy of promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor; existing faculty members will be granted tenure based on guidelines set by the CoB with approval from the appropriate university governing bodies and their respective policies, guidelines, and processes.
- ✓ Faculty members desire that norms provide guidelines about what constitutes performance standards, yet not be constrained by a behavioral checklist of required activities or tightly-drawn job descriptions.

Tenure Track Faculty

Supporting Principles for Tenure and Promotion Norms

Several key principles support the norms of the CoB. The principles listed below shall be interpreted as core understandings critical to the growth of the CoB.

1. We place teaching and learning above all other activities, and the primary responsibility of all faculty is to facilitate, enable, and support student learning.
2. Intellectual contributions are an important factor in the CoB's ability to obtain and maintain AACSB accreditation, improve faculty development, inform teaching, and attract, recruit, hire, and retain qualified faculty.
3. We are in the business of providing intellectual growth for students. As a consequence, intellectual growth is important for faculty members.
4. Outside evaluations of scholarship and related intellectual contributions or qualifying developmental activities will be sought. In seeking outside evaluations, a rule of reason should be applied so that the assessments solicited are fair and realistic.
5. Faculty members should submit evidence of the quality of their teaching as well as

their scholarship, and with respect to both, provide evidence of career maturation when being evaluated for tenure and promotion.

6. Promotion and tenure necessitate that faculty members produce at a standard that on average surpasses the “meets expectations” threshold across the areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service.
7. Tenure and promotion are rewards for effectiveness and growth in teaching and scholarship. However, administrative contributions will often be considered part of service.
8. The CoB embraces the notion of citizen faculty members, as colleagues, advisors, employees, and community residents. As such, service is an expected component of their position, and will be considered when being evaluated for tenure and promotion.

Teaching Track Faculty

The duties of a Teaching track faculty will be teaching and scholarly work, advising and service. Faculty in this track can serve on graduate thesis/dissertation committees if they hold the appropriate terminal degree and have expertise in the area of focus.

1. Faculty members in this track would be expected to be experts in their field in addition to being very knowledgeable in advancing pedagogy and in delivering engaging, high-quality courses, and will actively engage in pedagogical development and scholarship.
2. Faculty members in this track would be expected to have higher teaching loads than in the Tenure track, with loads determined by the faculty member’s academic Department /college/ administrative unit and formally included in the Faculty Handbook. This will be a contract based position.
3. The length and type of contracts in the track will be as follows: 1-year contracts for Instructors, 3-year traditional contracts for Assistant Professors, 4-year traditional contracts for Associate Professors, and 5-year contracts for Full Professors.
4. Titles for faculty in this track would be:
Instructor
Assistant Teaching Professor
Associate Teaching Professor
Teaching Professor

The CoB Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

Governance of the tenure and promotion process is managed in the CoB by the CoB P&T Committee, formed from the regular, full-time corps of faculty (excluding faculty as designated by

the University P&T guidelines; e.g., applicants for P&T) and is constituted in the following manner.

- The CoB P&T Committee shall consist of five full-time faculty members with the rank of associate professor or above, and at least three members must be tenured. The college faculty will elect three committee members and the Dean shall appoint the remaining two faculty members. The Dean shall provide a list of eligible College faculty members of the appropriate academic rank.
- The Committee shall elect its own chair from its membership and shall establish its own procedures for review of faculty applications, within the constraints of the Florida Tech Faculty Handbook and University P&T guidelines.
- Terms of the committee members are to be aligned with the University P&T procedures and PTR membership, and are set at three years. Members may be renewed through a simple majority vote and/or with approval from the Dean. Members will be appointed on a rotating scheduling so that reappointment of only 1/3 of the members occurs each year.

CoB Performance, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures and Methods

The following procedures and guidelines serve to anchor and steward performance appraisals as well as recommendations for promotion and tenure in the CoB.

- A. Faculty members in the CoB will be evaluated on teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
- B. Annual Faculty Evaluations are performed by the Dean. Formative feedback is given on effective teaching, quality and impact of scholarship, and engaged service that furthers the mission of the CoB.
- C. Documentation for evaluation primarily exists in digital repositories of faculty activity. All faculty members are expected to regularly update their data. For annual evaluations, the appointed college official on or about February 1 will extract a report for the previous academic year. Materials not submitted by this date will not be considered in that year's Annual Faculty Evaluation. For promotion and tenure, a portfolio developed in accordance with the University guidelines for dossiers will be made available to the P&T Committee no later than September 1 or as otherwise stipulated in the University P&T schedule set forth in the procedures and guidelines documents, with University guidelines and schedule superseding CoB timelines.
- D. At a minimum, faculty members are expected to maintain AACSB qualifications.

The AACSB guidelines for accreditation includes definitions of qualifications as well as quality and impact measures for scholarship.

Domains of Evaluation

I. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Appendix 1)

1. Teaching Evaluation Overview

Effective teaching is a key cornerstone of the work product for CoB faculty, and in keeping with the Mission, Vision, and Values of the CoB, teaching shall be evaluated with a broad consideration of various measures and metrics. Holistically, the aim is to incent, reward, recognize, and promote faculty who take strides to continuously improve their curricula, while being responsive to rapidly changing global workforce demands. It is understood that no single measure of teaching effectiveness can accurately represent a faculty member's output effort and impact on students. While traditional measures will be collected and evaluated, in order to account for special circumstances and efforts given during the integration of new and/or innovative approaches to teaching and learning, metrics will be considered in light of these sometimes risky endeavors that are necessary when attempting new and innovative methods. On average, the CoB faculty have high teaching evaluation scores; however, in order to combat rating inflation, and with the understanding that sometimes 'easy' classes can receive higher scores than 'harder' classes, other evaluative considerations may include, but not be limited to, a review of:

- a. the overall course GPA;
- b. subject difficulty;
- c. level of course;
- d. course and/or audience specialization or inter-disciplinary nature, including measures of diversity, as well as whether the course was graduate, undergraduate, onsite, offsite, online, executive education, and/or targeted at traditional or non-traditional students;
- e. rating, ranking, or scoring against previous semester scores of similar or same course by same and/or other faculty of different sections;
- f. the degree to which 'new' methods were included, and what aspects of the course, its delivery, testing, evaluation, etc., were impacted;
- g. student enrollment numbers;
- h. number of student complaints and/or praises (i.e., subject student comments reported on student evaluations);

- i. average faculty teaching scores over time, and with regard to mean CoB scores and standard deviations;
- j. whether the course was singularly or co-taught;
- k. other measures as deemed necessary or appropriate considering the circumstances.

2. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:

- a) **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** – Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and work to recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.
- b) **Professional Administration of the Class** – While effective teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise — and different disciplines often approach teaching differently — teaching is also a profession that requires administrative and professional functions regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.
- c) **Student Response to Instruction** – Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for the course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

3. Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence

- a) **Peer Review of Teaching Materials** – In all evaluation processes reviewers should be presented with a representative set of teaching materials such as syllabi, tests, assignments and projects, and/or class activities. For promotion and tenure, at least two members of the CoB P&T Committee must review teaching materials, exclusive of the CoB Administration. The committee will select the two reviewers and may select non-committee members as a proxy or for the purposes of including subject matter experts or other highly ranked teaching faculty in order to gain sufficient data to formulate an opinion on teaching excellence.
- b) **Self-Evaluation of Teaching** – Each faculty member may provide a narrative self-evaluation of teaching addressing the three dimensions of effective teaching.
- c) **Direct Observation of Teaching** – In order to comply with AACSB quality standards, it is the responsibility of the Dean's office that all faculty members be regularly and randomly evaluated by direct observations of classroom teaching. Classroom observation, however, will never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness.
- d) **Student Assessment of Instruction** – Use of the University-wide student assessment instrument is required of all sections of all courses taught by faculty.

4. Criteria for Annual Evaluation

- a) **Exceeds Expectations** – The faculty member:
 - i. is clearly regarded as a high-quality teacher;
 - ii. regularly updates course materials to ensure they are thorough, clear, and useful to students;
 - iii. demonstrates some evidence of innovation in the classroom;
 - iv. is frequently available to students outside of posted office hours in person or via email;
 - v. regularly mentors students, including supervision on dissertations or other research projects.
- b) **Meets Expectations** – The faculty member:

- i. is regarded as an effective teacher;
- ii. maintains acceptable teaching materials;
- iii. meets posted office hours and appointments;
- iv. sometimes mentor's students, including supervision on dissertations or other research projects.

c) **Needs Improvement**

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment slightly below the expected level. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

d) **Does Not Meet Expectations** – The faculty member:

- i. is regarded as a poor teacher;
- ii. fails to update course syllabi and/or uses outdated material;
- iii. maintains teaching materials of poor quality;
- iv. fails to honor office hours;
- v. is the subject of frequent student complaints (only complaints verified and found valid through the college's complaint handling process are to be considered when determining faculty quality);
- vi. rarely, if at all, mentor's students or supervise dissertations or other research projects.

5. Standards for Review Events

a) **Promotion to Associate Professor** – Must meet expectations or must exceed expectations in 3 of the 5 most recent years. Evidence must demonstrate that any PDP has been successfully completed. The standard applies to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

b) **Promotion to Full Professor** – Must meet expectations, and must exceed expectations in 50% of the intervening years since promotion to tenure or to associate professor. The standard applies to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

6. Post-Tenure (Teaching)

The CoB supports continuing faculty development, the promotion of faculty vitality, and the encouragement excellence among tenured faculty. This is

achieved by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance, offering suggestions to enhance performance, and providing a clear and transparent annual evaluation of faculty members. Demonstration of professional competence, conscientious execution of duties – taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the Dean – and efforts to improve performance with regards to departmental criteria should be considered the basic standard for meeting expectations.

II. Scholarship Activity (Faculty Handbook Appendix 1)

The CoB recognizes three types of acceptable forms of scholarly activity:

- a) Scholarship of discovery — Scholarship of this type “generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods.” The intent is to impact the theory or knowledge of business.
- b) Scholarship of integration/application — Scholarship of this type “synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge.” The intent is to impact the practice of business.
- c) Scholarship of teaching and learning — Scholarship of this type “develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior.” The intent is to impact the teaching and/or pedagogy of business.

The CoB adopts AACSB terminology for categorizing faculty in terms of expectations for intellectual contributions and/or intellectual developments and their role(s) in achieving the CoB’s mission. Within the CoB, a faculty member maintains Scholarly Academic (SA) qualifications by regular production of Peer Reviewed Journal Publications (PRJs) and Scholarly Works (SWs), which are collectively referred to as Intellectual Contributions (IC). The CoB defines PRJs as a faculty-authored material in a subject area reasonably considered related to the subject taught by the faculty member and which has appeared in a peer reviewed, publicly available academic outlet. The CoB defines SWs as scholarly, high-quality, intellectual contributions that do not qualify as PRJs. SWs not fitting the definition of a PRJ may also be considered evidence of intellectual contributions, including but not limited to activities and output such as:

- 1. submitting and/or receiving a substantial grant from a recognized funding agency;
- 2. publishing in an academic outlet that can be considered a quality outlet (as

- previously described);
3. publishing scholarly books or chapters in scholarly books or publishing a textbook;
 4. proceedings and/or presentations at an academic or professional conference;
 5. serving as a journal editor, senior editor, or associate editor, or special edition editor;
 6. authoring significant reports (e.g., from sponsored research, FIT Consulting, or similar source) that are widely disseminated, that may be considered proprietary but yet have significant impact;
 7. development and delivery of a significant professional product (e.g., software development, consulting implementation) derived through external funding;
 8. development and presentation of substantive continuing professional education activities or executive education programs;
 9. substantive leadership roles in academic or professional associations;
 10. publishing (and sustaining the publication of) a newsletter or sequence of reports that is subscribed to by the business community; and others.

A faculty member qualifies as SA if one (or more) of the following conditions holds.

- ✓ The faculty member has produced three or more PRJs in the last five years; or
- ✓ The faculty member has produced two PRJs and at least three SWs in the last five years; or
- ✓ The faculty member has published one PRJ and at least six SWs in the last five years; or
- ✓ The faculty earned a doctorate within the last five years from an institution that could be considered by AACSB to be qualified for SA.

The following directives guide faculty scholarship review:

1. Window for Evaluation — Five academic year rolling window. Candidates for Full Professor will be evaluated on their full body of work.
2. Quality of Scholarship – an activity that qualifies as an “intellectual contribution,” regardless of the type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) external peer review; (2) methodological rigor; (3) substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and (4) disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community. These four criteria help to differentiate: 1) the scholarship of teaching and learning from teaching; and, 2) the scholarship of application from service engagement. Peer review can include traditional forms (e.g., journals, conference presentations, edited work, grants), but it can also include a broader community of external scholars through non-traditional peer review. A candidate

may present "interesting things" that do not fit well with the standard definition of scholarship, yet are still believed by the candidate as legitimate with an appropriate description of how the item is relevant. Given the current publishing milieu and changing expectations, classification of an intellectual contribution as either PRJ or SW is a "judgment call." For that reason, faculty should identify those activities which they believe qualify as intellectual contributions "of record" during their annual review process and obtain written acknowledgment from the Dean whether the efforts count as either PRJ's or SW's. This allows both administration and faculty to identify early on whether intellectual contributions will have the gravitas to maintain faculty qualifications and can be counted when applying for promotion and tenure. Should a faculty member propose a work as PRJ or SW which does not receive the Dean's approval as such, the faculty member has recourse to present their case to the CoB P&T Committee which will render an independent opinion on the categorical nature of the work.

3. Faculty Responsibility – It is required of the faculty member to seek outlets for their intellectual contributions (IC) that are considered quality outlets. For purposes of evaluating quality, while the CoB makes no distinction between strategies of inquiry and research methodology (i.e., whether the IC is quantitative, empirical, qualitative, case study-based, or other valid methods of inquiry), ICs are considered to be 'quality' as evidenced by the data and narrative provided by the faculty member. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide said evidence, which may include, but is not limited to:
 - measures of quantity and quality related to which, how many, and the rating/ranking of the indices in which the outlet is scored, included or ranked (i.e., regional, national, or international indices and their respective rankings, such as the Journal of Citation Reports, Scopus, etc., and associated scores);
 - overall or volume acceptance/rejection rates;
 - target audience or intended markets (i.e., regional, national, international);
 - whether it is/was a full journal article, conference presentation, publication, or preceding;
 - longevity of outlet and number of subscriptions, adoptions, or access points;
 - the type of journal (i.e., traditional scholarly journal, open access, trade journal, popular press, etc.);
 - whether the journal or manuscript in question is/was peer reviewed, blind peer reviewed or double blind reviewed, invited, editorially reviewed, or board reviewed, an open or closed callout, special edition/issue;
 - the number of citation counts or key/critical citations in leading

- national/international bodies of work (e.g., handbooks, national/international standards, etc), including h-index scores or similar;
- or other measures of rating or rankings as deemed appropriate and representable by the faculty member and Dean.

4. Criteria for Annual Evaluation

- a. **Exceeds Expectations** — The faculty member has produced intellectual contributions that surpass the requirements for SA qualification in either or both quantity and quality.
- b. **Meets Expectations** — The faculty member has produced, on average, over a rolling five-year period, five quality intellectual contributions. Scholarship is not uniform from year-to year; consequently, the evaluative process should consider one's scholarship agenda and the progress made toward achieving the goals of that agenda. Some combination of the following intellectual scholarly works may be judged by the Dean to be the equivalent of a PRJ: paper presentations, book and/or textbook authorship, sponsored research, publication in a trade journal, textbook cases, consulting, and so forth. A first-year faculty member is, at a minimum, expected to have submitted for peer review at least one intellectual contribution. A second-year faculty member is expected to have received an acceptance of one peer-reviewed intellectual contribution and made one additional submission for peer review. Third through fifth-year faculty members are expected to have produced an average of one intellectual contribution annually across the rolling period.

e) **Needs Improvement**

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment slightly below the expected level. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

- d) **Does Not Meet Expectations** — The faculty member fails to meet the requirements for SA qualification in the area of scholarly activity. At all times, traditional, full time faculty must maintain their SA status.

5. Standards for Review Events

- a. **Promotion to Associate Professor** – For tenure track faculty, the candidate must produce a minimum of 5 quality intellectual contributions of which a

minimum of 4 must be high quality PRJs in respectable outlets as outlined in the previous section detailing the measurement of quality**. For non-tenure track faculty, they must produce a minimum of 3 quality intellectual contributions of which a minimum of 2 must be high quality PRJs in respectable outlets as outlined in the previous section detailing the measurement of quality**.

- b. Promotion to Full Professor** – The candidate must clearly meet or exceed expectations. For tenure track faculty, the candidate must produce a minimum of 10 PRJs; must be high quality PRJs in respectable outlets as outlined in the previous section detailing the measurement of quality. Documentation of quality of scholarship (e.g., journal reputation, citation metrics, h-index, research and/or funded research/consulting dollars) is required. Evidence of international reputation and exposure is also considered.** For non-tenure track faculty, the candidate must produce a minimum of 5 PRJs;

** meeting 'minimum' standards as outlined above does not connote or imply candidate is guaranteed to receive a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. Evidence of quality and all other efforts, work, and service produced by applicant will be considered in whole.

6. Post-Tenure (Research)

Post-tenure can best be envisioned along two time periods within an academic career. For recently tenured Associate Professors, who endeavor to be promoted to Full Professor, progress towards achieving the criteria for promotion is evidence of meeting the expectations for tenured faculty and a satisfactory annual faculty evaluation. For tenured Full Professors, and tenured career Associate Professors, a re-weighting of faculty tasks among the triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service may be considered for maximum benefit to the CoB. The Dean, based on the needs of the CoB and the relative strengths of the faculty member, shall propose or revise a set of directional goals provided by the faculty member, which will be considered in the annual faculty evaluation. These directional goals shall be jointly agreed to and approved by the Dean and the faculty member, and they can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the Dean, as deemed appropriate due to changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. Directional goals should include milestones that will be incorporated into annual performance evaluations, and satisfaction of these directional goals shall provide the basis for the annual faculty evaluation.

III. Service (Faculty Handbook Appendix 1)

As professionals, faculty members are expected to provide service to their College, University, community, and their profession. Service is an important dimension of professional life, but it receives less weight for tenure and promotion than creating an effective learning environment and scholarship. Service contributions cannot be the primary basis for promotion and/or tenure.

Typically, faculty members who seek tenure and or promotion to Associate Professor are not judged heavily on their service contributions. However, faculty who seek promotion to Professor are expected to provide leadership in the area of service. In addition, faculty members who have been assigned heavy administrative responsibilities or who undertake heavy administrative responsibilities with the approval of the Dean as part of their Plan of Work should be expected to demonstrate effectiveness along this dimension. Faculty members are expected to serve as effective advisors to assigned students.

The following directives guide service review:

1. Institutional Service - The faculty member contributes to the University mission by such activities as service to the college, school, university, or university system.
2. Community Engagement - This includes, but is not limited to, providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at a local, regional, or national level. It also includes continuing education and other non-credit instruction, lectures, presentations, workshops, grant writing, and other such activities as well as student service-learning involvement activities.
3. Special Expertise, Unusual Time, etc. - This includes service to entities such as academic, non-profit or professional societies, organizations, journals, or work on accreditation documents, service within or to academic units at the University in support of their programs such as administrative duties or other leadership roles, and other similar activities.
4. Advising & Other Service to Students - School service includes advising roles and activities. Effective advising involves being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, assistance with student academic and career planning.

Specific examples of service activities include but are not limited to the following items.

- ✓ Served on university and college governance committees
- ✓ Served on university academic and examining committees
- ✓ Performed administrative functions within the college

- ✓ Served as director of college Centers of Excellence
- ✓ Contributed as a non-remunerated consultant in an area of technical expertise to private or public sector organizations
- ✓ Provided scholarly lectures or invited talks in non-conference or industry settings
- ✓ Provided service activities to the community
- ✓ Represented the college or university in regional, national or international organizations related to university affairs
- ✓ Contributed to university- or college-related outreach projects
- ✓ Professional society service
- ✓ Journal chief editor or area editor
- ✓ Reviewer on papers for refereed journals
- ✓ Reviewer for refereed proceedings and conferences
- ✓ Session chair, discussant or panelist at state/national/international conferences
- ✓ Member of accreditation visiting teams
- ✓ External member on graduate or doctoral committees at another university
- ✓ Officer or active member, or received recognition by a professional or scientific society at the local, regional, national or international level
- ✓ Organized or taught short courses or seminars in the field of study to the business or industry-specific community

5. Criteria for Annual Evaluation

- a. **Exceeds Expectations** — Shows high level of participation at the College, or University level, such as being a member of a major committee or ad hoc committee, chair of a committee, or serves on several committees; ongoing involvement in community engagement such as College, or University representative to a community organization; assumes 'more than the normal' school level duties such as fulfilling the responsibilities of a faculty member who is ill or performing significant leadership roles such as President of the Faculty Senate or the Chair of a Faculty Senate committee; initiates and follows through with new school initiatives; meets all College, and University responsibilities; is often available for additional student development outside of class, and in addition to those activities required or expected for the fulfillment of assigned 'teaching duties' as outlined above.

- b. **Meets Expectations** — Assumes a fair share of school responsibilities; completes work in a timely manner; occasionally is involved in community engagement and/or consulting; occasionally serves on University committees;

meets School, College, and University responsibilities.

- c. **Needs Improvement** - This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment slightly below the expected level. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.
- d. **Does Not Meet Expectations** — Shows a low level of participation or rarely serves on a School, College, or University committee; little evidence of community or professional engagement.

5. Standards for Review Events

- a. **Promotion to Associate Professor** — Must meet expectations and must exceed expectations in 2 of the 5 years. Evidence must demonstrate that any development plan has been successfully completed.
- b. **Promotion to Full Professor** — Must exceed expectations.

6. Post-Tenure (Service) All tenured and non-tenured teaching faculty members must meet expectations in each year of the applicable period.